

INSTITUTE OF MARXISM-LENINISM OF THE CC CPSU

M. BASMANOV

**CONTEMPORARY
TROTSKYISM:
ITS
ANTI-REVOLUTIONARY
NATURE**



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
M O S C O W

Translated from the Russian

М. Басманов.

Антиреволюционная сущность
современного троцкизма

На английском языке

First printing 1972

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
CHAPTER I.	
HOW THE TROTSKYITES PERMANENTLY FOUGHT AGAINST THE REVOLUTION	17
Ignoring the Laws of Revolution	18
A Scornful Attitude to the Peasantry	25
The Rejection of the Possibility of a Socialist Revolution in One Country	29
Calls "To Carry the Revolution on Bayonets"	36
Disbelief in the Possibility of Building Socialism in One Country	40
Inventions and Reality	43
The Ideological Collapse of Trotskyism	55
CHAPTER II.	
HOW THE "FOURTH INTERNATIONAL" WAS HAMMERED TOGETHER AND WHAT CAME OF IT.	59
The Formation of the "Fourth International", and Its Activity on the Eve of the Second World War	59
How Many "Fourth Internationals" Can There Be?	70
CHAPTER III.	
CONTEMPORARY TROTSKYITE CONCEPTIONS: WORDS AND ACTIONS	77
1. <i>Denial of the Revolutionising Role of the World Socialist System</i>	80
For Socialism—In Words, But Not in Deeds	82
Misinterpretation of Peaceful Coexistence	87
Communist Construction in the USSR—One of the Main Targets for Anti-Sovietism	92
2. <i>The Views of Contemporary Trotskyites on the Revolutionary Struggle in Capitalist Countries</i>	93
Fabrications about the "Stagnation" of the Working-Class Movement	95
Undermining the Democratic Anti-Imperialist Movement	103
Defeatism in the Guise of "Leftism"	113
3. <i>How the Trotskyite "Left-Wing" Line Harms the National Liberation Struggle</i>	124
The Policy of Isolating the National Liberation Movement	126
Adventurist Recipes in the National Liberation Movement	136

4. <i>Contemporary Trotskyism and Problems of War and Peace</i>	147
Calls for Atomic Blackmail and a Preventive War . . .	148
Hostile Attitude to the Anti-War Efforts of the International Working Class	157

CHAPTER IV.

DEVICES AND METHODS OF TROTSKYITE DISRUPTIVE ACTIVITY IN THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT . . .	168
What Is "Entrism"?	168
Activities of Trotskyite "Entrists" in Capitalist Countries . .	173
How Trotskyites Help the Enemies of the National Liberation Movement	179

CHAPTER V.

HOW BOURGEOIS PROPAGANDA USES TROTSKYISM FOR ANTI-COMMUNIST AIMS	188
Trotskyism—Provider of Anti-Soviet and Anti-Communist Fabrications for Bourgeois Propaganda	191
Who Will Gain From Advertising Trotskyism as a "Species of Marxism"?	198
SOME CONCLUSIONS.	203
NOTES	214

INTRODUCTION

The second half of the twentieth century will be known in history as a period of the most profound revolutionary change. The emergence of a world socialist system, which has become the chief revolutionary force of our epoch, the fall of colonial empires and the appearance of dozens of independent countries in their place, an unprecedented upsurge of class struggle in developed capitalist countries—all this has transformed the political climate of the world.

Our age is a time of increasing revolutionary activity among the widest sections of the people. While in the last century, at one stage of history or another, the number of participants in revolutionary action in all the countries might be counted in thousands, rarely tens of thousands and even more rarely hundreds of thousands, nowadays hundreds of millions of people take part in the anti-imperialist movement. Now the battle front against imperialism extends throughout the world.

“The world is being revolutionised” is a phrase which reflects the anxiety of the supporters of imperialism, and appears more and more often in the pages of the capitalist press.

The scientific and technological revolution is not only altering the economic profile of the countries, it is bringing about serious changes in the class structure, and increasing the social polarisation of bourgeois society.

The working class is rapidly increasing in numbers, its organisation improves and its ability to resist grows.

Social groups that seemed a short time ago to be a long way from any kind of revolutionary action, are joining in the anti-imperialist struggle.

The working intelligentsia is making itself felt as a force to be reckoned with by the monopolies. More and more of them are joining the ranks of the hired workers, and their interests are closely interwoven with those of the working class.

Back in the fifties bourgeois propaganda, with satisfaction rather than in reproach, spoke of the students as the "silent", "passive" generation. But now students are demanding democratic reforms in higher education, guarantees that work will be found for them in their particular field, and are taking part in the struggle for social progress and national liberation.

The ruling bourgeoisie is yielding to the working class in the struggle to win other social strata that has gone on for more than a hundred years. Imperialism is steadily losing its ability to mesmerise the masses with its ideals and has no alternative to put forward against socialism.

Yet imperialism remains a serious and dangerous enemy. It uses all sorts of devices to impede the inevitable development of the revolutionary process which is transforming society. These include attempts to create a united front of the reactionary forces of the whole world, stepping up of ideological sabotage against the socialist system, new and more refined methods of social demagogy and the ideological hoodwinking of the workers in capitalist countries. Where demagogy will not help, imperialism is quick to resort to force, to police brutality against those who take part in revolutionary movements.

Ahead lies a hard and complex struggle, class conflict of the sharpest kind. Victory over imperialism can be brought nearer by co-ordinating the actions of the working class and all progressive and democratic forces, and by the closest co-operation between the numerous anti-imperialist movements and trends.

This is all the more essential because the ideological and political offensive of the supporters of imperialism is now aimed primarily at splitting the main revolutionary streams of our time—the world socialist system, the working-class movement in capitalist countries and the national liberation movement. They also try to set at loggerheads various sections of the population: non-proletarian groups with anti-imperialistic inclinations are set against the working class, the young against the older generation, and working people who are not members of the Communist parties against Communists. Imperialism sees temporary salvation in disunity of the revolutionary forces, and mortal danger in their unity.

In every country where a struggle against the power of capital is being waged there is no greater problem than the achievement of united action between workers, peasants and other working people. The mounting revolutionary mass movement can overthrow the supremacy of monopolies if all forms of social protest follow a clear-cut anti-monopoly line and contribute to a united programme of anti-imperialist struggle.

The solution of this problem is helped by the fact that the new social strata that are being drawn into the revolutionary conflict bring with them an enormous supply of energy, and a powerful feeling of hatred for the capitalist system. They are becoming increasingly aware of the need to unite with other revolutionary forces.

Of vital importance for the achievement of this aim is the fact that the anti-monopoly struggle is led by the proletariat, the class that sees its historic mission in the abolition of every form of exploitation. It is the proletariat that is coming forward in capitalist countries as the leading force in social progress.

Direction of the class struggle is an art and a science, and in mastering them one is helped by a profoundly scientific, revolutionary world outlook, which crystallises the preceding experience of liberation movements, and can answer the questions raised by present-day revolutionary practice. Marxism-Leninism provides such a world outlook. It guides the activities of the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat, the Communist and Workers' parties. By bringing up to date and perfecting the strategy and tactics of class struggle, Marxism-Leninism helps the workers to find the best ways and methods for a revolutionary transformation of society.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, when Russia entered a period of the most bitter class conflicts, Lenin urged Marxists to raise the workers to the level of revolutionaries. This Leninist principle is not only valid but has even acquired a particular significance today.

While spreading the ideas of scientific communism among the broad proletarian masses and preparing them for the revolutionary struggle, Communists also intensify their propaganda work among those non-proletarian sections which are groping their way towards political life, and

among whom manifestations of social protest are the strongest.

The Communist and Workers' parties are guided in this respect by the approach Lenin adopted in the conditions of tsarist Russia of having an action programme that would appeal both to protesting students and dissatisfied teachers and to discontented believers.

At the same time the Communist and Workers' parties must be able to resist the various erroneous opinions and ideas which appear both in the ranks of the working class and among other sections of the working people. Such opinions are bound to spread when broader social strata are joining in the revolutionary movement.

Lenin wrote on this point: "If this movement is not measured by the criterion of some fantastic ideal, but is regarded as the practical movement of ordinary people, it will be clear that the enlistment of larger and larger numbers of new 'recruits', the attraction of new sections of the working people must inevitably be accompanied by waverings in the sphere of theory and tactics, by repetitions of old mistakes, by a temporary reversion to antiquated views and antiquated methods, and so forth. The labour movement of every country periodically spends a varying amount of energy, attention and time on the 'training' of recruits."¹

The nineteen sixties saw the emergence of many different theories denying the revolutionary potential of the working class, and seeking the motive force of revolution anywhere but in that class. The non-proletarian strata (the intelligentsia, students and partly peasants in developing countries) are having it drummed into them that a revolutionary transformation of society can be brought about without an alliance with the working class.

These pseudo-scientific "theories" have this in common: their advocates strive to refute the ideas of scientific communism and foster distrust for the international policy evolved by the Communist and Workers' parties. Their objective is to prevent the creation of a single anti-imperialist movement without which revolutionary victory is unthinkable.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 348.

Such theories are particularly dangerous since they encourage tendencies prejudicial to the cause of the revolution, and start a long line of false conclusions and wrong actions. The group isolation peculiar to certain sections of the non-proletarian strata is presented as "a theoretical credo", while refusal to accept the proposal of the working class and the Communists to take joint action becomes a principle of behaviour.

Worse still, currency is given to pernicious and disruptive ideas that it is possible to be a revolutionary and oppose imperialism from anti-communist positions. To put it another way, monopoly is challenged in words, but the actual attack is being launched against the Communist parties and the international working-class movement.

Trotskyism is particularly active in spreading such views. In the twenties and thirties Trotskyism was routed, both ideologically and organisationally, was rejected by the international communist movement, and for a long time it lingered in the backwaters of history.

But now, since the fifties and the beginning of the sixties, the Trotskyites have begun to raise their heads. This has shown itself in mounting attempts to bring together various ill-assorted groups. Almost every two or three years Trotskyites of different persuasions hold "international" congresses at which they hurriedly work their way through a variety of motions dealing with revolution, war and peace.

What is the reason for these stirrings of life among the Trotskyites?

The reason why Trotskyism has become active—however insignificant and peripheral such activity may be on the world scene—is to be found in certain peculiarities of the present stage of the anti-imperialist struggle. The Trotskyites have placed their hopes on those representatives of the non-proletarian strata of capitalist and developing countries who are trying to be "Lefter than the Left" and reject the strategy and tactics of the Communist parties.

Like dried infusoria which revive in a drop of muddy water, the Trotskyites bestirred themselves at the first signs of petty-bourgeois "ultra-Left" hostility towards communism. The thing that has enabled the Trotskyites to refloat their leaky political boats for a while is "Left" extremism that, having reached the peak of absurdity and substituting anti-

communism and anti-Sovietism for the struggle against capitalism, has gained some influence among certain non-proletarian strata.

Using treachery, intrigue and every political dodge, Trotskyite groups in several capitalist countries (their membership rarely reaches two figures) have set themselves the task of infiltrating the "Left radical" movements and trends which arose in the sixties. They try in every way to fan the ultra-Left tendencies that exist there, and to drag in the anti-communist principles of their "Fourth International".

Thus, until recently, a significant number of Trotskyites entertained great hopes of spreading their ideas in the countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa. Expecting to acquire supporters there, they proclaimed the peasantry to be the most radical force of the present time, and concentrated their efforts on penetrating the peasant movement and bringing it under their influence. When, however, they saw that their hopes would not be fulfilled, they began to seek a new sphere of action.

Since 1968 proposals have been made at Trotskyite congresses and conferences to probe the growing political potential of students, who, it was claimed, should in the present historical conditions be considered the most radical force.

It is clear that the attempts of the Trotskyites to attach themselves to the student movement are not accidental.

The present-day student population is a new generation which was born and grew up after the Second World War. And many young people, who naturally have not had time to acquire any sort of serious political experience, often give themselves up to illusions regarding the possibility of working out a special programme of "youth" activities quite apart from the general context of the class struggle. Besides Communist groups within the student movement, which is exceedingly variegated from the social point of view, there are all sorts of currents and trends—from supporters of pure reformism to advocates of "immediate direct action", who fight an unceasing ideological war among themselves.

Unlike the older generation, who still remember earlier anti-revolutionary Trotskyite actions and know the worth of their ultra-Left phrases, the students have no "immunity"

from Trotskyism. They usually have a distorted understanding of Trotskyism, acquired from the lectures of bourgeois professors, who do not spare praise for Trotsky and his "teaching" in order to blacken scientific socialism.

The Trotskyites have simultaneously increased their ideological appeals to extremist-minded petty-bourgeois intellectuals, exploiting their prejudices against the Communist parties' strategic principles and the search for a "third path" of social development having nothing in common with either capitalism or contemporary socialist reality.

Lenin, in his day, noted that Trotsky "unites ... all philistines who do not understand the reasons for the struggle",¹ and this is just how the successors of Trotsky try to attract people who are confused by the complexity of the political struggle and do not even comprehend what they expect from it.

The Trotskyites ferret out every possible approach to petty-bourgeois intellectuals with extremist leanings, the student movement, and the Latin American revolutionary guerrillas among whom there are both peasants and officers with radical sympathies. And everywhere their function is to split the revolutionary movement and provoke it to irresponsible adventurism.

Left-wing extremism, as is well known, is sometimes a punishment for the Right-wing opportunist sins of Social-Democracy. It is no accident that Trotskyites are also active where the revolutionary movement is artificially held back by the compromising policy of Right-wing Social-Democrats. In a number of West European countries they try to influence those members of Social-Democratic parties and of the organisations connected with them who are opposed to the treacherous policy of the social-reformers, but fight shy of the tactics and strategy of the Communist parties.

The position adopted by the Communist Party of China has played into the hands of the Trotskyites.

The "congress" of the Paris group of the "Fourth International" held in 1961 openly announced that Maoist efforts to undermine the international communist movement had created "such opportunities for Trotskyite activity as there have never been before". And the next "congress" two years

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, p. 21.

later, which came out in favour of the Maoists' basic "programmatic" demands, urged Trotskyites "toward bolder and more aggressive action than ever before".

The theories of both Trotskyites and Maoists certainly have features in common. The Peking leaders agree with the Trotskyites on many points: anti-Marxist views on the world revolutionary process and orientation on the export of revolution; emphasis on war as the only means for the promotion of world revolution; defeatist appraisals concerning the prospects of building a socialist society; slanderous outbursts against the Soviet Union; ideas about the pre-eminence of political directives over the objective laws of social development; attempts to isolate the national liberation movement, and setting it up in opposition to other revolutionary streams of today; slanderous charges of "degeneration", "revisionism" and so on against Communist parties in a number of countries.

Of course, Maoism is not a version of Trotskyism, but it is an eclectic petty-bourgeois system which besides elements of Confucianism, anarchism and petty-bourgeois chauvinism includes a variety of Trotskyite ideas.

In some ways the Chinese leaders have simply taken over certain Trotskyite doctrines; in others their views objectively coincide. Both of them, from their own peculiar positions and for their own selfish purposes, undermine the struggle against imperialism by fighting against the Communist parties and Marxism-Leninism.

A great deal of the uproar that the Trotskyites have raised about their readiness to form a union with the Peking leaders savours of self-advertisement. The leaders of the "Fourth International" have tried to squeeze the maximum political advantage out of the similarity between their opinions and those of the Peking leaders. And this political game of the Trotskyites misleads certain people in capitalist countries.

In the Central Committee's report to the 24th Congress of the CPSU it was pointed out that the Trotskyites quite often gang up with the factionalist groups created by the Chinese leaders.¹

Fishing for new supporters, the latter-day Trotskyites

¹ See *24th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1971, p. 26.

make every effort to appear in Marxist colours and, while distorting Leninism, cunningly use its terminology for their disruptive purposes. This has been part of their strategy for a long time.

The purpose behind the Trotskyite pretence was revealed by that prominent figure in the world communist movement, Otto Kuusinen, in an article entitled "Notes on Historical Experience", in which he wrote: "Trotskyites were masters in the art of political forgery and in the art of manipulating quotations taken from Lenin. They understood the strength of the international influence wielded by the teaching of Lenin, and realised that without at least lip-service to Leninism it was no use hoping to attract revolutionary-minded workers to their side."¹

Here again bourgeois propaganda hastens to the rescue of the Trotskyite deceivers.

As Lenin wrote in 1915, "bourgeois society is continually producing ... opportunists who love to call themselves socialists, who deliberately and systematically deceive the masses with the most florid and 'radical' words".² Today's reality again confirms the truth of Lenin's words. Anti-communist propaganda constantly supports ultra-Left tendencies, insofar as they do not constitute a serious danger to imperialism, but run counter to the general line taken by the most revolutionary force of our time, the international communist movement, and hinder the strengthening of the solidarity of the anti-imperialist fighters.

Sparing no effort to popularise various ultra-Left conceptions, bourgeois propaganda presents Trotskyism as a "trend" in the communist movement, as a "legitimate branch of Marxism", its aim being to stimulate interest in Trotskyism and its anti-communist "theoretical" clap-trap.

The sponsors of the anti-communist propaganda campaign give their utmost support to the Trotskyites. They enable them to pursue their activities legally even in countries where the forces of democracy are cruelly persecuted and the Communist parties have been driven underground. Trotskyite writings are printed by major bourgeois publishing firms.

¹ O. V. Kuusinen, *Selected Works (1918-1964)*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1966, p. 682.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 429.

And although there is no direct admissions, either in the bourgeois or in the Trotskyite press, that the Trotskyites receive financial subsidies in some covert way from their "well-wishers", it is obvious that such help exists. How otherwise could these feeble groups find the means regularly to publish dozens of journals and papers, organise "international congresses", and take part in election campaigns?

The Trotskyites repay their debts. Applauded by bourgeois propagandists, they slander the Communist parties, and vie with one another in calumniating socialist countries.

Wherever they can, they try to prevent unity among the ranks of the revolutionaries. They are best served when there is a split, as in these conditions they can engage in political manoeuvres and take advantage of organisational weakness in the revolutionary movement.

The anti-imperialist movement can succeed if it displays vigilance in face of subversive activities of the Trotskyites. To expose them means to show the deep gulf that exists between words and deeds. Claiming to the name of "revolutionaries", they have always done all they can to hinder the advance of the class struggle.

The Trotskyites are still at the same game today, spinning their intrigues among the non-proletarian strata. Experience has shown that those who fall into their political trap are lost to the revolutionary movement. Even a short term in Trotskyite circles more often than not leads to political apathy and a loss of interest for the class struggle. No one can put down revolutionary fervour as effectively as the Trotskyites with their concepts, Leftist in form and defeatist in substance.

This is why the Communist and Workers' parties, who have long worked for a genuinely anti-imperialist movement, wage an irreconcilable war against Trotskyism. They expose its schemes, and reveal the mechanics of its disruptive activity. The Communists expose the real aims pursued by the imperialist press in supporting Trotskyism and its views, and explain to the masses why so much energy and funds are directed towards putting new life into Trotskyism.

Communist parties go deeply into the historical experience of the international working-class movement's struggle against Trotskyism.

Of special interest among the work of Soviet historians

are two books that came out in 1968 and 1969, *The Struggle of the Bolshevik Party Against Trotskyism (1903—February 1917)* and *The Struggle of the Bolshevik Party Against Trotskyism in the Period After the October Revolution*.¹ The authors employ a great deal of factual material to illustrate the anti-revolutionary activities of the Trotskyites and show the struggle Lenin and the international communist movement waged against Trotskyism right up to its ideological and organisational defeat at the end of the twenties.

Among other works on Trotskyism mention should be made of a book by a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of France, Léo Figuères, *Trotskyism Is Anti-Leninism*, which deals mainly with the struggle waged by the CPSU against Trotskyism in the period before the October Revolution and in the first decade after it.² This book also briefly discusses Trotskyism's attempts to galvanise its activity after its utter ideological and organisational defeat within the communist movement.

The aim of this present book is to show that the Trotskyites, having been utterly defeated ideologically and organisationally within the international communist movement, have tried to rebuild their position and to embark on a new series of anti-revolutionary campaigns. The task is twofold, first we must get to the bottom of the views of contemporary Trotskyism on the world revolutionary process. Second, the means and methods of Trotskyite disruptive activity in the contemporary revolutionary movement must be exposed.

All this should enable us to see the political character of Trotskyism better, and to understand its anti-revolutionary essence.

¹ V. A. Grinko, N. A. Mitkin, Y. F. Sopin, S. S. Shaumyan, *The Struggle of the Bolshevik Party Against Trotskyism (1903—February 1917)*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1968; *The Struggle of the Bolshevik Party Against Trotskyism in the Period After the October Revolution*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1969. See also the collections of documents: *Trotskyism—Enemy of Leninism*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1968; *The Struggle of Lenin and the CPSU Against Trotskyism*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1972; *Leninism and the Ideological and Political Defeat of Trotskyism* by V. M. Ivanov and A. N. Shmelyov. In this last work there is a detailed, well-grounded criticism of the Trotskyite "theory of permanent revolution", and also a general survey of the anti-revolutionary activities of contemporary Trotskyites.

² Léo Figuères, *Le trotskisme, cet antiléninisme*, Paris, 1969.

Chapter I

HOW THE TROTSKYITES PERMANENTLY FOUGHT AGAINST THE REVOLUTION

The essence of any political trend that claims to open the ways of social development and social progress is more clearly apparent as soon as the question of revolution, its motive forces and ultimate aims, is raised. Whatever sort of "Left" phrases are used by pseudo-revolutionaries, it is enough to look at the way they resolve the question of revolution to know whose interests are served by their views.

The latter-day Trotskyites zealously advertise the so-called "theory of permanent revolution", announcing that it is "the most revolutionary teaching of our time". They affirm that this "theory" does not differ essentially from Lenin's views on revolution, although in actual fact they are substituting Trotskyism for Marxism-Leninism. Moreover, they have the audacity to claim that their "theory" supposedly had a "decisive significance" for the development of the world revolutionary process.

By crude falsification of this kind the Trotskyites hope to kill several birds with one stone. First, they give Trotsky the halo of a revolutionary, in order to stimulate interest in his views and pronouncements of a frankly anti-Soviet and anti-communist nature. Second, they claim they are "the heirs of the revolutionary traditions of the past".¹ Third, they give the impression that they have some sort of "revolutionary programme" of their own, which allegedly has stood the test of time.

Since Trotskyites loudly proclaim that all their activity is founded on the so-called "theory of permanent revolution", it is as well to remind readers what this theory amounts to.

Trotsky launched this "theory" in 1905-06, and frequently returned to it to deepen its anti-Leninist content.

¹ In a book published in Paris in 1969 Pierre Frank, one of the leaders of present-day Trotskyism, claims that the "Fourth International" is "the successor to revolutionary Marxism", and has constantly "enriched Marxism" (Pierre Frank, *La Quatrième Internationale. Contribution à l'histoire du mouvement trotskyste*, Paris, 1969, p. 8).

With the help of his "theory of permanent revolution" Trotsky tried to give the impression that he had some overall conception of the ways, motive forces and ultimate aims of the development of revolutionary struggle. In fact, he longed for one thing—to oust Marxism-Leninism by a petty-bourgeois system of concepts presented in the trappings of pseudo-Marxism. "The theory of permanent revolution" speculates both on Marxism and on the desire of the participants in the revolutionary movement to understand it and put it into practice.

If the rhetoric and declarations of adherence to Marxism (which confused and still confuse some people) are removed from the books, articles and speeches of Trotsky, and the remaining skeleton of the "theory of permanent revolution" is closely examined, it turns out to be made up of a few propositions, some of them frankly defeatist, some, as Lenin said, masking defeatism with absurdly Leftist phrases.

These propositions include: a tendency to jump over the various stages of revolution, and to denounce general democratic movements; disbelief in the ability of the working class to have and to rally allies in the revolutionary struggle; disbelief in the victory of revolution in one country; orientation on "revolutionary wars"; denial of the possibility of building socialism in one country. In the twenties and thirties the "theory" acquired another essential element—crude anti-sovietism.

"The theory of permanent revolution" itself, like the whole past of Trotskyism, serves as a bill of indictment against those who give themselves out to be the heirs of Trotsky and seek in his "theories" the justification for anti-communist pronouncements.

Ignoring the Laws of Revolution

Trotsky and his present-day followers claim that "the theory of permanent revolution" is the development of the ideas of Marx and Engels. Thus the English Trotskyites state in their *Newsletter* (now called *Worker's Press*) that when Trotsky was developing his theory he based it completely on the thesis promulgated by the founders of Marxism in

March 1850 in the address of the Central Committee to the Communist League.¹

In this address Marx and Engels wrote: "While the democratic petty bourgeois wish to bring the revolution to a conclusion as quickly as possible . . . it is our interest, and our task to make the revolution permanent, until all more or less possessing classes have been forced out of their position of dominance, until the proletariat has conquered state power. . . ."²

As far as Trotsky's "theory of permanent revolution" is concerned, it has nothing in common with this, apart from the word "permanent" used by Marx and Engels. In any case Trotsky himself admitted in his book, *My Life*, that when he was developing the "theory", he relied not on Marx, but on the German Social-Democrat Parvus, most of whose ideas he was trying to "develop". This is the same Parvus who later on lauded German imperialism and slandered Soviet Russia.

In 1964 in West Germany, a certain Winfried Scharlau published his doctoral thesis, "Parvus as the Theoretician of German Social-Democracy and His Role in the First Russian Revolution".³ Scharlau refers to the components of the now forgotten theory of Parvus and compares them with Trotsky's views on revolution, and proves rather convincingly that, after long discussions with Parvus in 1905, Trotsky became for a time a convinced "parvusite".⁴ He then reproaches Trotsky for not learning his lessons, showing too much "temperament", and being more precipitate in his conclusions than his teacher.

During the years of the first Russian revolution Trotsky, to whom "only the *European* models of opportunism"⁵ appealed, opposed Lenin's views on revolution with his own "theory".

¹ *The Newsletter*, June 4, 1968.

² Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1969, pp. 178-79.

³ Winfried Scharlau, *Parvus—Helphand als Theoretiker in der deutschen Sozialdemokratie und seine Rolle in der ersten russischen Revolution*, Münster, 1964.

⁴ In his book *The Permanent Revolution*, published in Berlin, Trotsky does not deny that his and Parvus' "views on the Russian Revolution of 1905 coincided closely without being identical".

⁵ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 341.

Lenin developed Marx's thesis on the need to combine proletarian risings with the peasant movement, and analysed the difference between bourgeois democratic revolutions in the imperialist epoch and bourgeois revolutions in the pre-monopoly period. He came to the conclusion that the proletariat could and should be the leader of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, for it was the only class capable of uniting around itself broad non-proletarian masses in the struggle for the fullest and boldest development of the revolution.

Lenin showed that if it took on the role of leader of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the proletariat would extend the limits of democratic revolution, and, by defending its own class interests, would be preparing the transition to the next, socialist stage of the revolution. "We cannot get out of the bourgeois-democratic boundaries of the Russian revolution," wrote Lenin, "but we can vastly extend these boundaries, and within these boundaries we can and must fight for the interests of the proletariat, for its immediate needs and for conditions that will make it possible to prepare its forces for the future complete victory."¹

It was the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasants that had to create objective conditions for such a transition in Russia. It was not socialist but democratic by its very nature and, as such, could fulfil the immediate political and socio-economic demands of the workers without yet destroying capitalism.

At the same time the bourgeois-democratic revolution was not separated by a wall from the socialist revolution. The transition from one revolution to the other depended on the organisation and consciousness of the working class, and on its ability to lead the working masses. Lenin wrote: "... from the democratic revolution we shall at once, and precisely in accordance with the measure of our strength, the strength of the class-conscious and organised proletariat, begin to pass to the socialist revolution. We stand for uninterrupted revolution. We shall not stop half-way".²

Guided by Lenin's theory of revolution, the Bolshevik party put forward concrete slogans which stirred up revolu-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 52.

² *Ibid.*, p. 37.

tionary energy among the masses and brought them to an understanding of the necessity of defeating capitalism.

Trotsky denied the need for the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and believed that there should immediately be a socialist revolution in Russia. During the period of the first Russian revolution this idea of Trotsky's was reflected in the slogan "No Tsar, but a workers' government".

Trotsky never took into account the actual political situation or the balance of class forces, and would not see who might join the proletariat.

In 1907, he published a pamphlet *Our Revolution*, in which he asserted that revolution must immediately bring about the transfer of power to the proletariat, which would embark on a socialist policy without delay. Two years later, in the article "1905", in discussing the idea that it was essential for a "workers' government" to be established in the very first days of the revolution, Trotsky attempted to prove that in itself revolution could only be of benefit to the proletariat, and met only its class interests.

One of the most fundamentally fallacious aspects of the "theory of permanent revolution" (in the book *The Permanent Revolution* Trotsky admitted: "My treatment of this question certainly differed from Lenin's") lay in the fact that it completely ignored the proposition on the development of the revolution in stages which had been worked out in general terms by Marx and Engels. Trotsky's "theory" lacked precisely what he claimed for it—i.e., an understanding of the revolutionary process as developing uninterruptedly and in stages and having a class content.

The most politically harmful thing about Trotsky's views was that he ignored the actual prerequisites for rallying broad masses of working people round the working class. Rash slogans about an imminent socialist revolution could have alienated other strata of the population opposed to tsarism from the working class and its party. Had not the working class adopted a differentiated policy of alliance with some and neutralisation of others, it would have found itself in the position of a lonely champion, deprived of supporters, and the party would have been cut off from the masses.

In insisting on leaping over the stages, Trotsky was, therefore, not just "hurrying". He advocated a course which

would have condemned the working class to isolation and the revolution to defeat.

Exposing the anti-Marxist, opportunist character of "the theory of permanent revolution", in his article "Historical Meaning of Inner-Party Struggle in Russia", Lenin pointed out: "Trotsky . . . has never been able to form any definite views on the role of the proletariat in the Russian bourgeois revolution."¹ He also noted that "Trotsky's major mistake was that he ignored the bourgeois character of the revolution and had no clear conception of the transition from this revolution to the socialist revolution."²

Trotsky put forward the idea that the imperialist epoch totally excluded any sort of generally democratic revolutionary action in the interests of the majority of the nation. Criticising this view and emphasising the fact that Trotsky refused to consider the reasons why life had passed by this theory for a whole ten years, Lenin wrote in 1915: "From the Bolsheviks Trotsky's original theory has borrowed their call for a decisive proletarian revolutionary struggle and for the conquest of political power by the proletariat, while from the Mensheviks it has borrowed 'repudiation' of the peasantry's role. The peasantry, he asserts, are divided into strata, have become differentiated; their potential revolutionary role has dwindled more and more; in Russia a 'national' revolution is impossible; 'we are living in the era of imperialism,' says Trotsky, and 'imperialism does not contrapose the bourgeois nation to the old regime, but the proletariat to the bourgeois nation.'"³

Even after the 1917 February Revolution in Russia Trotsky still clung to his "theory of permanent revolution", scoffed at a general democratic struggle and the task of winning over working peasants to the side of the working class.

In his "Letters on Tactics" Lenin stated clearly that his theses were directed against the views of Trotsky, who was still ignoring the process by which the bourgeois democratic revolution would grow into a socialist revolution. "But are we not in danger of falling into subjectivism, of wanting to arrive at the socialist revolution by 'skipping' the bourgeois-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 380.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 15, p. 371.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 21, p. 419.

democratic revolution—which is not yet completed and has not yet exhausted the peasant movement?

“I might be incurring this danger if I said: ‘No Tsar, but a *workers’* government.’”¹

And although the experience of the February and October revolutions of 1917 showed beyond any shadow of doubt that Trotsky’s views were invalid, Trotsky continued to cling to his “theory”.

He attempted to give it philosophical backing. In his book *The Permanent Revolution*, published in 1930, he categorically stated: “It is nonsense to say that it is impossible in general to leap over stages. A living historical process always leaps.”

These views of Trotsky’s had nothing in common with materialist dialectics.

Marxists-Leninists consider that in definite conditions certain stages of social development can be skipped. In an epoch in which mighty socialist forces exist not all countries and nations need to go through the historic stages of social development known to man. Lenin foresaw the possibility that the colonial peoples, having freed themselves from the imperialist yoke, would be able to set forth on a non-capitalist road of development, without going through the capitalist melting pot.

In our time Lenin’s proposition has become one of the strategic slogans of the international communist movement which takes strictly scientific account of the real needs of the internal political development of the countries of the Third World, as well as the nature of our epoch and the whole complex of contemporary historic conditions, whose chief and most distinctive feature is the revolutionising influence of the socialist system on world events.

To put it in another way, Marxists-Leninists are in favour of shortcuts in revolution, when conditions allow. However, they energetically oppose every sort of adventurous attempts to “cheat” history and leap over definite stages of development when the necessary conditions for this are absent. As the rich experience of the revolutionary struggle teaches, such “experiments” can only do enormous damage to the

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 24, p. 48.

revolutionary cause, and hurl the working class far back from the positions it has gained.

Trotsky actually advocated "cheating" history, and took a voluntaristic approach to these leaps. According to his subjectivist thinking they are not prepared by the whole complex of social development, but are planned by "individuals active in revolution". This logically led him to the conclusion that these leaps were a mere mechanical jumping over certain stages. Light-heartedly proclaiming that life always moved in leaps, he never burdened himself with an analysis of the cause and conditions of development in leaps.

Lenin taught the party of the proletariat to take a strictly scientific approach to such a complex and many-sided phenomenon as revolution. He taught that "a revolution cannot be 'made', that revolutions *develop* from objectively (i.e., independently of the will of parties and classes) mature crises and turns in history".¹

According to Trotsky these revolutionary leaps were the result of the activity of some sort of select group, who could concentrate the will of the proletariat for the revolutionary transformation of society. "On the political market," he wrote, "the party can offer for consideration not the objective interests of the proletariat, theoretically sifted, but the consciously organised will of the proletariat."² Trotsky imagined that the revolutionary transformation of society was not the conscious constructive work of the broadest masses, but the study of the situation on the "political market" by the same élite whom the mass of the people would apparently follow blindly.

It should be noted that in his book *The Permanent Revolution*, Trotsky attempted to patch up the holes in his badly battered conception, and even to juggle with facts. He asserted that his "theory" did not in principle reject the democratic stage of revolution. At the same time, he not only contradicted what he had himself said in this connection, but even his own statements in this very book. Having admitted on several pages the possibility of bourgeois-democratic revolutions, he then goes on to say that they can

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 240.

² Quoted from the journal *Under the Banner of Marxism*, No. 9, 1930, p. 155 (in Russian).

only succeed by means of the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship. This is the road, he predicted, that must be taken even by the economically and politically backward countries, in particular the colonies and semi-colonies. With them especially in mind, Trotsky wrote: "According to the theory of permanent revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat is the only final solution of their democratic problems and the problems of national liberation."

These conclusions of Trotsky's are confused. But his fundamental idea is clear. He continued to advocate leaping over the revolutionary stages. And the defeatist substance of his views became particularly manifest in the prospects he outlined for colonial and semi-colonial countries. Here the traditional Trotsky formula "everything or nothing" became a prophecy of defeat for the national liberation movement unless the dictatorship of the proletariat was established.

A Scornful Attitude to the Peasantry

In Trotsky's "theory of permanent revolution" leaping over the stages of revolution is organically connected with belittling the role of the peasantry as a force capable of siding with the working class in the struggle against the system of monarchy and landed estates and the remnants of feudalism, and finally being an ally in the process of breaking up the exploiters' society.

Trotsky did not wish to see the urgency of the agrarian problem in Russia, with the age-old peasant striving to get rid of landowner and semi-feudal dependence. He ignored the fact that life itself compelled the peasants to take part in the revolutionary struggle, since among its aims was the liquidation of social oppression in the village. Trotsky saw in the peasant only a proprietor, and did not notice his other side—that of the worker. He rejected the revolutionary capabilities of the many-million peasant masses that made up the bulk of the population of Russia. "So long as the peasantry remains in the vice of estate and social slavery," wrote Trotsky in 1915, "it continues, in its spontaneous outbursts against the old regime, to retain all the characteristics of economic and ideological dissociation and lack of political consciousness, cultural backwardness and helplessness, which

always and in every movement paralyse its social energy and force it to stop just when genuine revolutionary action is about to start."

According to Trotsky's scheme, the proletariat was doomed to carry on the struggle against tsarism and the landowners, surrounded by disbelief and hostility on the part of the peasants. Even if some of the peasants, he announced, were to follow the working class, conflict would inevitably arise between them as soon as the revolution achieved victory. In the pamphlet *Results and Perspectives*, written in 1906, he asserted: "Left to its own resources, the working class of Russia will inevitably be crushed by the counter-revolution the moment the peasantry turns away from it."

Trotsky was also putting forward these same views as to the reactionary character of the peasant masses a few weeks before the February Revolution. In January 1917 he wrote: "There is again incomparably less hope in the revolutionary role of the peasantry as a class than there was in 1905."

Having said that in 1905 the peasantry had betrayed the expectations of the Bolsheviks, Trotsky deliberately painted a gloomy picture of the events of the first Russian revolution. For the sake of his idea, he "forgot" that in spite of being scattered and unorganised, the peasantry, even in 1905, had showed itself to be a revolutionary force and the ally of the working class.

Trotsky's statements were implacably opposed to the Marxist idea of uniting "the proletarian solo" with "the peasant chorus" as the revolution went on. Here, too, the "theory of permanent revolution" was the very opposite of Lenin's programmatic proposition that the working class should establish an alliance with the peasantry as an indispensable condition of the victorious outcome of the revolution.

His prophecy of a possible collision between the working class and the peasantry brought Trotsky into the camp of the Mensheviks. They also sowed doubt as to the possibility of a revolutionary victory, and considered that the working class would only have a chance of success when it made up the majority of the nation.

The experience of the February and October revolutions brilliantly confirmed Lenin's strategic plan, which had been worked out as far back as the beginning of the twentieth century, of bringing about an alliance between the working

class and the peasantry. "Things have turned out just as we said they would," Lenin stated in November 1918. "The course taken by the revolution has confirmed the correctness of our reasoning. *First*, with the 'whole' of the peasants against the monarchy, against the landowners, against medievalism (and to that extent the revolution remains bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic). *Then*, with the poor peasants, with the semi-proletarians, with all the exploited, *against capitalism*, including the rural rich, the kulaks, the profiteers, and to that extent the revolution becomes a *socialist one*."¹

The practical experience of the revolution itself thus dealt a resounding blow to Trotsky's insistence on the "conservative" and "reactionary" nature of the peasantry. Neither was his "prophecy" justified that the peasants would "make war" on the working class and would be a deadly threat to the gains of the revolution. As soon as it had seized power, the proletariat, led by the party of Bolsheviks, resolved the urgent democratic problems and in this way ensured the support of the overwhelming majority of the peasants. The alliance between the industrial workers and the working peasants became the reliable foundation of Soviet power.

How did Trotsky react to historical events developing contrary to his "theory", which was artificial and divorced from life? In *The Permanent Revolution*, he admitted: "It is possible to find articles, for instance, in which I expressed doubt as to the future revolutionary role of the whole of the peasantry as a class." And in the same breath he declared that the Bolsheviks had overestimated the role of the peasantry as an ally, and that no one had been nearer the truth than he was.

Trotsky went on asserting that the peasantry could not display political initiative and was passive. It was therefore impossible to see whom it would follow—the working class or the bourgeoisie. Examining the future development of the political situation in the economically less developed countries, he said that the peasantry would not be able to show itself as a revolutionary force; moreover, it would grow less active than it had been "in the epoch of the old bourgeois revolutions".

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 300.

From this Trotsky drew the conclusion that as long as imperialism existed in the world the slogan on the right of oppressed nations to self-determination was unrealistic and mere propaganda.

Trotsky tried to prove the futility of any effort towards national liberation. He wrote in 1930: "In the conditions of an imperialist epoch a national-democratic revolution can only be brought to victory if social and political relations in the given country have developed enough to allow the proletariat to assume the leadership of the masses. But what if this has not yet happened? In that case the struggle for national emancipation will bring poor results, and these will be to the detriment of the working masses."

Trotsky's conclusions about the national liberation struggle in many ways echoed what he had predicted with regard to the revolution in Russia. The only difference was that Trotsky used more gloomy colours in painting a political portrait of the peasantry in the less developed countries. While Lenin and the Communist parties aimed at an alliance between the international working class and the peasantry of the less developed countries, Trotsky virtually wrote off the national liberation movement as a force in the world revolution.

As far back as 1915, Lenin pointed out that Trotsky was playing into the hands of the forces "who by 'repudiation' of the role of the peasantry understand a *refusal* to raise up the peasants for the revolution".¹ In the years before the revolution Trotsky played into the hands of those forces which tried to prove that there was no future for a socialist revolution in Russia on the grounds that the country was backward, and the majority of the population were peasants.

After the October Revolution Trotsky's views on the futility of revolutionary action in colonial and dependent countries objectively came very close to the arguments of imperialist reaction, which was also trying to instil into the exploited masses the idea that they were doomed, and that there was no hope for any sort of action in the cause of national liberation.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 420.

The Rejection of the Possibility of a Socialist Revolution in One Country

In the years preceding the October Revolution, the Bolshevik Party was faced with the question of whether it was possible for a socialist revolution to be victorious first in one country. This question had an enormous practical and theoretical significance. The working out of the scientifically based strategy and tactics of the Bolshevik party and the international revolutionary movement as a whole depended on the right answer.

Lenin formulated the theory of the transformation of a bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution as far back as 1905, and this theory contained propositions leading to the conclusion that the victory of socialism in one country was possible. Based on laws inherent in the development of revolution, Lenin's theory inspired revolutionaries with faith in victory, which depended, in the main, on the ability of the working class to head the revolutionary movement and lead the masses.

A deep and scientific analysis of imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism enabled Lenin to show later that the development of various capitalist countries proceeded very unevenly, and that some of them forged ahead, while others lagged behind. Imperialism increased the economic and political oppression of the working class, strengthened reaction in all fields, and brought the conflict between labour and capital to a head. The uneven development of capitalism in conditions of imperialism made a deep impression on the political life of the different countries and on the constantly changing balance of class forces.

Weak links in the imperialist system were bound to appear. "...The workers' revolution," Lenin pointed out, "develops unevenly in different countries, since the conditions of political life differ. In one country the proletariat is too weak and in another it is stronger."¹

Weak links, Lenin taught, were not necessarily to be found in countries where capitalism was most developed and the proportion of proletarians in the population was the highest. These links were to be found where the internal political

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 119.

contradictions had reached breaking-point and there were objective and subjective prerequisites for the ripening of a revolutionary situation and for resolute massive action against the system of imperialist exploitation.

In the epoch of imperialism the rivalry between separate imperialist states became more intensive as they strove for supremacy in the world arena, for spheres of influence, marketing outlets and the sources of raw materials. This rivalry became so severe that it hindered common action by the imperialist forces against a country where the development of the revolution questioned the very existence of capitalist relations.

“Uneven economic and political development,” wrote Lenin in 1915, “is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible first in several or even in one capitalist country alone.”¹

Lenin urged the working class of Russia, and together with it the proletariat of other countries, not to wait until such time as conditions in other countries might be favourable, but boldly to break through the imperialist front so long as there were circumstances that objectively and subjectively made revolution possible.

Lenin’s theory enabled the Bolshevik party to mobilise the working class for the victory of the socialist revolution and also oriented it on building socialism in Russia.

Besides this Lenin’s theory of the possibility of a successful socialist revolution at first in one country is also a theory that outlines the prospects of the world revolutionary process and views world revolution as a sequence of national revolutions, taking place at different intervals depending on the maturity of objective and subjective conditions, and resulting in the falling away of more and more links from imperialism.

In contrast to Lenin’s scientific analysis of objective processes and his revolutionary proletarian optimism, Trotskyism offered defeatist assessments of the internal and external conditions of the socialist revolution. Its forecasts concerning the very coming to power of the working class in Russia, which Trotsky had talked so much about, were frankly pessimistic.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 342.

The "theoretical" foundation of Trotsky's attack on Lenin's thesis of the possibility of the victory of a socialist revolution in one country was his rejection of the law of uneven imperialist development. Trotsky considered that the determining factor for imperialism would be not a sharpening of contradictions, but the levelling tendencies which, he claimed, would be greater in the twentieth century than before the emergence of monopoly capital.

For instance, he stated: "The law of uneven development is older than imperialism. Capitalism is at present developing very unevenly in various countries. But in the nineteenth century this unevenness was more pronounced than it is in the twentieth century. It is precisely because finance capital is an older form of capital, that imperialism develops stronger 'levelling' tendencies than pre-imperialist capitalism."

Trotsky gave a one-sided analysis of the development of imperialism. He was hypnotised by the levelling tendency in the development of different countries under imperialism and refused to admit that this same levelling process did not decrease but, on the contrary, increased the effect of the law of uneven development. The more levelling there was, the deeper was the antagonism between imperialist states, and the sharper the conflict. Every power strives to gain a temporary lead, but this inevitably brings about an increase in international rivalry and arouses opposition among other imperialist predators.

Trotsky's conclusions go against history, and this can also be seen in the fact that he understood levelling as a process in which the foremost capitalist countries were to mark time while the other countries were rapidly overtaking them. Comparing the economic development of the foremost capitalist countries with that of the countries of Asia and Africa, Trotsky asserted that crises and depression are typical of the former, and growing rates of capitalist development of the latter.¹

What was more, Trotsky ignored the intransient character of the contradictions between imperialist states, and believed

¹ See *Ways of World Revolution*, Seventh Enlarged Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, November 22-December 16, 1926, Verbatim Report, Russ. ed., Vol. II, Moscow-Leningrad, 1927, pp. 99, 166.

it possible to smooth them down and to merge the economies of separate capitalist states into a united world economy. He refused to consider the fact that the development of monopoly capital was determined, both on the national and the international scale, by the struggle of two opposing principles—competition and monopoly. By laying too much stress on one of these principles—the monopolisation of economy on an international scale—Trotsky ignored the very sharp competitive struggle that went hand in hand with the strengthening of ties between monopolies.

The inevitable historical process of the internationalisation of economic life cannot be fitted into the Procrustean bed of the state-monopoly form of economic relations existing between separate capitalist countries. Whatever treaties the foremost monopolies may make between themselves, they must be accompanied by interpenetration and mutual displacement of rival capital, the disproportion in the economic development of individual countries, bitter trade rivalry, and the striving for supremacy of the largest monopoly groups. This deformed “collaboration” gives birth to a new chain of insoluble economic and political contradictions.

Analysing the development of world capitalist economy, Lenin wrote: “There is no doubt that the trend of development is *towards* a single world trust absorbing all enterprises without exception and all states without exception. But this development proceeds in such circumstances, at such a pace, through such contradictions, conflicts and upheavals—not only economic but political, national, etc.—that inevitably imperialism will burst and capitalism will be transformed into its opposite *long before* one world trust materialises, before the ‘ultra-imperialist’, world-wide amalgamation of national finance capitals takes place.”¹

Trotsky’s thesis, which ignored the specifics of the development of capitalism, gave rise to overestimation of the forces of imperialism and underestimation of the revolutionary potential of the national working class. Imagining the imperialist system as some sort of organically single mechanism, Trotsky asserted that a socialist revolution could

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 107.

be successful only if it had a global, or at least a European, character.

Only such a mounting, frontal attack by the international working class could, in his opinion, lead to fundamental changes both on a world scale and in separate countries. On this basis, he foretold defeat for any national revolutionary rising.

As presented by Trotsky, national revolution was like a bonfire, which could turn into a wildfire if it had space to spread. If the national revolution failed to "set fire" to neighbouring states and peoples it died out like a bonfire that was not fed. In other words, the success of the revolution was finally determined not by the laws inherent in its development, but by the general historic background, by external factors.

In 1906 Trotsky asserted that if revolution was victorious in Russia, its fate would depend on whether the Russian working class would be able to assume the role of organiser of a world or an all-European attack on capital. "With government power in its hands, with the counter-revolution at its back, and with the European reactionary forces in front, it would send out to its comrades throughout the world the old rallying cry, which would then be the cry of the last attack: 'Proletarians of all lands, unite!'"

What would happen if the West European proletariat was not ready to respond to this call?

In that case, Trotsky replied, the revolution in Russia would be suppressed by the united force of the imperialist states. "It is hoping against hope," he wrote, "that revolutionary Russia could stand up against conservative Europe."

Not long before the October Revolution, Trotsky countered Lenin's theory of the possibility of a victorious socialist revolution in one country with his slogan of a United States of Europe. He clamoured for support of a "United States of Europe without monarchy, without permanent armies, without ruling feudal castes, without a secret diplomacy".

This slogan at first actually avoided the question of a proletarian revolution. Its liberal-bourgeois character showed itself in the fact that it called for the creation of a bourgeois United States. Lenin exposed it as unrealistic and reactionary. "Either this is a demand that cannot be implemented under capitalism, inasmuch as it presupposes the

establishment of a planned world economy, with a partition of colonies, spheres of influence, etc., among the individual countries, or else it is a reactionary slogan, one that signifies a temporary union of the Great Powers of Europe with the aim of enhancing the oppression of colonies and of plundering the more rapidly developing countries—Japan and America.”¹

The slogan of the United States of Europe was an outward expression of the cosmopolitan and simultaneously defeatist “theory of permanent revolution”. Having produced such a slogan in the years when Russia was on the road to revolution, Trotsky again showed his lack of faith in the possibility of a proletarian victory in one country, and his unwillingness to take into consideration the national peculiarities of the class struggle.

Having announced that the imperialist epoch had no room for the successful accomplishment of national revolutions, Trotsky thought only in terms of world-wide or at least all-European events. Priority was given to the tasks of the development of revolution in a global, international context. Trotsky rejected offhand Lenin’s proposition that revolutions do not break out simultaneously, but come about as the result of the development of the class struggle in certain countries, nurtured by political conditions which cannot be identically the same in all countries and in all continents.

The slogan of the United States of Europe was no more than a piece of “revolutionary” rhetoric, meant to disguise Trotsky’s lack of any sort of programme for revolutions in separate countries, from which eventually world revolution would take shape. The question of the actual means by which revolution should be achieved was drowned in irresponsible, pseudo-Left phrases about European and world revolution.

While Lenin’s theory of the socialist revolution has inspired revolutionary energy in every national contingent of the working class, Trotsky’s scheme for a permanent revolution, divorced from reality, left the working class, no matter in what country, without any concrete plan of action.

Trotsky’s ideas were in fact disarming the working class and its revolutionary vanguard. In a letter addressed to the Sixth Congress of the Communist International in 1928,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 344.

Trotsky openly stated: "In our epoch, which is the epoch of imperialism, that is, world economy and world politics controlled by capitalism, none of the Communist parties can work out a programme that would be based to a greater or lesser extent on the conditions and tendencies of its own national development."

Even later on Trotsky did not give up his defeatist ideas concerning revolutions taking place in separate countries. In 1930 he again asserted that "the consummation of a revolution without a national framework is unthinkable".

Disregard of historical experience and of objective factors of social development became particularly obvious in Trotsky's interpretation of the Great October Socialist Revolution. One would have thought that the victory of the revolution in Russia, proving as it did the correctness of Lenin's forecast of the possibility of breaking the imperialist chain in a single country, would have given Trotsky no option but to admit that in this case the practical experience of the revolution had upset his theoretical surmises.

Trotsky, however, preferred to turn everything upside down. As in other, similar situations, he set about proving that the historical process had apparently not developed as it should have done. Like all metaphysicians, he argued on the assumption that if practical experience did not fit into a theoretical scheme, so much the worse for practical experience.

Trotsky spared no effort to belittle the significance of the October Revolution, and tried to present it as a deviation from the "ideal" way which he had earlier depicted in his writings. Since it was not supported by simultaneous risings of the European proletariat, he regarded it as an episode not typical of the development of the world revolution. The victory of a revolution in one country, he claimed, was a "crisis phenomenon" thrown up by the march of historic events.

Trotsky's arguments about "crisis phenomena" were accompanied by attempts to foist on the party of the victorious proletariat aims which would mean throwing away the gains of the October Revolution. Asserting that the Russian revolution should at all costs spread beyond the national boundaries, Trotsky propagated "revolutionary wars", and "fomenting" class struggle on an international scale.

Calls "To Carry the Revolution on Bayonets"

At different periods of his anti-Bolshevik, anti-Leninist activity, Trotsky gave prominence to various aspects of the "theory of permanent revolution". And each time his arguments proved to be in utter contradiction to the immediate tasks of the revolutionary movement.

After the October Revolution, Trotsky concentrated his efforts, under the guise of calling for "revolutionary wars" and stimulating revolution in other countries, on instilling defeatist sentiments and disbelief in the possibility of the Russian proletariat retaining state power.

After the October Revolution Lenin emphasised: "... The most significant change that has occurred is the foundation of the Russian Soviet Republic, and the preservation of the republic ... is most important to us and to the *international socialist movement*..."¹ He saw the chief task of Soviet power in those years as withstanding and repulsing the attacks of internal and external enemies, and beginning to build a socialist society, while doing "the utmost possible in one country for the development, support and awakening of the revolution in all countries".²

Trotsky declared this to be "national narrowness", and demanded that Soviet Russia should carry the revolution on the point of the "red" bayonets to other countries. He considered the Great October Socialist Revolution merely as a jumping-off ground for carrying the war into the capitalist world. In his view the October Revolution could only influence the march of world history if it could immediately provoke, "stimulate" and "push" revolutions in the whole world.

In the very first months after the October Revolution, Trotsky actually suggested the following alternative: either Soviet Russia had to enter into a revolutionary war with the capitalist world, or it should admit that the proletariat had seized power prematurely. At the 7th Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in 1918 he announced that if the revolutionary proletariat could not wage a decisive battle against imperialism, "then say that Soviet power is too

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 452.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 28, p. 292.

heavy a burden for the revolutionary proletariat, that we have arrived too early, and should go underground”.

Trotsky also asserted that the Russian proletariat was not ready for revolution, and therefore it would be no great loss if it was unable to sustain a fight with the bourgeoisie. He said: “A bourgeois victory against us would be a blow to the development of the revolutionary movement in Europe, but it would not be comparable to what took place after the Paris Commune. . . . The European proletariat is more ripe for socialism than we are. Even if we were destroyed, there is not the slightest doubt that there could not be such a historical gap as there was after the Paris Commune.”¹

While pressing for world revolution in words, Trotsky was trying to rob the working-class movement of its revolutionary bulwark. He urged the working class that had seized state power to embark on adventurist activity fraught with disastrous consequences for Soviet Russia. At the same time Trotsky confused the working class that still remained in conditions of capitalist exploitation, giving it illusions of some sort of “deliverance” from without.

Trotsky’s precepts were dangerous because they intensified the attitudes of “petty-bourgeois revolutionism” which, during the first post-October months, were being spread among the ranks of the working class by those representatives of the petty-bourgeois strata who imagined that it was enough to issue a call to revolutionary war for all the nations to join in a battle that would sweep imperialism away finally and irrevocably. Lenin showed that ringing phrases about “revolutionary war” served as a screen for petty-bourgeois adventurers, who objectively were helping the enemies of the revolution. Addressing the supporters of “revolutionary war”, he announced: “. . . In your objective role, you are a tool of imperialist provocation. And your subjective ‘mentality’ is that of a frenzied petty bourgeois. . . .”²

In those years many believed that the sharpening of contradictions in capitalist countries might at any minute bring about a world revolution. Trotskyites ignored the growth of social conflicts. They worked on the crude assumption that world revolution would come about if events could

¹ *Seventh Extraordinary Congress of the RCP(B), March 1918. Verbatim Report*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1962, p. 71.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 330.

somehow be hastened at the cost of a few sacrifices. It took great efforts on the part of Lenin and the whole Communist Party to prevent the Trotskyites and the "Left Communists" who acted with them from provoking Soviet Russia to political actions which would have been disastrous to her. Lenin convincingly proved that these views had nothing in common with Marxism, which rejects the "pushing" of revolutions. Revolutions mature in the first place when class contradictions within a country are exacerbated to the point of national crisis.

Trotsky again demonstrated his inability and unwillingness to give a scientific analysis of the internal political distribution of class forces, without which a correct assessment of the prospects of the revolutionary struggle was impossible. He did not believe in the revolutionary initiative of the working class, but pinned all his hopes purely on external pressures, which were to bring about some sort of internal social collisions, fundamentally change the political situation, awaken the "sleepers", and push the "waverers" into decisive action.

These views of Trotsky's came close to his vision of world revolution as a chain of battles and conflicts, carried forth from the main centre of insurrection by armed detachments. The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, in his opinion, had been achieved not by the unbroken growth of political consciousness and activity of the broad masses, led by the Bolsheviks, but by the actions of armed detachments sent out after the fall of the Provisional Government to all parts of the country. Thus he stated: "... Improvised detachments of sailors and workers carried the revolution from Petrograd and Moscow throughout all of Russia and the Ukraine."

Trotsky approached international revolution with the same yardstick, and considered that it could be "carried" throughout the world by the armed detachments of Soviet Russia.

Theoretical disquisitions on the need for a "revolutionary war" between Soviet Russia and international capitalism were not enough for Trotsky. By his practical actions during the negotiations with German representatives at Brest he tried to drag Soviet Russia into such a war and expose her to the danger of military defeat.

As described by Lenin, the struggle against the pseudo-revolutionary adventurism of Trotskyites and other "Left-wing" opportunists during the Brest period was a bitter, humiliating, difficult, but essential and useful lesson. The Party emerged from this struggle stronger organisationally and ideologically and more clearly aware of the aims and problems of revolutionary development.

Trotsky, however, obstinately continued his attempts to impose on the Party the line of unleashing "revolutionary wars". In August 1919 he addressed a long letter headed "a strategic plan" for the conduct of "revolutionary wars" to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party.

Trotsky proposed to turn the Red Army "to face the East", since there it would be more effective than in Europe. He wrote: "An army that at present cannot have a decisive influence on the European scales, can shatter the frail balance of Asiatic relations of colonial dependence, give a definite push to a rising of the oppressed masses, and guarantee the victory of such a rising in Asia."

He later announced that "the road to Paris and London lies through the towns of Afghanistan, the Punjab and Bengal", and he urged the formation of a cavalry corps of thirty to forty thousand horsemen "to be flung at India".

The fallaciousness of Trotsky's suggestions was self-evident. The existence of the Land of Soviets became the decisive factor in speeding up revolutionary and national liberation movements throughout the world after the October Revolution. Trotsky's "raids into the enemy's rear" could only strengthen the onslaught of world imperialist reaction against Soviet Russia. The adventurism of Trotsky's "recommendations" becomes even more understandable when one remembers that the country was then within a hair's breadth of disaster, and under pressure from external and internal reaction.

Defending his views on revolutionary wars as a means of bringing about world revolution, Trotsky attempted in 1929 to prove that it was supposedly essential to export the revolution, provided that the proletariat had sufficient resources for this.

This fundamentally wrong interpretation of the internationalist duty of the proletariat Trotsky and his supporters used for treacherous attacks on the basic principles of the

Soviet Government's foreign policy worked out by Lenin. Proceeding from the idea of "revolutionary war", they opposed Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence. Their notion of switching revolution at will from one country to another cut out the possibility of the existence, perhaps for a long time, of states possessing different social systems.

In the opinion of the Trotskyites, Soviet Russia should be in a condition of perpetual conflict with the capitalist world, taking every sort of risk, even to the point of self-sacrifice, and thus "stimulating" revolution in other countries. Any other policy, except that of the "revolutionary war" they recommended, was dubbed "national narrow-mindedness".

The Trotskyites asserted that the interests of the international proletariat did not permit of any sort of agreement between Soviet Russia and the capitalist countries.

It is not surprising that, taking up a position "to the left of common sense", the Trotskyites violently attacked Lenin's plan for the building of socialism in the Soviet Union.

Disbelief in the Possibility of Building Socialism in One Country

In the twenties the Communist Party set about building socialism on a big scale. It was guided by Lenin's dictum that in the Soviet Union there were all prerequisites for the building of a complete socialist society. In this period the Trotsky "theory of permanent revolution" became the platform for bringing together the most diverse anti-socialist elements.

Trotskyism reflected the mood of a certain section of the petty bourgeoisie, mostly urban, who feared the socialist reconstruction of society.

The party policy for strengthening socialism was received with hostility by precisely those petty-bourgeois elements, who, having been swept off their feet by the gale of revolutionary events, took part in the civil war on the side of the working class, but had only the vaguest notions of the ultimate aim of the conflict. They became depressed, pessimistic and even anti-revolutionary when life put before the Soviet people the problem of the transition from Civil War

to the hard work of peacetime, and the construction of socialism became the chief direction of the party's practical activity.

Pessimism infected even part of the working class, who considered that Russia had not yet got the requisites for a decisive onslaught of socialist forces against those of capitalism. Trotsky was joined by vacillating members of the party, who turned out to be incapable of withstanding the petty-bourgeois influence that was growing at that time.

Trotsky's platform also attracted opportunists who were opposed to the building of socialism and yet continued to swear their allegiance to the revolutionary cause and Marxism-Leninism. The Trotskyites disguised their defeatist views on the impossibility of building socialism in the Soviet Union with high-sounding phrases about the need to support world revolution.

In accordance with Lenin's precepts, the Bolshevik party laid mankind's first road towards socialism, strengthened Soviet Russia as the bulwark of world revolution, and gave its utmost support to the revolutionary struggles in other countries. Thereby the victorious working class not only solved national problems, but carried out its highest international duty with regard to the world revolutionary movement. "Our socialist Republic of Soviets," Lenin emphasised, "will stand secure, as a torch of international socialism and as an example to all the working people."¹

One of the fundamental arguments that Trotsky advanced against the policy of building socialism was that this task could not be accomplished in a national framework in any case. It could be tackled only after the victory of the revolution in all or in the majority of capitalist countries. In 1922 he wrote in the epilogue to *A Programme for Peace*: "Socialist economy can only arise in Russia after the victory of the proletariat in the most important countries of Europe."

In this way Trotsky again tried to instil the idea that Soviet Russia had no alternative other than to unleash a revolutionary war against the capitalist world, or wait for revolution in other countries. In either case the gains of the October Revolution were threatened.

Indeed, what would it have meant for Soviet Russia to

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 472.

await revolution in other countries without trying to strengthen the socialist beginnings in its own social and economic life? The historic argument as to who would win being undecided, the various capitalist elements and remnants of the exploiting classes would inevitably have come to life. They would most certainly have concentrated their efforts on strengthening and expanding their position. In these conditions the danger of a restoration of capitalism would have arisen, and this would have thrown the world revolutionary movement as a whole a long way back.

Trotsky tried to base his conclusions on the fact that, owing to her backwardness, Russia would be about the last country that would be able to get down to the business of socialist construction. "The present state of world economy," he asserted in the years when the party and the people had adopted the policy of large-scale socialist construction, "allows it to be stated without any sort of hesitation that capitalism has come nearer to proletarian revolution than the Soviet Union has to socialism." He maintained that the building of socialism in Russia would become a real possibility in not less than 30 to 50 years. Besides, he went on, the peasants would not support the working class in socialist construction, and the socialist reorganisation of the countryside would be possible only with the victory of the revolution in other countries.

Trotsky and his supporters did not believe in the possibility of carrying out Lenin's co-operative plan for the rural areas. They considered that this could only result in mutual distrust and hostility between the working class and the peasants. Trotsky would not hear of the idea that, given a correct rural policy, the peasants would follow the working class, and become its most reliable ally in the work of socialist construction. He only saw the reactionary side of the peasantry and did not believe it could have any interest in promoting the revolutionary transformation of the countryside.

Trotsky also produced a pseudo-scientific argument to the effect that the Soviet people would not be able to escape from economic dependence on imperialist states. His simile was that the October Revolution could not switch off the post-revolutionary economy from the general system of world capitalist economy, in the way that electric light can

be switched off with a flick of the finger. The orientation on surmounting economic backwardness, according to Trotsky, would inevitably put the Soviet Union into an even greater danger of dependence on capitalism.

In the end Trotsky went to the length of asserting that the policy of building socialism would serve the interests not so much of the proletariat, as of the international bourgeoisie. And in a letter addressed to the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, he announced that the policy of socialist construction in the Soviet Union was "a policy of co-operation with the foreign bourgeoisie".

Trotsky's arguments about the impossibility of socialist construction in one country were directed not only against the vital interests of the Soviet people, but against the revolutionary movement as a whole. Trotsky's line would actually have thrown away the victories that had been paid for by the blood of Soviet Russia, the bulwark of world revolution.

Inventions and Reality

Even a short survey of the fundamental propositions of "the theory of permanent revolution" shows how clumsy were the attempts to present it as being in line with Lenin's views and his teaching on revolution. One of the most active propagandists of Trotsky's ideas, Isaac Deutscher, produced the fantastic idea that "the theory of permanent revolution" was adopted in all essentials by Lenin and the Bolshevik party as part of their weaponry. Deutscher readily repeats the assertion made by Trotsky in his time that the October Revolution "corresponded more to Trotsky's ideas than to Lenin's".

Bourgeois sociologists were quick to pick up these wild ideas, as they have long acted on the principle that the more fantastic the lie, the more delicious a dish it would make in the kitchen of the anti-communist propagandists.

It is sufficient to compare the views of Lenin and Trotsky on the fundamental questions of the strategy of the working-class movement—the paths and prospects of the revolution, the relationship between general democratic and socialist aims, allies of the working class, the combination of the national and international tasks of the proletariat, the building of socialism—to find oneself confronted with two

completely different approaches and two lines of thought. One oriented proletarian revolution on victory and successful development, the other spelled defeat.

Bourgeois propaganda is not satisfied with attempts to present Trotsky as some sort of "revolutionary theoretician". At the same time various other myths are put into circulation with the object of making Trotsky out a more important figure, and an outstanding "practising revolutionary".

Thus Trotsky's role in the events of 1905 is exaggerated. For instance, the author of a number of books published in the USA, Louis Fischer, states that Trotsky became "a leader of the revolution" in that period. The same view of Trotsky is given by that double-dyed falsifier, Leonard Schapiro, in his book *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union*.

In order to make this legend credible the falsifiers assert that it was Trotsky, as one of the leaders of the Petersburg Soviet of Workers' Deputies, who energetically pressed for an armed insurrection and a general political strike.

The facts prove the opposite. As can be seen from the records of the Petersburg Soviet, the question of armed insurrection was never on the agenda. Moreover, at the beginning of December 1905, the Executive Committee of the Soviet published a resolution in which the necessity for an armed insurrection was rejected. It noted: "The Executive Committee has been receiving a significant number of recommendations to this effect for some time past. The Executive Committee is not inclined to consider them." One of the reasons for this attitude of the Petersburg Soviet was that Trotsky was wholly on the side of the Mensheviks who had seized control of the Soviet.

In the foreword to the pamphlet *Before January 9* Trotsky expressed his doubts as to the possibility of overcoming tsarism by means of armed insurrection. And later, in a letter to the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party of June 14, 1906, he justified the Mensheviks who had opposed the arming of the working class. As a result of the position taken up by Trotsky and his Menshevik colleagues, the Petersburg Soviet did not become an organ of armed insurrection, and the Petersburg proletariat did not support the December armed rising in Moscow.

At the same time Trotsky, while clamouring for a general

political strike and proposing it as an alternative to an armed insurrection, announced that Petersburg could not take upon itself the role of initiator, and should only move after the provinces had moved. When the strike in Petersburg began to reach considerable dimensions, he hastily brought before the Petersburg Soviet on November 5 a recommendation that it should be called off. He was supported by the Mensheviks.¹ If Trotsky has left any trace of himself in the history of the first Russian revolution, then it is only as a defeatist and disbeliever in the revolutionary strength of the working class.

And here is another false report spread around by the bourgeois falsifiers. They try to attribute to Trotsky the role of one of the organisers of the Bolshevik party. In his three-volume biography of Trotsky, Deutscher persistently attempts to convince the reader that Trotsky was a founder of the Bolshevik party. The anti-communist West German journal *Osteuropa* saw the main value of Deutscher's books in the fact that "he has disposed of the version that one comes across now and again that Trotsky was a man who from the beginning stood in opposition to the Bolshevik system; in fact he took part in its foundation".² Here is another fact which the falsifiers carefully pass over: right up to 1917 Trotsky was not in the Bolshevik ranks, so he could not have played any part in founding the Bolshevik party. For more than 15 years, starting in 1903, he was attached organisationally to the Mensheviks, either coming out openly as a Menshevik, or hiding his adherence by proclaiming himself a so-called man of the centre.

Trotsky soon found much in common with the Mensheviks with regard to questions of the organisational structure of the party, for the Mensheviks were also opposed to Lenin's plan for the creation of a monolithic, fighting, disciplined, revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat. They advocated free access to the party for the petty-bourgeois, opportunist elements. It was not by accident that soon after the Second Congress, at which Trotsky had spoken from Menshevik positions on programme and organisational problems, he

¹ See V. A. Grinko, N. A. Mitkin, Y. F. Sopin, S. S. Shaumyan, *The Bolshevik Party's Struggle Against Trotskyism (1903—February 1917)*, pp. 78-87.

² *Osteuropa*, No. 7/8, 1964, p. 490.

allied himself with the Mensheviks, who, according to Martov, "rebelled against Leninism".

During more than ten years before the Revolution, Trotsky concentrated his energies on fighting Lenin, the Bolsheviks. He frankly stated that he saw this as the main purpose of his political activity. The congratulatory postcard to Joffe (1910) is sufficiently widely known; in it Trotsky urged "a great fight" against Lenin, and threatened that in it "Lenin will meet his death". A few years later, in 1913, in a letter full of hatred of Lenin, addressed to Chkheidze, Trotsky wrote venomously: "...The whole Lenin edifice ... carries within it the poisonous seeds of its own decay."

As an émigré Trotsky never stopped asserting that Bolshevism was an accidental, and not a typical phenomenon of the Russian revolutionary movement. The Amsterdam International Institute for Social History published in 1969 a hitherto unknown letter from Trotsky to Henriette Roland-Holst. She was connected with the journal *Uorbote* (Fore-runner), which was published by a group of Left-wing members of the Zimmerwald conference.* In this letter, written at the beginning of 1916, Trotsky described Bolshevism as "the product of an amorphous and uncultured social environment". "There can be no Leninist supporters, to my mind, either in Germany, or in France, or in Britain," he asserted. Trotsky opposed in those years Lenin's efforts to rally internationalist elements within the world revolutionary movement on the basis of revolutionary Marxism. "Extremists," he stated, denigrating Lenin's supporters with this name, "cannot create an International."¹

His plans were at that time directed at weakening the Bolshevik positions and creating a Menshevik, opportunist party.

Trotsky sometimes covered up his hostility to Lenin and the Bolsheviks by appearing as a "conciliator". Lenin considered this "conciliating" stance one of the worst aspects of opportunism. "The conciliators," he wrote, "are not Bolsheviks at all ... they have nothing in common with Bolshevism ... they are simply inconsistent Trotskyites."²

* See Notes (on p. 213).

¹ *International Review of Social History*, Volume XIV, 1969, Part 2, Amsterdam, pp. 257-58.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, p. 261.

Trotsky formed bloc after bloc, trying to bring together all the enemies of Bolshevism: the liquidators, the otzovists, the Bund members** and other carriers of bourgeois influence in the ranks of the party. As a result of the great variety of political combinations in which Trotsky engaged the composition of his adherents was constantly changing. In some cases losing his last supporters, he found himself in complete political isolation.

As Nadezhda Krupskaya pointed out in a letter to Maria Fyodorova on April 4, 1912, a new group brought together by Trotsky consisted "of five Trotskyite intellectuals". Krupskaya also referred to the predominance of intellectuals in Trotsky's "alliance" in another letter, of April 20, 1912.

A little later, in 1914, Lenin noted that Trotsky and his allies had formed a "group of intellectuals" ready to join in a "most unprincipled alliance of bourgeois intellectuals against the workers".¹

Trotsky disguised his struggle against the formation of a Bolshevik party in Russia capable of leading the proletariat and seizing power, with arguments that his views on the Party and the progress of revolutionary struggle in Russia were a development of Marxism and the ideas of scientific socialism. Lenin pointed out in this connection that Trotsky's tricks were those of a speculator: "Trotsky has never yet held a firm opinion on any important question of Marxism. He always contrives to worm his way into the cracks of any given difference of opinion."² In exposing the Trotskyites, Lenin emphasised that "they make out all the time that what they 'want' and what are their 'opinions', interpretations, 'views', are the demands of the working-class movement". This he saw as "one of the greatest, if not the greatest, faults (or crimes against the working class) of the... Trotskyites"³

The clumsy attempts of present-day bourgeois falsifiers to present Trotsky as one of the founders of the Bolshevik party are also disproved by the following piece of information. In May 1917 Trotsky dissociated himself from the Bolshevik party. As can be seen from Lenin's notes, Trotsky

¹ Ibid., pp. 382, 463.

² Ibid., pp. 447-48.

³ Ibid., p. 382.

announced at the so-called Mezhrayontsi conference: "...I cannot be called a Bolshevik. . . . We must not be demanded to recognise Bolshevism."¹

However, a few weeks later he realised that there was nothing he and a small group of supporters could propose as an alternative to Bolshevism. Therefore, afraid of "missing the train", Trotsky requested of the Sixth Congress that he be admitted to the party. As he noted in his autobiography, *My Life*, Lenin met him "guardedly and with restraint". Trotsky was obliged to make a statement agreeing with all the Bolshevik tenets.

Further events were to show that this agreement was mere hypocrisy to deceive the party. It was the usual cunning of "Judas Trotsky", as Lenin aptly described him. He made use of his membership of the party to prepare better positions for another series of attacks on Leninism. At first this was "reconnaissance in force": in 1918 the target was the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk; between 1920 and 1921, the discussions on the trade unions. In Lenin's last years and especially after his death, Trotsky decided that at last "his hour had come", and launched a frontal attack on Leninism and the policy of the Bolshevik party.

So much for the second invention claiming that Trotsky was a "founder" of the Bolshevik party.

The third myth circulated by the bourgeois falsifiers ascribes to Trotsky the leadership of the October Socialist Revolution.

The facts show that Trotsky took up a position which objectively helped the enemies of the revolution in the period of preparation for the armed rising in October. While before then he had at times been in his utterances "more Left than the Left" and "the most revolutionary of all revolutionaries", and had called for leaping over the revolutionary stages, when it came to the days when decisive action was needed, he became extremely cautious. He started to talk of the use of "legal" means, and, in effect, tried to put out the flame of revolutionary battle that had been lit.

Trotsky suggested putting off the date of the uprising to time it with the opening of the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets. What would this have led to? The Provisional

¹ *Lenin Miscellany IV*, Russ. ed., p. 303.

Government would have had time to gather together counter-revolutionary forces, especially as the day of the opening of the congress might have been postponed owing to the efforts of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks. Under the pretext of talks with the Soviets, Kerensky's government would undoubtedly have made use of the delay and taken counter-revolutionary measures.

Lenin resolutely opposed Trotsky's proposal. To waste the favourable political situation that had arisen and to wait for the Congress of Soviets, would, he declared, be "utter idiocy, or sheer treachery".¹

Even on October 24, when the uprising had virtually started, Trotsky spoke against it at the meeting of the Bolshevik group at the Second Congress of Soviets. "The arrest of the Provisional Government," he said, "is not on the agenda as an independent task. If the Congress were to form a government, and Kerensky refused to submit to it, then it would be a matter for the police and not for politics."²

Lenin spoke energetically against views of this sort. In his letter to the members of the Central Committee he wrote: "With all my might I urge comrades to realise that everything now hangs by a thread; that we are confronted by problems which are not to be solved by conferences or congresses (even congresses of Soviets), but exclusively by peoples, by the masses, by the struggle of the armed people."³

The falsifiers carefully avoid these facts. They prefer to produce the fiction that Trotsky headed the Revolutionary Military Committee. As can be seen from the records of the Petrograd Revolutionary Military Committee, Trotsky took no active part in its work.⁴

In this way the October armed rising took place, first, in spite of Trotsky's attempts to turn the revolution on to a bourgeois parliamentary course, and, second, without any noticeable contribution on his part.

It was Lenin and the Central Committee led by him, who organised and who were the inspiration of the rising. They carried out an enormous amount of work in the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 82.

² *The Proletarian Revolution* No. 10, 1922, p. 90 (in Russian).

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 234.

⁴ See *The Petrograd Revolutionary Military Committee. Documents and Materials in Three Volumes*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1966-67.

preparation and implementation of the greatest revolution in history.

The fourth legend paints a vivid picture of Trotsky's "special services" to the Soviet state. The falsifiers carefully pass over in silence the great wrong done by Trotsky to Soviet Russia in continually sowing doubt with regard to the possibility of victoriously developing and strengthening the revolution. By his persistent struggle against Lenin, the party, he caused disorganisation of government and party activity throughout the country.

The establishment of Soviet Russia as a state of workers and peasants did not fit in with his notorious "theory of permanent revolution". And he regarded it as some sort of abnormal act, as "an exception to the rule".

The practical steps taken by Trotsky were as harmful as his "theory".

His not very long period as Commissar for Foreign Affairs was distinguished by one particular act—the breaking off of peace negotiations with the representatives of Kaiser Germany at Brest-Litovsk, an act that exposed Soviet Russia to mortal danger.

Trotsky did not confine himself to declaring that Soviet Russia would stop the war against Germany and would demobilise the Army. He sent a telegram to the Commander-in-Chief, N. V. Krylenko, insisting that orders be sent out immediately demobilising the Army. The personal intervention of Lenin was needed to countermand Trotsky's unauthorised instruction.¹

The people of Russia paid dearly for Trotsky's "diplomatic" activity. It was his fault that in the fighting that took place near Pskov, Revel and Narva thousands of Red Army men were killed resisting the German troops. Because of Trotsky's treacherous policy, the new peace terms proved a great deal heavier and more humiliating than those which, despite Lenin's directive, Trotsky had rejected.

The falsifiers praise Trotsky to the skies for his "military activity": as member and head of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic he is alleged to have done a great deal to secure the defences of the Soviet state in the years

¹ See M. D. Bonch-Bruyevich, *All Power to the Soviets. Reminiscences*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1957, p. 239.

of the Civil War. Trotsky is depicted as "the organiser of the Red Army". For a long time the bourgeois press has given space to statements aimed at belittling the part played by Lenin, the Communist Party in creating the Soviet Armed Forces and organising the country's defences.

In actual fact it was Lenin, the party that were in charge of the formation of the Red Army. The Red Army was created by their efforts in those same threatening days of February 1918, when they repudiated Trotsky's treacherous line of unilateral demobilisation of the Russian forces and surrendering Petrograd and Moscow to the Germans for the sake of keeping the world "in a state of tension".

Lenin, the party worked out the principles for building up the Red Army, which embodied the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, an alliance of the working people of all Russia's peoples. The Central Committee of the party determined the strategy of the most important operations of the Red Army and mobilised the human and material resources for it.

This huge work was organised by the Council of Workers' and Peasants' Defence, set up on November 30, 1918 (in 1920 its name was changed to the Council of Labour and Defence). This body was entrusted with full powers to turn the country into a war camp and mobilise all forces and resources in order to defend the Soviet state. The Council of Workers' and Peasants' Defence, with Lenin as its chairman, worked in accordance with the political line of the Central Committee of the Party, and the most important commissions of the Council were at the same time commissions of the Central Committee.

The activity of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic and other military organisations was carried on under the strictest party control. In December 1918 the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party passed a special resolution, which emphasised that "the policy of the military department, as of all other departments and establishments, is carried out in complete conformity with general directives, issued by the party through the Central Committee, and under its immediate control".¹

¹ "The Communist Party—Organiser of the Victory of the Great

Trotsky sometimes tried to act in contravention of the party directives. Whenever this happened, a stop was put to it. At the Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party in 1919 there was some particularly sharp criticism of Trotsky's striving to act against the opinion of the party organisations in the Army.

In this connection, the party's Central Committee, elected at the Eighth Congress, at its very first meeting on March 25, 1919, described the congress delegates' criticism of Trotsky as a "serious warning". In a special decision signed on March 26 by those members of the Central Committee, who constituted the Politbureau, it was stated: "(5) To point out to Comrade Trotsky the need for the most thoughtful attitude to Communists working at the front, since the policy of the Central Committee in military matters cannot be carried out without the fullest comradesly solidarity with them."¹

In spite of this the falsifiers try to create the impression that Trotsky was also "prominent" even in the period when Soviet Russia was changing over to peaceful economic reconstruction. They base their assertions, partly, on the fact that he enjoyed great influence on the biggest trade union in the country—the Central Committee of the Railwaymen's and Water Transport Workers' Union (Tsektran). Trotsky is credited with "special" services in the solution of the most important problem facing the republic—the restoration of transport dislocated by the war. With an astounding lack of scruples bourgeois historians bestow on him the title of "founder of the Soviet trade unions".

One has only to study the resolutions of Party congresses and of the Central Committee, and to go through the newspapers of that period, to realise the absurdity of these assertions. The work of restoring transport in 1920 was organised by the party under the personal supervision of Lenin. A tenth of the delegates to the Ninth Party Congress and thousands of the best Communists from various parts of

October Socialist Revolution and the Defence of the Soviet Republic. March 1917-1920. Book 2 (March 1918-1920)", *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Vol. III, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1968, p. 105.

¹ *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Vol. III, pp. 278, 279.

the country were sent to restore transport and organise party political work among the transport workers. The newspapers daily published news of the progress of the transport restoration work side by side with military reports. It was due to the efforts of the working class, led by the Communists, that the transport situation improved.

At that time Trotsky was instituting in Tsektran dictatorial management methods and petty tyranny, was suppressing democracy and carrying out a policy which he himself called "tightening the screws". It was Trotsky's factional activity that brought about the split in Tsektran, and the creation of a gulf between the leadership and the rank-and-file members of the union. The harm done by Trotsky's policy was considerable because the enormous problems that faced the transport workers demanded good teamwork.

The party firmly rejected Trotsky's "advice". It had worked out the principles of the activity of Soviet trade unions and defined their role and place in the life of the socialist state as social non-party organisations without which the broad masses could not be drawn into management of the state and production, and building the new socialist society. Noting the immense significance of trade unions as the embodiment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin said: "But it is not a state organisation; nor is it one designed for coercion, but for education. It is an organisation designed to draw in and to train; it is, in fact, a school: a school of administration, a school of economic management, a school of communism."¹

The fifth legend sets out to present the ideological and organisational defeat of Trotskyism in the twenties as having been due to some kind of "coincidence", and to reduce the very serious differences of opinion that had arisen regarding the paths of development of the Soviet state to motives of a personal nature.²

Meanwhile the Soviet Communists showed great clarity of

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 20.

² This version of events so often found in the works of bourgeois historians is not even supported by the present adherents of the "Fourth International". The British Trotskyites declare: "Trotsky never saw the struggle against Stalin as one between individuals. Basic principles and questions of Marxist theory and philosophy were involved." (*Workers' Press*, June 24, 1971).

mind in the twenties, a time when the fate of all mankind hung in the balance, by casting aside the defeatists who advocated giving up the idea of building socialism. Who can deny the colossal influence exercised by the building of socialism in the USSR on the whole course of history? The peoples of the world were shown an actually existing socialist society, and the experience of the Soviet Union became the treasured possession of the international communist movement.

And how could mankind have been saved from the threat of fascist enslavement, if the political monolith of the Soviet Union, with its highly developed socialist economy, had not existed? The transformation of the communist movement into the most influential force of modern times, the establishment of a world socialist system, the development of the national liberation movement, the continually growing power of attraction throughout the whole world of the ideas of scientific socialism—all these events, characteristic of our times, proved Lenin's prophecy that fundamental socialist reforms would have the very greatest influence on the whole progress of world history.

In the twenties the Trotskyites did all they could to hinder the development of these events, and to block the continuous movement of the Soviet peoples along the road to socialism. From forcing one discussion after another on the Party, from creating factions and groupings, from attempts to substitute Trotskyism for Leninism, they turned to open anti-Soviet action. Trotskyites organised anti-party demonstrations, printed slanderous pamphlets and declarations on underground presses, arranged conspiratorial meetings, and even created illegal Trotskyite centres.¹

For these same purposes Trotsky made slanderous statements concerning the "degeneration" of the Soviet state and "thermidor". Having always advocated "tightening the screws", the principle of appointment instead of electivity, army-type command of the working masses, and "the iron dictatorship of the party", he tried to pose as some sort of fighter for democracy. By means of this demagogic device Trotsky hoped to break up the unity of the Soviet people and

¹ For further details see *The Struggle of the Bolshevik Party Against Trotskyism in the Post-October Period*.

the unity of the party. The logic of many years of anti-party struggle brought him into the camp of the enemies of the Soviet state, the counter-revolutionary camp.

Thus, the ideological and organisational defeat of Trotskyism was not the result of some fatal coincidence or "unfortunate moves". Having put himself in opposition to the Soviet people and the party, he was fated to suffer defeat.

The Ideological Collapse of Trotskyism

The ideological and organisational defeat of Trotskyism had been prepared by a lengthy ideological struggle waged by Lenin, the party.

At the Thirteenth Conference of the Russian Communist Party, in January 1924, it had been noted that Trotskyism was "not only an attempt to revise Bolshevism, not only a direct retreat from Leninism, but also a clearly expressed *petty-bourgeois deviation*. There is not the slightest doubt that this opposition clearly reflects the pressure of the petty bourgeoisie against the position held by the proletarian party and its policy".¹ Thanks to the consistent exposure of Trotskyism, the working masses realised how harmful his "theoretical" arguments and his practical actions were to the Soviet state. The forging ahead of socialist construction gave the lie to the claim that socialism could not be built in the USSR. The more malevolent the actions of the Trotskyites became, now that they had finally the ground cut from under their feet, the more obvious was the counter-revolutionary content of their opinions and speeches.

The Communists of the Soviet Union unanimously condemned Trotskyism. Trotsky was roundly defeated at the party meetings held in 1927. Less than 0.5% of the Communists supported Trotsky's views.

This defeat of the Trotskyites was consolidated by the decisions of the 15th Party Congress, which finally routed Trotskyism both ideologically and organisationally and expelled its most active supporters from the party. As the

¹ *The CPSU in the Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Meetings of the Central Committee*, 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 2, Moscow, 1970, p. 511.

Congress noted, the Trotskyite opposition "took the path of capitulation to the forces of the international and internal bourgeoisie and objectively became a weapon of the third column against the regime of the proletarian dictatorship".¹ Trotsky had slid to positions close to those of Menshevism. This was reflected in his disbelief in the revolutionary ability of the working class, in his sceptical attitude to the possibility of an alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, and in the defeatist declarations on the impossibility of socialist construction in the Soviet Union. Adherence to Trotskyism and the propagation of his views were stated to be incompatible with membership of the Communist Party.

Trotskyite infiltration into the international working-class movement was also thwarted. In March and April 1925 an enlarged plenary meeting of the Executive Committee of the Comintern emphatically stated that Trotskyism was not only a Russian, but a world phenomenon, and declared: "To realise Leninism in the Comintern, means to expose Trotskyism in all the parties and to liquidate it as a tendency."² The plenum called on all parties to fight anti-Leninist deviations on the same high level as the Communists of Russia.

The Trotskyites tried to set up factions in several West European countries. "All the worst elements in the labour movement, the openly opportunist elements in the communist movement, all renegade groups kicked out from the ranks of the Comintern are now uniting on the Trotskyite platform of struggle against the USSR, the CPSU and the Comintern..." noted the Ninth Plenum of the Comintern Executive.³

In the Comintern the Trotskyites pursued the same line as in the CPSU—they aimed at undermining Leninism, liquidating the principles of Bolshevik organisation, and at dragging in opportunist views, foreign to the working class, under the banner of Marxism.

¹ *The Fifteenth Congress of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks). December 1917. Verbatim Report*, Russ. ed., Vol. 1, p. 429.

² *International Press Correspondence*, Vol. 5, No. 47, June 4, 1925, p. 616.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 8, No. 12, March 1, 1928, p. 256.

In February 1928 the Ninth Plenum of the Comintern Executive approved the decision of the 15th Congress of the All-Russia Communist Party (Bolsheviks). "... Adherence to the Trotskyist Opposition and solidarity with its views, is incompatible with further membership of the Communist International."¹ This resolution of the Ninth Plenum was fully approved by the Sixth Congress of the Comintern.

As a result of determined and consistent struggle, the ranks of the Communist parties were cleared of all overt adherents to Trotskyism. The task set by the fifth enlarged plenary meeting of the Executive Committee of the Comintern concerning the liquidation of Trotskyism as a trend within the communist movement was thus fulfilled.

The ideological and organisational defeat of Trotskyism had a historic significance for the Soviet Union, for its Communist Party and for the international communist movement as a whole.

Pointing out the meaning of the defeat of Trotskyism, William Z. Foster, a well-known activist in the Communist Party of the USA wrote: "In this fight not only was the fate of the Revolution in Russia at stake, but also that of the world communist movement. A victory for the Trotsky forces would have been a decisive success for the world reaction."²

The defeat of Trotskyism added ideological and organisational strength to the international communist movement. The Communists' sense of responsibility for unity and solidarity increased both in separate parties and in the communist movement as a whole.

Communists applied in real life Lenin's directives on a decisive, uncompromising fight against all forms of opportunism, as an essential condition of the development of the new type of party. They learnt to expose the opportunist and defeatist nature of pseudo-revolutionism, to cope with instances of petty-bourgeois instability and to defend their ranks from the influence of petty-bourgeois ideology. In 1926, the seventh enlarged plenum of the Comintern Executive

¹ Ibid.

² William Z. Foster, *History of the Three Internationals*, New York, 1955, p. 349.

noted that the fight against "ultra-Leftism", like the fight against Right-wing opportunism, was an absolute prerequisite for the successes of the communist movement.¹

The great work of enlightenment, which was carried out by the Communist parties in exposing Trotskyism, led to a higher level of theoretical knowledge among Communists, and helped them equip themselves with an understanding of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and learn to apply Marxist method to the practical problems of the revolutionary struggle.

The anti-communist campaign of the defeated Trotskyites that followed became a struggle of small groups that found themselves outside the organised working-class movement.

The First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uruguay, Rodney Arismendi, described these groups as the wreckage of a sunken ship. This simile clearly defines the present state of affairs.

¹ *International Press Correspondence*, Vol. 7, No. 11, February 3, 1927, p. 224.

Chapter II

HOW THE "FOURTH INTERNATIONAL" WAS HAMMERED TOGETHER AND WHAT CAME OF IT

The ideological and organisational defeat of Trotskyism showed up its complete bankruptcy and its lack of any sort of support from the masses. Expelled from the ranks of the Communist parties, Trotskyites found themselves politically isolated.

Many of them, however, did not lay down their weapons. They began to seek new forms of anti-communist struggle. In a number of countries the followers of Trotsky began to form small groups for disruptive work and for the propagation of their ideas and views in the working-class parties.

As can be seen from the statements made by Trotsky and his adherents, at the end of the twenties and at the beginning of the thirties, they placed special hopes on the fact that many Communist parties were still not organisationally strong, and had quite a number of Left- and Right-wing opportunist elements. The Trotskyites' plan was to sow discord in their ranks, split some of them and form their own parties. This characterised the tactics of Trotsky and his supporters from 1929 to 1938, up till the formation of the notorious "Fourth International", when it became clear even to them that these calculations were built on sand.

The Formation of the "Fourth International" and Its Activity on the Eve of the Second World War

Immediately after being deported from the Soviet Union, Trotsky sent letters to all corners of the earth calling for an intensification of the fight against the Communist parties and the Comintern. His addressees included all groups and persons, who had ever opposed the policy of the Communist parties and the Comintern no matter on what problem. Trotsky urged these little groups and trends to push their differences into the background and work out a kind of common plan of action.

He was ready to ally himself with anyone in his efforts to divert the Communist parties from the Leninist course. At first he thought of finding a form of association that would give the impression that he did not wish to break with the Comintern.

For several years the Trotskyites, despite their exclusion from the ranks of the international communist movement, tried to assume the role of the "Comintern opposition", though it was not recognised by anybody. Trotskyites used the same camouflage in several countries, making themselves out to be "factions" of the Communist parties in those countries.

Proceeding from the idea of creating an "international opposition" to the Comintern within the communist movement, Trotsky embarked on the most unbridled defamation of the Comintern's policy and leadership. He rushed out book after book, spreading fabrications about "a most dangerous crisis", which the Comintern was supposedly suffering. In 1930 he published in Berlin a brochure, *Who Now Governs the Communist International*, in which he defamed the policies of almost all the Communist parties.

In his book that came out just at that time, *The Permanent Revolution*, Trotsky absurdly accused the Comintern of "centrist ideology". His followers went so far as to publish in Warsaw a distorted text of Lenin's work "*Left-Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder*". Various propositions and formulas of Lenin's were distorted or even omitted.¹ This deception was carried out so that Trotsky, in the introduction to the book, could once again falsify Lenin's statements and announce that the "war against the bureaucratic centrism of the Comintern" was a task of primary importance.

Simultaneously Trotsky stepped up his slander campaign against the USSR. From arguments on "the necessity of restoring the dictatorship of the proletariat", he went on to call openly for the overthrow of the Soviet system by force, maintaining that Trotskyite ideas could be realised "only by force."

It was with these slogans that Trotsky tried to unite the various little Trotskyite groups who gathered together in 1930 in Paris and called themselves "the international Left

¹ See *The Communist International*, No. 22, 1933, pp. 52-57 (in Russian).

opposition". In the reports of this gathering it was stated that the creation of an "opposition" "does not lead to a Fourth International" and that its aim was "the rebirth of the Communist International".

Meeting again in Paris in 1933, "the opposition" announced eleven requirements for admission to its ranks. Among these were the repudiation of the possibility of socialist victory at first in one country and the acceptance of "the theory of permanent revolution". However, Trotskyites soon realised that it was infinitely easier to work out these admission requirements, than to enrol supporters.

The "opposition" itself began to give way at the seams. The Trotskyite and near-Trotskyite groups were so variegated in their views that Trotsky's intention of uniting them and bringing under one roof the so-called "Comintern opposition" proved impossible in practice.

Trotskyite hopes for the internal transformation of the Comintern did not come true. Everywhere Trotsky's supporters were deservedly repulsed by the Communists and workers. The intrigues of the small Trotskyite clique failed to make any impression on the policy pursued by the Comintern.

Then Trotsky decided to create his own "international" which, he hoped, would become a political force capable of opposing the Comintern. In October 1933 he published an appeal to his followers, which declared: "The problem of world revolution, as well as the problem of the Soviet Union, can be summed up in one and the same formula: the Fourth International!"

The idea of Trotsky was not supported even by the so-called "international Left opposition", which met in Paris to discuss the proposals for setting up a "Fourth International". Only a minority of the conference agreed, the rest resolutely refusing to establish a "Fourth International". This did not prevent the minority from carrying an independent resolution on the expediency of establishing such an "international" subsequently, and defining the position of the other participants of the conference in the following manner: "With regard to the decisions, passed by the ill-assorted majority of the conference and bearing the imprint of that diversity, the minority can take no political responsibility".

As some of Trotsky's "admirers" themselves noticed, the proposition to create a "Fourth International" contradicted

his own statements in 1929 on the pointlessness of such a step. They reminded him what he had said as far back as 1921: if there was created "International No. 4, where subjectivism, hysteria, adventurism and revolutionary phrasemongering are presented in the most final form, we shall have a 'Left-wing' scarecrow". However Trotsky was prepared even to lose some of his allies, rather than turn away from the adventurist idea of setting up the "Fourth International". He was apparently guided by the proverb: "So long as there is a swamp, the devils can be found."

In 1936 Trotsky again gathered together a small group of supporters and tried to argue them into creating an "international". There was no support for his suggestion on this occasion either. Nevertheless between 1934 and 1937 he claimed to speak in the name of a "Soviet section" of the non-existent "Fourth International".

Trotsky's position was quite aptly stated by Deutscher, who in his laudatory trilogy noted Trotsky's political adventurism: "Long live the Fourth! His duty, as he conceived it, was to proclaim this; as for the rest, let the future take care of it."¹

At last on September 3, 1938 Trotsky got together for a "constituent conference" those of his fellow-thinkers whom he converted to his idea of a "Fourth International". The conference was held near Paris. In certain inexplicable "interests of conspiracy" the place of meeting was given later in a communique as Lausanne. The conference (consisting of 21 people) stated that the so-called executive committee and the international bureau of the Trotskyite "international Left opposition" "had shown their incapacity for action in past years". Nevertheless the resolution on the establishment of the "Fourth International" was passed.

The pessimism of the "founders" was reflected in their declaration which said: "Sceptics ask whether the moment for the creation of a new international has come. How can an international be created artificially, they ask, when only the most important events can give birth to it?" All the same Trotsky had his way.

The history of the "Fourth International" was the history of wrangling and squabbles between the ill-assorted Trot-

¹ I. Deutscher, *The Prophet Outcast. Trotsky: 1929-1940*, London, 1963, p. 429.

skyite groups. Even a man as frankly "sympathetic" to them as Isaac Deutscher had to admit that all Trotsky's attempts to breathe life into the "Fourth International" proved unsuccessful and that the idea itself of creating a mass international organisation was a fiasco.¹

The "Fourth International" was knocked together on the basis of an ephemeral union of several Trotskyite groups, who had no sort of organisational ties apart from their statement that they belonged to this "International".

They were recruited, as a rule, from among persons who had been expelled from Communist parties, or from a variety of adventurers with anti-communist leanings. Every type of renegade, attempting to hide his hatred of the Soviet Union and the Communist parties with a "Left phrase", could find a welcome there. They came predominantly out of petty-bourgeois and bourgeois intellectual circles as far as their social status was concerned. In some countries, for instance the USA, the Trotskyites managed to attract some young people who at first had not been able to distinguish the anti-revolutionary character of their pseudo-Left speeches.

By far the biggest "section" of the "Fourth International", which called itself the World Party of Socialist Revolution, was a group of US Trotskyites. Its leader was James P. Cannon, who had been expelled from the Communist Party in 1928 for his Trotskyite views. At first the group numbered some 500 members,² and after its amalgamation with the extremist American Workers' Party, which consisted of intellectuals inclining towards "Left-radicalism", it rose to 1,000 members. William Foster, in *The History of the Communist Party of the United States*, said that the Trotskyite membership subsequently averaged only a thousand or two people.³ The Trotskyites of the USA were rent by frequent splits, with new splinter groups constantly being formed.

Two organisations of British Trotskyites joined the

¹ I. Deutscher, *The Prophet Outcast*... , p. 513.

² *As We Saw the Thirties. Essays on Social and Political Movements of a Decade*, edited by R. J. Simon, Urbana, Chicago and London, 1967, p. 22.

³ William Z. Foster, *The History of the Communist Party of the United States*, New York, 1952, p. 270.

“Fourth International”. One called itself the Marxist League, and the other the Marxist Group. They had been warring for a long time, and then in 1944 they were united with the so-called Workers’ International League. As a result the Revolutionary Communist Party was formed with a membership of about 500.¹ In 1949 it fell apart into several Trotskyite groups.

The “Fourth International” was joined by a few groups of French, Danish and Belgian Trotskyites, and also by German followers of Trotsky who had emigrated to France.

No information was published anywhere about the total number of members of the “Fourth International”. The Trotskyites prefer to keep such details strictly secret. It is no accident that Trotsky bequeathed all his archives to Harvard University, on condition that the classified materials relating to his “international” would not be published till 1980 and not be made available to historians. He wanted, apparently, not only to hide the unseemly dealings of the “Fourth International” from the public eye, but also to conceal the number of his adherents in 1938.

With regard to the “policy statements”, which were made by the “international”, they consisted of slanders about the theory and practice of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and the strategy and tactics of the Communist parties.

The whole business of contriving the “Fourth International” coincided with the period when the international working-class movement was fighting fascism and the growing threat of world war.

The Communists were the only political force that exposed the imperialist nature of fascism and mobilised the peoples for the fight against it and the threat of a new war. It was the Communists who urged anti-fascist forces to unite in a Popular Front and saw it as a form of joint action which would allow the working class to play the leading role in the struggle for general democratic aims and to exert influence on the course of world events. Drawing the masses into a broad anti-fascist, general democratic movement, the Communists prepared thereby favourable conditions for the subsequent transition to the struggle for new, socialist goals. They implemented the decisions of the Seventh Congress of

¹ *Marxism Today*, No. 9, 1964, pp. 276-77.

the Comintern on the unification and mobilisation of all the forces of the working class and the widest sections of the people.

What stand did the Trotskyites take at the time?

In every possible way they opposed the creation of the Popular Front and carried on splitting activities among the anti-fascists. The "programme" adopted by the "Fourth International" stated: "The first condition of the revolutionary struggle against fascism is the merciless exposure of the theory and practice of the Popular Front." The Trotskyites accused the Communist parties of "yearning for a coalition with a non-existent liberal bourgeoisie", of an inability to lead the struggle against fascism because they had "slipped from their class positions". This sabotage of the anti-fascist struggle was supported with irresponsible statements that the overthrow of Mussolini and Hitler must take place by means of a proletarian revolution "under the leadership of the Fourth International".

In this way they helped the fascists. The Italian Trotskyites, for instance, from the first days of Mussolini's rise to power, did all they could to undermine Communist efforts to unite anti-fascist forces. Not for nothing did the founder of the Italian Communist Party, Antonio Gramsci, when he was in prison and found out that some of the political prisoners were in danger of falling under Trotskyite influence, transmit his laconic warning through the prison cells: "Trotsky is the *puttana* (a vulgar word for a prostitute) of fascism."¹

The German Trotskyites also sabotaged the anti-fascist struggle, while calling themselves the "international Communists of Germany". In a resolution of 1935, on the "Tactics of the Communist Party of Germany and the International Communists of Germany", they announced that "the tactics of a united front is a form ... of revisionism" and urged refusal to take part in an anti-fascist front.

Meanwhile Trotsky sank so deep as to make the monstrous statement that the Popular Front was an instrument for saving imperialism. In 1938 he wrote, "The popular fronts on the one hand and fascism on the other are the last political resorts of imperialism in the struggle against the proletarian revolution."

¹ See Palmiro Togliatti, *Selected Articles and Speeches*, Vol. I, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1965, p. 210.

The harm caused by the Trotskyites was particularly evident in France and Spain.

The French Trotskyites called for "immediate revolutionary action" instead of the creation of a Popular Front. Their slogans, seized on by other "Leftists", were: "All is possible", "Socialism today".

Léo Figuères, a member of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party, states in a book published in 1969, *Trotskyism Is Anti-Leninism*: "If these outwardly 'ultra-revolutionary' slogans had not been so resolutely refuted by the Communist Party and Maurice Thorez, they would have led in the summer of 1936 to the break-up of the Popular Front, that is, the alliance of proletariat and the middle classes, who would have been flung into the arms of the darkest reaction. The road to a speedy fascist victory would thus have been open."¹

In Spain, during the Civil War of 1936-39, the Trotskyites tried to discredit and undermine the unity of the Popular Front, sowed defeatism, strove to liquidate the regular army and encouraged disobedience to commanders. Their policies show that they acted as accomplices of fascism.²

The "Fourth International" strove to prevent the international solidarity of the working class in the struggle against fascism, the chief enemy of the proletariat in those historic conditions. Here, too, Trotskyism, which had always worn the mask of "internationalism" and presented itself as a fighter against "narrow national limitations", fell into contradiction with its own dogmas. It spoke quite differently when in a real life situation the problem of uniting the efforts of the international working class came to the fore.

Trotskyites in other countries did not confine themselves to supporting the position of their Spanish colleagues, who were undermining the struggle against the fascists. They impeded the organisation of a massive international campaign in support of the Republican government. While Communists were sending volunteers, collecting resources and medicines, the Trotskyites sabotaged the activities of committees

¹ Léo Figuères, *Le trotskisme, cet antiléninisme*, p. 193.

² See *The History of the Communist Party of Spain. Short Survey*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1961, pp. 161-62.

that were helping the Spanish people materially and medically.¹

They also waged war against the call to defend democracy issued by the Seventh Congress of the Comintern. As fascism increased its hold on a number of countries, effective action was demanded from the international working class. At the Seventh Congress Georgi Dimitrov said: "We are not anarchists, and we cannot be indifferent to what political system exists in a given country: a bourgeois dictatorship in the form of a bourgeois democracy, even if with severely curtailed democratic rights and liberties, or a bourgeois dictatorship in its openly fascist form. As supporters of Soviet democracy, *we shall defend every inch of the democratic gains which the working class won through years of stubborn struggle, and we shall throw ourselves vigorously into the struggle for increasing these gains.*"²

The Trotskyites tried to promote defeatist ideas of the futility of efforts to safeguard democratic liberties. While the Communist parties oriented the masses towards the maximum use of democratic institutions in order to check the threatening march of fascism and start a mass struggle, the Trotskyites declared that a struggle for democracy, against fascism was "sowing illusions in the masses". In May 1940 the "Fourth International" adopted a manifesto which described the calls in defence of democracy as "faulty" and "false", since democracies inevitably "turn into reactionary distatorships".³

The "Fourth International" even tried to smear the Communist parties' struggle for peace in the thirties. The Seventh Congress of the Comintern emphasised: "*The central slogan of the Communist Parties must be: struggle for peace.*"⁴ The Communists were in the front ranks of the fighters against the impending threat of world war.

The Trotskyites announced provocatively that there was

¹ Betty Reid, *Ultra-Leftism in Britain*, published by the Communist Party, London, 1969.

² Georgi Dimitrov, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1957, p. 467.

³ *Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution*, New York, 1940, pp. 12-13.

⁴ *Seventh World Congress of the Communist International. Resolutions and Decisions*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1935, p. 40.

no point in fearing war since "*war has not infrequently been the mother of revolution*".¹

The "Fourth International" did not spare bright colours to depict the future that awaited the working class in the event of war. It rejoiced at the news of the first aggressive steps of nazi Germany. Let events go their own way, let the flame of war seize the whole world, it is all in the cause of revolution, for it brings the end of the capitalist regimes closer. The "Fourth International" rejected with indignation the slogan of a war for democracy against fascism in one of its manifestos. It considered that the slogan of patriotism is a false slogan.² Objectively this stand of the Trotskyites actually helped nazism, which aimed at distracting the attention of the peoples from the threat of the brown plague spreading all over the earth and at preventing the anti-fascist forces from uniting.

Present-day Trotskyites do their best to justify the stand of their predecessors of the thirties. They claim that Trotsky and his supporters did not exclude the possibility of alliances and were also for a united front.

In Trotsky's speeches of that period references to a united front did occasionally slip in. In fact he spoke of a "united front" which would be based on his programme and would consist of Trotskyites and others of like mind. This would essentially have been an ideological front uniting the most rabid enemies of the Communist parties and the Soviet Union. The "Fourth International" thus actually sided with the fascist and pro-fascist forces. The Trotskyites were more concerned with their struggle against the Soviet Union than the fight against fascism. At that time they revelled in predicting "the downfall of the regime created by the October Revolution", and all their hopes were pinned on war.

Trotsky prophesied the defeat of the Soviet Union even during the Second World War, maintaining that imperialism was infinitely stronger in technical, economic and military matters. He also talked about the political weakness of the USSR and declared that "the first heavy social blows

¹ *Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution*, p. 40.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 12, 42, 44.

from outside can bring . . . Soviet society to a condition of civil war", and that as a result the Soviet Union "would collapse and give way to a capitalist regime or, more correctly, capitalist chaos".¹

The manifesto of the "Fourth International", published a year before the outbreak of the Great Patriotic War, again prophesied the defeat of the Soviet Union in the event of war, because of the alleged weakness of its army, and the fact that the country would be paralysed by "centrifugal nationalist tendencies".²

Banking on the supposedly inevitable defeat of the Soviet Union, the Trotskyites asserted that the international working class could only gain from this, since revolution would break out in all the countries drawn into the war, and the world bourgeoisie would not be able to cope.

After Hitler Germany's attack on the Soviet Union, the Trotskyites sabotaged the anti-fascist struggle. Using the same yardstick in assessing the policies of the fascist bloc states and the countries that had fallen victim to aggression, they refused to recognise the liberating character of the peoples' struggle. The Trotskyites said that the very concept of "the anti-fascist struggle" was a Communist "lie" and a "deception" and the war was imperialist. Therefore they urged "non-participation in the imperialist war" and no support for the Soviet Union.

The French Trotskyites behaved like traitors during the war, protesting against participation in the Resistance movement because, in their opinion, the need was for an "independent organisation for proletarian struggle". Some of them even served in various Hitlerite organisations, justifying this by "tactical considerations".

The Trotskyites invented the idea that the creation of an anti-Hitler coalition was an act foreign to the interests of the Russian and the world revolution. They were opposed to a second front, since "it would hold back the revolutionary European workers".³

¹ *Die neue Weltbühne, Wochenschrift für Politik, Kunst, Wirtschaft* No. 49, 1933, S. 1527.

² *Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution*, pp. 22-23.

³ *Marxism Today* No. 9, 1964, pp. 276-77; *The End of the Comintern. The Manifesto of the Fourth International*, New York, 1943, pp. 31-32.

Vying with fascist propaganda, they distributed leaflets slandering the Soviet Union and Communists who were everywhere in the front ranks of the Resistance. The war years showed even more clearly the treacherous nature of Trotskyism, and many people who had been doped by fine phrases and sided with it had their eyes opened. Many of the Trotskyite groups fell apart.

How Many "Fourth Internationals" Can There Be?

After the war the Trotskyite groups that survived presented a sorry sight.

Of those that had existed in 1938, at the time when the "Fourth International" was formed, the only one that preserved its outward form of organisation was the so-called Socialist Workers' Party of the USA. As for the other groups, some of them had disappeared altogether, while others, after a series of splits and feuds, were trying to revive in another form.

In the post-war period Trotskyism has been a mix-up of a variety of tiny groups. Quite often they consist of no more than a few "functionaries". These are extremist, anti-communist petty-bourgeois intellectuals, as well as those who were expelled from the ranks of Communist parties as hostile elements, political adventurers and career-seekers.

The Trotskyites have been forced to admit that their "international" is composed of representatives of the petty bourgeoisie. One of the leaders of the French Trotskyites, Stéphane Just, speaking of the "Fourth International", wrote: "In its social composition it is to a large extent petty-bourgeois and has no strong ties with the working class."¹ The Belgian Trotskyites, in their journal *Lutte ouvrière*, also do not deny the fact that "both in France and particularly in Belgium there is very much more Trotskyite activity among the petty bourgeoisie."²

Before the war the Trotskyites were cock-a-hoop with the idea that their supporters would multiply very steeply

¹ *La Vérité. Revue trotskyste*, Septembre 1965, numéro spécial, No. 530-531. Stéphane Just, "Dé fense du Trotskysme", p. 15.

² *Lutte ouvrière*, June 1, 1969, p. 8.

within a few years (in a letter to Cannon in July 1939, Trotsky suggested the expulsion of anyone who in the course of three to six months was unable to enrol at least one new member), but since 1945 the Trotskyites have no longer attempted to set themselves such a task. In the years since the war the chief concern of the "Fourth International" has been to preserve the remnants of its strength and put down the quarrels and feuds that have been tearing them apart.

At first the struggle was waged mainly between two groups. One of these considered that they should review some of the tenets of Trotskyism. The leader of this group Pablo (Raptis) demanded that amendments should be made to Trotsky's "teaching". This would strengthen the Trotskyite position in the struggle against communism. The other group, led by the leader of the American Socialist Workers' Party, Cannon, having the same end in view, defended the "immutability" of Trotsky's assumptions. The arguments were accompanied by mutual accusations of "revisionism" and "dogmatism".

In 1953 there was a split in the "Fourth International". It began with "an open letter to the Trotskyites of all the world" written by Cannon. He accused the leaders of the "Fourth International" of "revising Trotskyism". Cannon was supported by a few small groups.

They opposed the "international secretariat" of the "Fourth International", then headed by Pablo. And in 1962 the Latin American Trotskyites refused to obey the "international secretariat" and formed the "Latin American bureau".¹

The situation in the "Fourth International" was pessimistically described by Trotskyites themselves, who stated in 1961: "However, it must be frankly admitted that the Fourth International faces a serious internal crisis, which has endured for some years and which offers no easy or immediate solution."²

In the years that followed the wrangles between the Trotskyite groups continued, with each of them striving to dominate the "Fourth International".

¹ *International Socialist Review* No. 1, 1965, pp. 8, 13.

² *Ibid.*, No. 3, 1961, p. 98.

From the beginning of the sixties attempts have been made to gather under one roof all the diverse elements. The initiative has been taken by the American Trotskyites. In a statement they distributed in 1963, they declared that the position of Mao Tse-tung's group "predetermined an important stage in the reconstruction of the Fourth International". The statement formed the basis of the "congress", which was organised jointly by representatives of the two principal warring factions in the summer of 1963. Cannon was supported by the majority of the members of the congress. Pablo and his adherents found themselves in the minority. The communique announced: "The leaders of both sides stated that they had not changed their views about the past dispute."¹ The congress, which called itself a "reunification congress", passed a resolution appealing to all Trotskyites to put aside differences of opinion for the sake of a united struggle against the Communists.

But no reunification was achieved. The Latin American Trotskyites headed by Posadas, the British Trotskyites headed by Healy, the French Trotskyite group led by Lambert, and also the Canadian and some of the smaller groups of Japanese Trotskyites refused to participate in the congress. Even the American Trotskyites, who had been most insistent on reunification, did not formally join the "Fourth International", on the grounds that American law prohibited them from doing so.

Trotskyism remains divided into several rival groupings. Each of them claims to the name of an organisation of the "Fourth International". The following picture of the "balance of forces" in present-day Trotskyism can be drawn from the Trotskyite press and also from the information published in the bourgeois press.

The Paris "*International Secretariat of the Fourth International*" is headed by the Frenchman P. Franc and the Belgian E. Germain (Mandel). The Trotskyites grouping round this secretariat received the majority of votes (about 85 per cent) at the so-called reunification congress of 1963. Some of the French and Belgian Trotskyites, as well as the Trotskyites of Holland, Austria and some of the Latin American countries, joined this group. The group of the so-

¹ *International Socialist Review*, No. 4, 1963, p. 131.

called majority is supported by the Trotskyites of the USA, who gave their approval to the decisions of the congress of 1963.

This group publishes its "theoretical organ", which is called *The Fourth International*. Its editor is Pierre Franc, who was expelled from the French Communist Party for Trotskyite propaganda in the twenties. In 1932 and 1933 he was Trotsky's secretary, but did not take part in the constituent conference which set up the "Fourth International" in 1938 because of disagreements with Trotsky.

Under the name of the "*Marxist-revolutionary trend of the Fourth International*" are to be found the Trotskyites who were in the minority (about 15 per cent of the participants) at the congress of 1963. In subsequent years increasing disagreement between the majority and the minority has brought about a final organisational break. The minority has begun to issue a magazine *Under the Banner of Socialism*, which at first had the subtitle "The African Commission of the Fourth International", and later "The Organ of the Marxist-Revolutionary Trend of the Fourth International".

The "International Secretariat of the Fourth International" published a statement on February 14, 1964, in which it was emphasised that the magazine "is published by a minority group without the approval of the Secretariat", and that the opinions of the above-mentioned magazine were rejected by the congress in the summer of 1963. In November 1964 the secretariat accused the magazine of "fraudulence" for its continued efforts to present itself as the organ of the "Fourth International", and again disassociated itself from it.

In February 1965 the so-called minority organised a conference, where the groups of Franc and Germain were criticised as "opportunist". The secretariat of the "Fourth International" pronounced this conference "a breakaway from the official structure of the Fourth International into a separate group".

The final organisational formation of the minority into an independent group took place at a conference at the end of November 1965. Its participants announced that Franc and Germain had no right to speak in the name of the "Fourth International", and pronounced them "feeble

imitators" of the Trotsky tradition and traitors to it. The magazine *Under the Banner of Socialism* started a campaign for the formation of a new "Fourth International" on the basis of the so-called minority.

Supporters of the minority are to be found in various Trotskyite organisations: for example, in France, Belgium, Australia and Latin America.

At the head of this collection of small groups is the above-mentioned Michel Pablo (Raptis). After the war and until the reunification congress, he was the secretary of the "Fourth International". In 1964 he was expelled from the "International Secretariat of the Fourth International" for holding revisionist opinions.¹

The Latin American "Secretariat of the Fourth International", headed by the Argentinian Trotskyite Posadas, refused to take part in the reunification congress of 1963. It is openly hostile both to the majority and to the minority. It depends on the Trotskyite groups created in Bolivia, Chile, Peru, Mexico, Uruguay, Argentina and Brazil. Its "theoretical" organ comes out under the resounding title of *Revista Marxista-Latinoamericana*.

Posadas' group held its own conference in 1962, and called it "the emergency conference of the Fourth International". The supporters of Posadas consider themselves the only "one hundred per cent Trotskyites". In this connection the Paris "Secretariat of the Fourth International" declared in December 1962 that those Trotskyites who had joined Posadas "do not represent the Fourth International or its political orientation and, therefore, the Secretariat of the International can take no responsibility for their political line".²

In the second half of the sixties Posadas managed to recruit supporters from among British, French, Belgian and Italian Trotskyites. With their help he began to bring out the *European Marxist Review* in English, French and Italian. A large part of the magazine consists of articles and speeches by Posadas himself. Thus, in the issue for December 1968, out of 250 pages, 200 were written by him.

¹ These "opinions" do not differ very much in their anti-communist character from the opinions of other Trotskyite groups examined in the next chapter.

² *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 17, 1962, p. 68.

In 1967 Posadas organised a "congress of the Fourth International", which was attended by his Latin American supporters and also a few Trotskyites from Western Europe. In the organisational report Posadas emphasised the task of further extending the influence of this Trotskyite grouping in the capitalist countries of Europe. The leaders of the Paris "Secretariat" and the "Marxist-revolutionary trend of the Fourth International" were described as people "who had lost their faith in the revolution" and were "agents of imperialism".¹

The so-called *International Committee of the "Fourth International"* consists of British Trotskyites, who call themselves the Socialist Labour League, American and Canadian Trotskyite groups acting under the signboard of American and Canadian Workers' League and also the French Trotskyites, who call themselves "internationalist Communists".

The fashion in this grouping is set by the British Socialist Labour League, which has a membership of about a thousand.² It is led by Healy, who has declared that the Paris "Secretariat of the Fourth International" is revisionist and proposed the setting up of a "counter-international". Healy accuses the leaders of the other Trotskyite groups that they are only hiding behind the name of Trotskyism, but actually have long abandoned its programme.³

In April 1966 the "International Committee" held a conference of its supporters and passed a resolution "For the Reconstruction of the Fourth International".⁴ In October 1967 the leaders of the committee announced that this reconstruction was being hindered by the "capitulators" and "renegades" Franc and Germain, who had "usurped the name of the Fourth International".⁵ Calls for reconstruction also resounded at the 1968 meeting of the Trotskyite groups mentioned above.⁶

¹ *Rivista Marxista Europea*, No. 5-6, December 1968, pp. 93, 94.

² *Marxism Today*, No. 3, 1965, p. 96.

³ *The Newsletter*, June 7, 1969; *The Fourth International*, No. 3, Winter 1968/1969, p. 113.

⁴ *La Vérité. Revue trotskyste*, No. 533, 1966, p. 10.

⁵ *La Correspondance internationale. Bulletin du Comité International de la IU-e Internationale*, Supplement No. 3 to *La Vérité*, October-November 1967, p. 7.

⁶ *The Newsletter*, April 9, 1968.

The "International Committee" issues two magazines, *The Fourth International* (this has nothing to do with the magazine of the same name brought out by Franc) and *International Correspondence* (in English and French).

Two youth organisations, formed by British and French Trotskyite groups, are affiliated to the committee. One calls itself Young Socialists and the other The Alliance of Youth for Socialism. At the conference in London in the spring of 1969 held by the Young Socialists it was stated that this group, like the French Alliance of Youth for Socialism, had made a vital contribution to the creation of the "International Committee of the Fourth International".¹

So, at the present time, there are four Trotskyite centres claiming to be the "Fourth International". Perpetual war goes on between them, brought about not so much by political considerations, as by frankly careerist motives. Besides the differences of opinion which tear apart the "Fourth International", there is also the rivalry between the separate groups in a number of countries formally supporting one and the same centre. In France, for instance, there are at least seven Trotskyite organisations, not counting the tiniest groups.² There are five or six, or perhaps more, Trotskyite groups in Britain, Belgium, Japan and some of the Latin American countries.

However, in spite of all their variety and contradictions, these little groups have one thing in common: they are openly anti-communist and hostile to the socialist countries.

Trotskyism is seeking new ways of attracting extremist and anti-communist elements. This is the aim that has been behind all the opinions it has voiced in the sixties.

¹ *The Newsletter*, April 15, 1969.

² *Cahiers du communisme*, No. 10, 1968, p. 81; *ibid.*, No. 5, 1969, p. 70.

Chapter III

CONTEMPORARY TROTSKYITE CONCEPTIONS: WORDS AND ACTIONS

The events that took place after the ideological and organisational defeat of Trotskyism in the international communist and working-class movement clearly show the futility of its forecasts with regard to the development of world revolution.

Lenin emphasised that the best criterion for judging one or other theory or doctrine was the latter's correspondence to the actual process of social and economic development.

The Trotskyite theories have come into contradiction with real life. Trotsky, who liked to figure as an oracle and a prophet, in actual fact turned out to be politically blind and incapable of seeing the trends of world social development, or of distinguishing the mechanics of social progress. It was not the matter of simply "making mistakes". The whole of his system of views was permeated with anti-communism and anti-sovietism, and this subjective outlook inevitably led to a distorted picture of the real state of affairs and the course of development. In his vicious nihilism he condemned all that was new and that had let down deep roots, foretelling defeat and destruction for the forces of the revolution.

Trotsky declared that the building of socialism in the Soviet Union was an impossible task and obstinately maintained that the conditions for this were not ripe either internally or internationally. Meanwhile the Soviet people, led by the Communist Party, were carrying out a transformation never before seen in history, and in changing the appearance of the country, were changing themselves. They grew into a mighty force and were the first in history to establish a socialist society.

Equally groundless was Trotsky's prophecy that should war come, the USSR would be defeated by imperialism. The Soviet people had to withstand the bloodiest war that any country had ever endured. They shouldered the main burden of the war against fascism, the striking force of international counter-revolution, organiser of the "crusade" against socialism and democracy. The Soviet socialist system

went through great trials and demonstrated to the world the advantages of the socialist system over that of capitalism.

The Soviet Union not only defended its socialist achievements, but also enlarged the breach in the imperialist system. In helping the European peoples free themselves from fascist slavery, and the peoples of Asia from the yoke of Japanese imperialism, the Soviet Union once again demonstrated its dedication to the principles of proletarian internationalism and the international solidarity of the working people.

A brilliant confirmation of Lenin's theory of revolution was the development of a number of countries in Eastern Europe and Asia which, after the Second World War, fell away from the capitalist system. They carried out deep political and socio-economic reforms and were able to make the transition from people's democratic revolutions to socialist revolutions. The people's democratic revolutions took place in these countries not because of any export of revolution, but as a result of the revolutionary situations that had arisen. Years of Communist-led struggle by the working class and the peasants against fascism and their own reactionaries at home had paved the way for the victory of the revolutionary forces. This victory was made easier by the friendly help of the Soviet Union, which effectively blocked any intervention on the part of international imperialist reaction.

Trotsky's assertions that socialism could not be built in separate countries until the final triumph of the new society throughout the world appear particularly inept in the light of post-war events. The world socialist system has created the essential conditions for the victory of socialism within the framework of the whole system. The Soviet Union has built socialism and is successfully solving the problems of the transition to communism.

The Trotskyite defeatist conceptions about the impossibility of any sort of serious national liberation struggle while imperialism exists in the world, have been exploded. The national liberation movement, which has become an integral part of the world-wide anti-imperialist struggle, has put an end to the system of colonial slavery.

Contrary to the Trotskyite statements that only war brings about great revolutionary changes, the new, third stage of the general crisis of capitalism did not begin in connection

with world war. It began in an atmosphere of conflict between two systems and an increasing swing in the balance of forces in favour of socialism, the growth of the national liberation movement, and a deepening of the contradictions between the monopolies and the interests of the overwhelming majority of nations.

In 1913, speaking of the successes of Marxism, Lenin said that "a still greater triumph awaits Marxism, as the doctrine of the proletariat in the coming period of history".¹ What he foretold has come to pass in our own time. The victories won by the international communist and working-class movement are a brilliant realisation of the ideas of Marx and Lenin.

How do the Trotskyites react to the fact that life sets all their schemes and ideas at naught? A double standard is characteristic of the conduct of the "Fourth International". On the one hand, for the benefit of those who know little of the finer points of Trotskyism, they declare out of hand that post-war development has confirmed the correctness of the theory of permanent revolution.

On the other hand, the leaders of the "Fourth International", whether they like it or not, have to admit that Trotsky's prophecies have not been fulfilled. Back in 1966 Pablo stated: "Since the Second World War a new international situation has taken shape that has negated a number of analytical assessments and forecasts of classical Trotskyism."² Posadas also accepts the fact that "Trotsky has no reply to the fundamental problems of the present stage".³

The Trotskyites do all in their power to darn the holes in the badly frayed theory of permanent revolution. They still cling to it as a fig leaf to hide their ideological nakedness and give the impression that they have some sort of integral system of opinions. In spite of historical truth and facts that are well known, they interpret world phenomena on the basis of the dead scheme of the theory of permanent revolution.

Often Trotskyites quite simply reject all that does not fit into this scheme and ignore the changes that have taken

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 585.

² *Sous le drapeau du Socialisme*, No. 33-34, 1966, p. 23.

³ *Lutte ouvrière*, July 10, 1969, p. 5.

place in historic development. But sometimes they try to shift their ground and work out new methods of struggle against the strategy and tactics of the Communist parties.

The concepts of contemporary Trotskyism again and again show its utter feebleness. It is no accident that the ideological activity of Trotskyism usually boils down to attacks on the assessments of contemporary problems made by the international communist movement. Fairly often they seem to follow on the heels of the documents issued by the Communist and Workers' parties, trying to distort individual propositions and hastening to voice exactly the opposite opinion on every fundamental question.

What are the basic lines along which contemporary Trotskyism develops its disruptive activities?

1. DENIAL OF THE REVOLUTIONISING ROLE OF THE WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM

In June 1969 the participants in the Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties stated: "*The world socialist system is the decisive force in the anti-imperialist struggle. Each liberation struggle receives indispensable aid from the world socialist system, above all from the Soviet Union.*"¹

The world socialist system is the fundamental achievement of the international revolutionary movement of the working class, the great result of all its preceding struggle for socialism, and the main revolutionary force of our epoch. Never in the history of the working-class movement has there been such a mighty bulwark in the struggle against capitalism.

The development and strengthening of the countries of the world socialist system prove the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist theory that capitalism, as a social system, has already outlived itself, while socialism is the highroad of development for mankind. The changing balance of forces in the international arena to the advantage of socialism has the effect of strengthening all revolutionary forces and opens up new possibilities for the solution of the tasks that confront them in the struggle for socialism, democracy and national independence.

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 21.*

Thus with the emergence of the world socialist system more favourable conditions have been created for the revolutionary struggle which is being waged by the working class of capitalist countries. It sees in the socialist states its great bulwark and chief ally. The strengthening of their economic and political might weakens capitalism, increases the influence of socialist ideas on the broad national masses and helps the consolidation of the anti-monopoly forces. Since the victory of socialist revolutions it is no longer merely the defects and contradictions of the bourgeois system that play a revolutionising role. There is also the force of the positive example of the socialist countries.

The significance of the world socialist system for the further growth of the revolutionary movement in capitalist countries is not limited to its revolutionising effect on the masses. The actual struggle of the working class becomes easier.

The victories of socialism have a profound effect on the economic, political and ideological struggle in capitalist countries, and help the proletariat to wring concessions from the monopolistic bourgeoisie and achieve social reforms, extension of democracy and greater social rights.

The successes of the national liberation movement are also inextricably linked with the formation and strengthening of the world socialist system, without which it would have been impossible for the former colonial and semi-colonial peoples to win their independence. Never before in history have there been such examples of selfless and limitless help, such a great display of internationalism, as exist in the relations between the socialist countries and the peoples who are setting out on the road of national liberation.

The increasing interconnection of all the revolutionary streams is a characteristic of our times. While making things easier for the working class in capitalist countries and the national liberation movement in their struggle against imperialism, the socialist community constantly feels their answering support.

The economic and political successes of the world socialist system, the class struggle of the workers of capitalist countries and the shattering blows dealt by the national liberation movement against the imperialist system—all this

undermines the foundations of imperialism and brings the triumph of socialist ideas on a world scale nearer.

The enemies of communism see in the unity of the revolutionary forces their chief danger and, therefore, try to cause dissension in the ranks of the fighters against imperialism and to disunite contemporary revolutionary streams. Trotskyism carries on its activities in the same direction.

For Socialism in Words, But Not in Deeds

One of the most characteristic sides of Trotskyism has always been the indiscriminate running down of the results of previous revolutionary struggle. As is well known, pre-war Trotskyism exulted in a campaign defaming the country which had successfully achieved a socialist revolution. Present-day Trotskyism has preserved and increased its hatred for the Soviet Union and is now vituperating the whole socialist system.

This calumny against the realities of socialism has as its source the Trotskyite conception of the future of social development, its interpretation of the present epoch. While assessing it formally as an epoch of transition from world capitalism to world socialism, the Trotskyites fill this definition with an anti-Leninist, anti-socialist content. They reject Lenin's idea that mankind will turn to socialism as more links, more countries, drop away from the capitalist system. They hold that the transformation of society is only possible as some sort of global cataclysm, which is to take place in the distant future, after the victory of socialist revolutions in all or in the great majority of countries.

Their talk of socialism as a far distant prospect for mankind clearly reveals one of the anti-revolutionary facets of Trotskyism.

The present-day followers of Trotsky, true to their teacher, can give no reasonable answer to the question what are revolutions for. They are not in fact interested in the prospects and ways of development of revolutions in different countries. Only when there are at least fifty of these revolutions, only then will the time have come for the logical culmination of each of them. Meanwhile, according to the Trotskyites, separate national detachments of the work-

ing class can only wait for a satisfactory development of events on a world scale after they have themselves brought about a successful revolution. As for the revolutions that have occurred, are occurring or will occur in separate countries, these, so they maintain, are but small contributions to a fund that will yield returns only after the victory of the world revolution. In this way the Trotskyites betray their anti-revolutionary nature. A revolutionary is not worthy of the name if he robs the working class of its aims and tasks, and thereby drives the revolutionary movement into a blind alley where it can only be defeated.

Contemporary Trotskyites do not believe in the creative capabilities of the working class. In their opinion, when the proletariat of any one country comes to power, it cannot even dream of building socialism. After the victory of such revolutions, they state, more than a hundred years must pass, and perhaps even several centuries, before the building of socialism can be undertaken. These are precisely the periods that the supporters of Pablo indicated at the conference they held in 1965. The Trotskyites remain true to themselves, reiterating the idea that there is some kind of barrier between a successful revolution and the building of socialism, and this will only vanish after a world revolution. And in this the anti-revolutionary essence of Trotskyism again shows itself. A revolutionary cannot be a revolutionary if he does not acknowledge the right and ability of the proletariat of a separate country, on coming to power, to destroy the remnants of the exploiting system and start creating a new, genuinely progressive society.

The anti-revolutionary essence of Trotskyite arguments is particularly noticeable in their venomous attacks against countries that have built or are building socialism. The whole purpose of their ideas concerning the prolonged transitional period is to malign socialist countries. An obviously futile attempt is being made to denigrate socialism from pseudo-revolutionary positions. The truth, however, is self-evident: no one can be a revolutionary who bends over backwards to defame the leading revolutionary force of our time—the socialist countries.

In their pseudo-theoretical statements on socialism, the Trotskyites cannot make the facts fit. They have to reckon with the colossal social and economic successes of the Soviet

Union and the other countries of the socialist system. "The capitalists," the American Trotskyites admit, "cannot point to a single country in the world where their system has offered results that come anywhere near the achievements of the Soviet Union, the countries of Eastern Europe. . . ."¹ The congress of the Paris "Secretariat of the Fourth International" unwillingly spoke of the "rapid economic growth of the Soviet Union and other states",² that had broken from capitalism, while the British Trotskyites mentioned "the outstanding economic successes of the Russian revolution".

Except for a few small groups that stand apart,³ present-day Trotskyites admit that the socialist countries have done away with the capitalist method of production. The adherents of the "Fourth International" no longer dare to refute the stability of the social transformations in countries that have fallen away from the capitalist system, and they no longer foretell their collapse, as Trotsky did.

At the same time in analysing the socio-economic development of these countries the Trotskyites carefully avoid answering the question as to what method of production has been established there and obstinately refuse to admit their socialist nature.

The Trotskyites fall back on their traditional tactics. If the facts go against them, so much the worse for the facts. In trying to refute what has long been widely accepted, they find nothing better than to turn to Trotsky's absurd arguments about the impossibility of building socialism in one or a few countries. They are not embarrassed by the awkward position in which they put themselves. In the twenties these arguments were advanced in a situation when Soviet Russia's paths of development were only just being outlined. Now, when a mighty world socialist system exists, such arguments are nothing but ridiculous anachronisms.

The rules of the "Fourth International" say simply: "Socialism cannot be built in one country without a world

¹ *International Socialist Review*, No. 4, 1967, p. 15.

² *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 12, 1961, p. 24.

³ The Spanish Trotskyites, for instance, in their blind anti-sovietism, have reached the conclusion that the Russian economic system is the same imperialist state capitalism as its American rival. Similar views are held by the British Trotskyites who bear the resounding name of International Socialists.

revolution." In developing this thesis Posadas' group stated: "The historic conditions are such that not a single nation in the world can build socialism by itself. Not a single revolution can be crowned with success and develop towards socialism because this can only happen on a world scale."¹

Behind the absurd statements that the building of socialism, which has taken place in the Soviet Union and is taking place in other countries, is "not socialism" and that "there are 14 workers' states but these 14 workers' states have not developed towards socialism",² one can clearly see the intention to sow doubt as to the practical validity of the theory and practice of socialist construction among the working people in capitalist countries and among the peoples who have started on the path of independent national development. In spreading the notion that the working class must not be guided by the experience of socialist countries, and certainly not by that of the Soviet Union, the Trotskyites act in support of the imperialist forces which are striving to drive a wedge between the world system of socialism and other contemporary revolutionary streams.

At the same time the Trotskyites try to go along with the extremist and anti-communist elements among the petty bourgeoisie, who are ready to condemn capitalism in words, but still will not accept socialist reality.

And although as a result of the changes that have taken place in the world, the attraction of socialist ideas is growing among the petty bourgeoisie, and their disbelief and prejudices are being dispelled, the Trotskyites strive to use for anti-communist purposes the still existing attitudes of downright nihilism with regard to socialist countries. It is to petty-bourgeois elements in this frame of mind that the Trotskyites make their main appeal.

Fabrications about the "deformations" of socialist revolutions are made for the same purpose. The Trotskyites allege that in the transitional period "from international capitalism to world socialism" "deviations and abominations" will to a greater or lesser extent accompany victorious revolutions. "During this prolonged and tortuous transitional period, especially in its first and restricted steps, it is undeniable

¹ *Revista Marxista Latinoamericana*, No. 14, August 1968, p. 116.

² *European Marxist Review*, No. 1, 1968, p. 134.

that the new society must go through aberrations and deformations in this or that time and place,"¹ say the American Trotskyites. This point of view was supported by the Paris "Secretariat of the Fourth International": "Deformations were inevitable in the USSR. . . . They accompanied and will accompany every victorious revolution in varying degrees."²

Denying the successes of socialist construction out of hand and masking their true intentions with general arguments about the historic inevitability of "deformations", Trotskyites continue to defame the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, alleging that these are "particularly deformed" owing to their past economic backwardness and prolonged coexistence with the capitalist system.

In this underhand fashion the Trotskyites again suggest that the working class has nothing to learn from the Soviet Union in the way of building socialism, but should follow its own, special path.

As the "conceptions" of the Trotskyites show, they have no clear idea what a socialist society should be like. They simply dismiss this question, considering that it will only become relevant when the revolution triumphs in the last capitalist country. After the victory of a revolution in one country the working class there will have nothing to do but remain in a condition of "deformation" and "abomination". This is the peak of absurdity Trotskyites have reached in their attempts to slander socialism and at the same time make themselves out to be socialists!

In this malicious hatred of the socialist countries the Trotskyites side with the forces of reaction and fascism. Thus in June 1953, the "Fourth International" welcomed with rejoicing the news that a band of spies and saboteurs, trained by Bonn and American intelligence agencies, had infiltrated into the capital of the GDR from West Berlin. The Trotskyites hastened to spread calumnies against the German Democratic Republic, and after the break-down of this provocation, which had been aimed at starting a civil war and restoring capitalism there, they expressed their regret that "that round of the struggle" was lost.³

¹ *International Socialist Review*, No. 1, 1961, p. 15.

² *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 32, 1967, p. 5.

³ *International Socialist Review*, No. 2, 1961, p. 46.

The Trotskyites behaved no less infamously during the counter-revolutionary revolt in Hungary. Welcoming fascist acts of violence against Communists and the rampage of the reactionary forces who set out to restore capitalism, the Trotskyites announced that this putsch was a "revolution". In one of the resolutions of the Paris "Secretariat" their blasphemy reached the point of equating fascist violence with socialist revolutions.

The Trotskyites also hastened to announce their solidarity with the Right-wing opportunist forces in Czechoslovakia, who tried to bring about a counter-revolutionary revolt and to tear the country away from the socialist community. With infinite cynicism the Trotskyites equated the actions of enemies of socialism with the revolutionary risings of the French workers in May and June 1968 and dubbed both of these as "revolutionary upsurge".

Along with open appeals to undermine the socialist system, the Trotskyites make vain attempts to discredit the policies of the USSR and other socialist countries. As has already been said, Trotsky used at one time to accuse the Soviet Union of having embarked on the "unrealisable" task of "building an isolated socialist house" and of having supposedly forgotten about proletarian internationalism. Latter-day Trotskyites are always talking about the "national exclusiveness" of socialist countries and of "their restraining the progress of world revolution".

With surprising unanimity contemporary followers of Trotsky attack the socialist countries' policy of peaceful coexistence of states that have different social structures.

Misinterpretation of Peaceful Coexistence

Trotskyites do not deny the fact that they are using the same arguments against peaceful coexistence as Trotsky did. They base their arguments on the crude assumption that peaceful coexistence is an alternative to class struggle. They present the policy of peaceful coexistence as an attempt by the socialist countries "to avoid the risk of socialist revolution at any price" and to "turn away from a

revolutionary upheaval by every possible means". According to their logic, there is no other alternative but peaceful coexistence or revolutionary struggle, and the one absolutely excludes the other. It is not difficult to see in this a hereditary likeness with Trotsky's views on armed conflict as the only way of "pushing forward" the revolution. If one analyses the outbursts against the policy of peaceful coexistence, it becomes fairly obvious that they have the same old end in view—to sow mistrust of the socialist countries among the working class of capitalist countries and among peoples fighting for national and social liberation. Contemporary Trotskyism sees peaceful coexistence as one of the main targets for attacks on the socialist system and, in making them, it is not averse to deception or to juggling with facts.

The Trotskyites say that the policy of peaceful coexistence "is a policy that is carried out not only internationally, but nationally". The Communist and Workers' parties, who are said to apply it to internal political struggle with the aim of preserving "the social status quo", are supposed to be pursuing this policy "nationally".¹

The Trotskyites pretend not to understand the meaning the international communist movement attributes to peaceful coexistence. Yet one has only to read the documents of international meetings of Communist and Workers' parties, and the programmes of these parties, to realise that it applies only to the principles of relations between states with different social systems.

In June 1969 the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow adopted a document entitled "Tasks at the Present Stage of the Struggle Against Imperialism and United Action of Communist and Workers' Parties and All Anti-Imperialist Forces", and this stated:

"The policy of peaceful coexistence does not contradict the right of any oppressed people to fight for its liberation by any means it considers necessary—armed or peaceful. This policy in no way signifies support for reactionary regimes. . . .

"The attempts of imperialism to overcome its internal

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, special number, July 1968, p. 3; *The Newsletter*, January 27, 1968.

contradictions by building up international tension and creating hotbeds of war are hampered by the policy of peaceful coexistence. This policy does not imply either the preservation of the socio-political status quo or a weakening of the ideological struggle."¹

Marxists-Leninists have only one approach to the policy of peaceful coexistence—as to a specific form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism on the world scene.

This struggle takes the sharpest forms. It is waged in all spheres of social life: in politics, economics and ideology.

The socialist countries' consistent defence of the principles of peaceful coexistence leaves less opportunity for the imperialists to interfere in the lives of other peoples and hinder their social and national liberation by means of armed intervention. In our day, as never before, the success of class struggle in individual countries is inextricably linked with the support it gets from the socialist states. Whatever the form the revolutionary or national liberation struggle of the workers takes, the socialist countries never remain neutral. They help politically, morally and materially and, if circumstances so dictate, they even give military support.

In a speech at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in June 1969, a member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, stated: "In defending the outpost of socialism in the Western Hemisphere, we have had the support of the Soviet Union, the socialist camp and the entire revolutionary movement. Here, in the homeland of the great Lenin, on the threshold of the glorious anniversary of his birth, in the country which was the first in history to destroy capitalist oppression and break the fetters of colonialism, we should like to stress on behalf of the Communist Party of Cuba the full significance for our struggle of the military aid, the economic support and the political and moral solidarity of the Soviet Union, the Soviet people and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union."²

Fighting together with other contemporary revolutionary forces against imperialist attempts to suppress by inter-

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*, p. 31.

² *Ibid.*, p. 308.

vention the movement for social liberation, the socialist system helps nations, however small they may be, to defend themselves successfully against imperialist plots.

In the picturesque phrase of the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uruguay, Rodney Arismendi, "the states of the socialist system have put such a curb on imperialist plans, that imperialists are prevented from returning through the window when they have been thrown out of the door".¹

This was the case in 1956 when the efforts of the socialist community thwarted the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt. In 1957 intervention against Syria was prevented, and in 1958 intervention against Iraq. In 1967 the Soviet Union and other socialist countries blocked the plans of Israeli war leaders and American imperialism to liquidate the progressive regimes in the Middle East. The socialist community helps the Arab states defend themselves against the encroachments of the Israeli aggressors. The people of Vietnam receive help of all sorts from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in their fight against American imperialist aggression.

The Soviet Union considers it its international duty to continue to help the sacred cause of oppressed peoples in their just efforts to free themselves from imperialism.

In the report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 24th Congress, General Secretary of the Central Committee Leonid Brezhnev stated: "And we declare that, while consistently pursuing its policy of peace and friendship among nations, the Soviet Union will continue to conduct a resolute struggle against imperialism, and firmly to rebuff the evil designs and subversions of aggressors. As in the past, we shall give undeviating support to the peoples' struggle for democracy, national liberation and socialism."²

The Trotskyites are especially furious at the course taken by the socialist countries to win the economic contest between the two systems. This is supposed to "demoralise" the international revolutionary movement. They accuse the

¹ Rodney Arismendi, *Problemas de una revolucion continental*, Montevideo, 1962, p. 153.

² *24th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1971, p. 39.

socialist countries of becoming engrossed in economic questions, "not caring" for the promotion of the world revolution, and wanting only "to integrate the economy of the Soviet Union and the East European states into the world market and the international division of labour".¹ There are even some Trotskyites who claim that the socialist countries spread illusions regarding the possibility of the "automatic collapse" of capitalism as a result of economic competition.

But the Communists have never considered that economic competition between the two social systems would automatically bring about revolutions in capitalist countries. Economic competition changes the balance of forces in the world arena in favour of socialism, and capitalism will be abolished in each of the capitalist countries by revolutionary means.

In the course of economic competition between the two systems, the socialist community builds up its strength in all ways, and socialist ideas become more attractive. The economic successes of the socialist countries have an impact upon the whole course of world social development, and show that historically capitalism has no prospects.

The increased struggle of the workers in capitalist countries for a higher standard of life and social rights, and concessions forced from the monopolies also have a definite connection with the economic achievements of the socialist countries.

Moreover, the successful economic development of the socialist system has been one of the factors that has prompted a number of countries who have won political independence to take a non-capitalist road of development. And it is this road that makes it possible to overcome economic backwardness in the shortest time, as the experience of the socialist republics of the Soviet East and People's Mongolia has shown. With the help of continually increasing aid from world socialism, the peoples of countries that have freed themselves from colonialism strengthen their economy and rid themselves of servile dependence on imperialist powers.

Trotskyite assertions, implying that the Communist parties consider that "ideological coexistence with the most reac-

¹ *Fourth International*, No. 3, Winter 1968/69, p. 105.

tionary ideologies of capitalism is possible",¹ are just as absurd as their other arguments. They are meant for people who are unacquainted with the policy of the socialist countries and do not know that from the day when they were first established, they have regarded the ideological front as one of the most important.

The socialist countries see their international duty in spreading Marxist-Leninist ideas throughout the world. They do all they can to help fraternal Communist parties in their work of saving the working people from the grip of bourgeois ideology and counteracting imperialist propaganda.

Thus the actual practice of the political, economic and ideological struggle of the socialist countries against imperialism is an obvious refutation of Trotskyite fabrications about peaceful coexistence being some sort of "class cooperation". Peaceful coexistence is a struggle waged on a world scale, and every one of its successes strengthens the revolutionary movement as a whole and weakens imperialism.

Communist Construction in the USSR— One of the Main Targets for Anti-Sovietism

In the slander campaign against the socialist countries, the "Fourth International" gives special attention to blackening the Soviet Union and belittling its contribution to the common cause of revolution. The programme for the building of communism has become the basic target. Trotsky's words about the impossibility of socialist victory in one country are reiterated in various ways. Germain, one of the leaders of the "Fourth International", asserts that "the problem of the building of communism cannot be solved until socialism is victorious in the West and particularly in the United States of America".²

Trotskyite notions that the task of building communism set by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is premature and contrary to the interests of the international revo-

¹ *The Newsletter*, May 25, 1968.

² *Bulletin intérieur du Secrétariat international de la IVe Internationale*, Décembre 1960, p. 4.

lutionary movement pursue the usual aim of sowing mistrust among the working people of other countries towards the policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and thus disunite the revolutionary forces of today.

The struggle for the building of a communist society is the highest manifestation of proletarian internationalism in the activity of the Soviet people. It facilitates and hastens the movement towards communism of the entire world socialist system, and promotes the spread and triumph of the ideas of socialism and communism throughout the world.

The resolution of the 23rd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union states: "The building of communism in the USSR and the all-sided improvement of Soviet socialist society are the basic contribution made by the CPSU and the entire Soviet people towards the world revolutionary process, towards the struggle of all peoples against imperialism, for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism."¹ The Soviet people are creating decisive prerequisites for shifting the balance of world forces in favour of socialism.

The building of communism in the Soviet Union helps consolidate the political army of fighters for socialism both in capitalist states and in countries that have freed themselves from colonialism. Peaceful forces that oppose the scheming of imperialist reaction are growing stronger. There are greater possibilities for rendering all-round assistance to peoples struggling for national liberation.

The slanderous accusations of the insignificant little gang of Trotskyites against the socialist community and the Soviet Union are shown up for what they are—feeble and pathetic, and they are powerless to discredit the role of the socialist system in the world revolutionary process.

2. THE VIEWS OF CONTEMPORARY TROTSKYITES ON THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE IN CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

In the sixties and seventies the international working-class movement has acquired a number of new characteristics. Ever wider sections of the people are joining in active

¹ *Twenty-Third Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Moscow, 1966, p. 300.*

opposition to monopoly capital. The forms and methods of the struggle are becoming more diverse. As was noted at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in June 1969, the major battles fought by the working class in a number of capitalist countries point to a new upsurge of the class struggle. They can lead to a fundamental transformation of society, to socialist revolution and the establishment of power of the working class in alliance with other strata of the working people.

The Communists' main precept lies in acknowledging the need to master all forms of class struggle up to and including armed insurrection, and being ready to change from one form to another in the quickest and most decisive way depending on the concrete situation and the distribution of class forces within a country and on the world scale. Communists believe that the revolutionary struggle, whatever form it takes—peaceful or non-peaceful—is an activity of the masses themselves, and particularly of the working class, directed towards revolutionary goals by their politically conscious vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist parties.

Communist and Workers' parties consider that the constant widening of the social basis of the anti-monopoly movement creates new, favourable opportunities for the revolutionary struggle. The growing participation in it of peasantry, intellectuals, students and the middle classes makes it easier even now, without waiting for the victory of socialism, to force measures on the bourgeoisie that would go beyond the limits of ordinary reforms. Their realisation would have a vital effect both on the working class and its further struggle for revolutionary victory and socialism, and on the majority of the nation.

A feature of the anti-imperialist struggle of our days is the growing significance of the movement in defence of democracy against the attacks of reaction, to secure peace and relaxation of international tension and to attain far-reaching social reforms. Broader opportunities are available for uniting and channelling these efforts into one mighty stream that will aim at overthrowing monopoly capital in the subsequent stages.

Communists see in the mobilisation of all types of democratic movements an integral part of the struggle for socialism. Life constantly produces new examples which

show that the movement for general democratic demands broadens the anti-monopoly front, creates the conditions for a transfer of power into the hands of the working class and its allies, and leads the masses on to socialist revolution.

Lenin wrote: "...Consistent democracy, on the one hand, is transformed into socialism and, on the other . . . demands socialism. . . . To develop democracy to the utmost, to find the forms for this development, to test them by practice, and so forth—all this is one of the component tasks of the struggle for the social revolution. Taken separately, no kind of democracy will bring socialism. But in actual life democracy will never be 'taken separately'; it will be 'taken together' with other things, it will exert its influence on economic life as well, will stimulate its transformation; and in its turn it will be influenced by economic development, and so on."¹

This conclusion of Lenin's has acquired special significance in our time, when material and socio-political prerequisites for the replacement of capitalism by a new social system have ripened to a far greater extent than ever before. Communists give a concrete answer to the question what should be done to further promote the anti-imperialist movement. They arm the working people of capitalist countries with a rich variety of forms, means and methods of struggle.

Communist and Workers' parties have, therefore, a clear and definite programme for guiding the revolutionary struggle which takes account of the present-day situation.

Fabrications about the "Stagnation" of the Working-Class Movement

For many years latter-day Trotskyites have excelled themselves in their attempts to discredit both the revolutionary movement in capitalist countries and the strategy of the Communist parties. Their picture of the class struggle is like a reflection in a curved mirror. Their pet device has been to highlight negative features that do actually exist (political apathy and the persistence of Right-wing reform-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 452.

ism among certain sections of the working class). At the same time they blankly deny the fact that the proletariat is continually becoming more involved in active opposition against monopoly capital and that social conflicts are taking on an increasingly political aspect. At their congresses the Trotskyites have passed resolutions about the "ebbing of the revolutionary tide in imperialist countries" and the "inert condition" of the workers.

They need this falsification to make credible their absurd statements about the "passivity" of the proletariat of capitalist countries, and even of its "avoidance of historic responsibility". Once again the Trotskyites turn out to be in the company of bourgeois ideologists, who do not tire repeating that the workers have stopped thinking of revolution.

More than three months before the French workers' actions in May and June, the Trotskyite paper *Avant-Garde*, issued in Paris, stated in January 1968: "In the advanced capitalist countries the relative stability of the existing regions and the extreme weakness of the vanguard obviously excludes in the immediate period all struggles of a revolutionary character capable of bringing down our own bourgeoisie."¹ These prophecies, which contradicted the whole postwar revolutionary experience of the French proletariat, sounded particularly inept in the light of the subsequent events.

The Trotskyites came out with the same ideas even in the first days of the May and June events. In May 1968 France was paralysed by a general strike, and the Trotskyite organ, *Voix ouvrière*, wrote: "The working people are demoralised, and they are still further demoralised by their own organisations."²

A contemptuous attitude towards the revolutionary possibilities of the proletariat of advanced capitalist countries was also demonstrated at the so-called Ninth Congress held by the Paris "Secretariat of the Fourth International" in April 1969. Resolutions talked of "the demoralisation" of the working class.

¹ Quoted from *The Newsletter*, February 18, 1969.

² Quoted from *The Newsletter*, May 28, 1968.

What was it that called forth these conclusions about the stagnation of the revolutionary movement and the apathy of the working class? These contemptuous and insulting attacks against the proletariat were used to "substantiate" another line of thought—about the "crisis of the revolutionary leadership in capitalist countries". In putting forward the thesis that "the new epoch demands new methods, and new methods demand new leaders", the Trotskyites intend to smear the Communist and Workers' parties.

The Trotskyites continually seek ways of belittling the significance of the Communist parties as the revolutionary vanguard of the working class.

Developing their attacks on the Communist parties, they lash out at what is most dear to the working class. The working class, as Lenin considered, has no weapon in its struggle for power except organisation. Lenin taught that only the political party of the working class, that is, the Communist party, can direct the united activity of the proletariat, and through it, that of all the toiling masses.

The Communist parties are the greatest historical achievement of the international working class, the embodiment of its organisational power, the highest evidence of its consciousness and the training school for its best representatives. It is the Communist parties that have ensured and will ensure in the future the unanimous and purposeful actions of the proletariat aimed at overthrowing the exploiting system and bringing about the victory of socialism. It is under their leadership that socialist revolutions have been accomplished, the bitterest class struggles waged and new positions won from imperialism. The Communists are always in the vanguard of mass movements, defending the great aims of social progress. Armed with a knowledge of the laws of social development, they light the path to the communist future for the peoples.

In opposing the Communist parties, the Trotskyites in effect repudiate the revolutionary movement. Without the party, Lenin said, the proletariat cannot rise to a conscious class struggle and the working-class movement is doomed.

As Trotsky did in his time, so his present-day followers now make a bid for non-party young people in the struggle against Communists. Making use of the political immaturity

of part of the younger generation, they call on them to act as a political force which has nothing in common with the Communist and Workers' parties and acts contrary to them.

The French Trotskyites, who bring out a monthly journal *La Quatrième Internationale*, frankly say that their main task is to encourage the anti-communist tendencies that exist among a certain section of the young people. They see a special "value" in their work with such people because they "stand in opposition to the bureaucratic leadership of the working-class movement".¹

They are echoed by the British Trotskyites. Youth, they say, can more easily be convinced of the "mistakes" allegedly made by the Communist parties.² The Italian Trotskyites, who believe it to be essential to appeal to "the critically inclined sectors" of the young people, hasten to develop disruptive activity among them.

The Trotskyites try to play up to the moods of the young generation, flatter them and call them "the most radical wing of the movement". The Trotskyite slogan that used to be well known in the old days is heard again: "Youth is the barometer of revolution." Young Left-wing radicals are said to be the chief force in the revolutionary struggle. It is instilled into them that they can appear in the role of the revolutionary vanguard of the working class, which allegedly is only waiting for this.

Posadas' group, which since the end of the sixties has been specially active in Western Europe, has announced: "...The student sector, as part of the petty bourgeoisie, has played a fundamental role." He goes on to say: "This student movement . . . does not express a particular phenomenon of the student sector, but the seeking for proletarian power and fundamentally the social proletarian force on which the movement supports itself, the proletariat not being able to express this same level through lack of centres and of leadership."³ The students are called the embodiment of the revolutionary consciousness of the workers.⁴

¹ *La Quatrième Internationale*, No. 27, March 1968, p. 7.

² *The Newsletter*, January 13, 1968.

³ *European Marxist Review*, No. 1, 1968, pp. 109, 111.

⁴ *Rivista Marxista Europea*, No. 5-6, 1968, p. 5.

The Trotskyites who are grouped round the London "International Committee" go beyond Posadas' assessment and state that "the youth must lead the fight to overthrow capitalism not just here in Britain but all over the world".¹ The idea is suggested to the students that they should form "an international revolutionary organisation of youth", which could take upon itself leadership of the revolutionary struggle.²

The necessity of forming an "independent youth organisation", alleged to be capable of "radicalising" the proletarian masses, was also discussed at the Paris group's Ninth "Congress" of the "Fourth International", held in April 1969.

In this way the Trotskyites stir up the separatist adventurist tendencies that are to be found in the ranks of the youth. Some of them do consider it possible to engage in an independent political struggle without an alliance with the working class. These the Trotskyites batten on hoping to set them against the working class and tear them away from it.

The Trotskyites obviously speculate on the fact that the student youth know little of the history of revolutionary struggle. This history shows that "student unrest" and "youth revolts" were a real danger to capitalism only when they were an organic part of the class struggles led by the proletariat and its revolutionary vanguard. Undoubtedly youth always played a prominent role in the revolutionary struggle. But it is also an irrefutable fact that revolution is class struggle, and the important thing is not the age of its participants, but their class position, the ability to unite round the most revolutionary force of the present age—the working class and its vanguard.

All the victorious socialist revolutions owed their success to the fact that they were headed by the working class. This was so in the Great October Socialist Revolution. It was so in the period of development of people's democratic revo-

¹ *The Newsletter*, January 13, 1968.

² *La Correspondance Internationale. Bulletin du Comité International de la IV^e Internationale*, Supplément No. 3 to *La Vérité*, October-November 1967, p. 8; *Fourth International*, No. 3, Winter 1968/69, p. 107; *Workers' Press*, June 10, 1971.

lutions into socialist revolutions in the countries of Eastern Europe.

This was confirmed by the experience of the Cuban revolution, when the urban and rural proletariat prepared and ensured the success of the revolutionary struggle by general strikes in 1955-59. "It was the working class," Fidel Castro emphasised, "with its general strike together with the insurgent army that put an end to the reactionary plans that would have torn victory from the hands of the people at the last moment, as had happened more than once in the past. It was in fact the strike—and we assert this with all the responsibility to which we have a right because of *our share* in the events of those decisive hours—that thwarted the last plots of the people's enemies. . . . The general strike put power into the hands of the revolutionaries."¹

The Trotskyites do serious harm to the youth movement not only by their attempts to draw a line of demarcation between them and their natural allies, thus leading the movement into a blind alley. They encourage the tendency towards spontaneity and anarchy, pushing youth into extremist, adventurist action.

One of the main drawbacks of the youth movement is the absence of a scientific, revolutionary world-outlook and of any clear idea of the forms of struggle and the methods to attain their goals.

By instigating this youth movement to oppose the Communist parties, the Trotskyites, in effect, rob it of any sort of future. It is not from reactionary university teachers, who pitilessly distort Marxism, nor from a puny bunch of Trotskyites, who substitute a collection of pseudo-revolutionary views for the teaching of Marx and Lenin, that students can discover the laws of social development, the strategy and tactics of class struggle. Only Communists can give them such weapons.

The Trotskyites have no thought either of the revolution or of the abolition of the capitalist system when they try to drag their views into the student and, to some extent, the working-class youth movement. What they want is to conserve for as long as possible the tendency towards sectar-

¹ Fidel Castro, *Speeches and Addresses*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1960, p. 162.

ianism and separatism that exists among some of the young people. They are determined to make use of these temporary, transitory moods to strengthen their position.

At the Ninth "Congress" in April 1969 the Trotskyites siding with the so-called Paris Secretariat noted that a definite section of the young people "is exceedingly poor in theoretical knowledge and in their ideas of organisation". In a special resolution the congress laid down that "a reservoir for recruitment" was opening here, and it was absolutely essential to instil into the ranks of youth without delay the "methods, doctrines and viewpoints of the Trotskyite movement".

For this purpose the Trotskyites attend youth meetings, gathering and discussions. In June 1968 at the conference of the Socialist Labour League they stated: "We must work always along the lines of mass activities, dances, sports and big public demonstrations through which we build up an association with hundreds of thousands of young workers."¹

What is meant by "activities among the young workers"? The Trotskyites consider it their mission to "show them how to gain a strength with which to resist the repression of the apparatus (the French Communist Party and trade unions—*M.B.*)".² They lie when they say that Communists "hate the young" and "behave in a hostile manner to young people who come from the petty bourgeoisie".

The Trotskyites urge youth to turn down suggestions from Communist youth organisations for a common platform and assure them that their refusal will only benefit the revolutionary struggle. Having got together a few student and youth groups of a frankly Trotskyite character in Britain and France, they use these as a weapon to split the youth movement.

The Trotskyites are suggesting to the young people that they can play the role of a "revolutionary vanguard".

The provocative and openly demagogic nature of these tactics can be seen from the assessment of the part played by youth in the May and June events in 1968 in France. On the one hand the Trotskyites assert that they were able to attract "the most forward and conscious section of the

¹ *The Newsletter*, June 18, 1968.

² *International Socialism*, No. 36, April/May 1969, p. 8.

young". On the other hand they have to admit that among the fourteen- and fifteen-year-olds that joined them, there were many whose only motive in taking part in the demonstrations was "to beat up coups".¹

The Japanese Trotskyites also carry on intensive disruptive activity in youth organisations. The main target of their infiltration policy is the All-Japanese Union of Autonomous Student Organisations (Zengakuren). They have managed to split off part of the youth and form a Trotskyite group. Making use of the fact that many students were inclined to use "violent mass action" against the American domination in Japan, the Trotskyites accused the leadership of the student organisations of pacifism, reformism and the rejection of revolutionary methods of struggle. The group got together by the Trotskyites includes also students with anarchist views.

In searching for the keys to the youth movement, the Trotskyites try in vain to create an impression that they have acquired their own programme of revolutionary struggle. They make a great deal of noise about "supporting and stimulating the revolutionary activity of the masses . . . as the primary task of the revolutionary vanguard", that is, the students and other young activists. They try frantically to prove that they have the key to "increased activity of the masses" because, they allege, the roads of class struggle are absolutely clear to them.

In actual fact the Trotskyites have nothing except a purely nihilistic attitude to the policy principles laid down by the Communist parties and a few slogans which are "Left" in form, but defeatist in content. Having set themselves the aim of splitting the anti-imperialist forces, they seize on all sorts of cunning methods to prevent the working people in capitalist countries from following the Communists. Slander against the policy principles of the Communist parties are their chief method. They are especially jaundiced with regard to the Communist campaign in defence of the general democratic demands of the working people.

¹ *International Socialist Review*, No. 5, 1968, p. 27.

Undermining the Democratic Anti-Imperialist Movement

There is one idea that runs through all the documents and declarations of the Trotskyite groupings, and that is that the movement for democratic rights deflects the working class from the tasks of the "revolutionary overthrow" of the capitalist system.

Present-day Trotskyites accuse the Communist parties of "displaying a tendency to disperse the struggle in time and space over many aims instead of concentrating it on one spot".¹

This clearly shows the hostile Trotskyite attitude to the general democratic movement, which brings wide sections of the people into active opposition to monopoly capital and leads them to socialist revolution. Revolutions would be impossible without this awakening of the masses to political life and without the creation of a mass army of revolution.

It is not difficult to see in the views of contemporary Trotskyites a definite continuity with the line taken by Trotsky, who ignored the general democratic stage of revolution.

Trying somehow to bolster up their conclusions about the futility and hopelessness of fighting for democracy, the Trotskyites assert that political development inevitably leads to the curtailment of democratic liberties and the replacement of bourgeois democracy by fascist regimes. Thus, Cannon says: "An organised fascist movement is an imperative necessity to the ruling class in every modern capitalist state threatened with social revolution."²

The French Trotskyites have expressed the same idea in a somewhat different form. The bourgeois state, they say, is secretly preparing for the liquidation of the remaining democratic liberties, and there is no choice except either the most savage capitalist dictatorship, which would deprive the working class of all its gains, or the victory of the proletariat.³

Naturally imperialist reaction has a definite tendency

¹ *International Socialist Review*, No. 3, 1967, p. 7.

² James P. Cannon, *Notebook of an Agitator*, New York, 1958, p. 350.

³ *La Correspondance Internationale*, Supplément No. 3 to *La Vérité*, October-November 1967, pp. 1-8.

towards a fascist take-over. As pre-war experience showed, such a process can take place even under the cover of bourgeois democracy. But all the same, does this mean that bourgeois democracy is foredoomed to transform itself into fascism?

Contemporary political development does not testify to this. Side by side with a tendency of the monopolistic bourgeoisie to make use of fascist methods of rule, there is an increasing ability among the masses to withstand the movement to the right, and this is making itself increasingly felt. Never before have the opportunities of defeating the enemies of democracy and progress been so favourable.

It is enough to remember the mass opposition in France to the OAS, and to the onslaughts of reaction in Italy and Japan. The involvement of broad sections of working people in the struggle for general democratic demands creates conditions which make it more difficult for the monopolistic bourgeoisie to adopt overt terrorist methods fearing formidable retaliation by the democratic forces.

The struggle against the attempts of reaction to use fascist methods of government is a very complex problem. Here there can be both misfortunes and setbacks, as events have shown in Greece, where it has been possible for fascists to defeat the democratic forces at least for a time. However, there is no doubt that the democratic forces of the world would certainly suffer much greater losses if they were to accept the idea of the fatal inevitability of the establishment of fascist systems in capitalist countries.

Trotskyite statements objectively play into the hands of fascist elements active in various Western countries. In effect, they smother the anti-fascist character of the democratic opposition.

Along with their talk of the inevitability of the transformation of bourgeois democracy into fascism, the Trotskyites produce another irrelevant argument. The stressing of general democratic demands, they assert, gives the working people the idea that it is necessary to protest only within the framework of a capitalist state. Slanderous statements alleging that the working class has adapted its struggle "to parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy" are never absent from the pages of Trotskyite publications.

Yet the general democratic demands made by the work-

ing class unite an ever growing number of workers for the struggle against the domination of monopoly capital. The working class more and more often breaks into spheres of economic and political activity that used to be the precinct of the bourgeoisie. It demands such radical measures as the nationalisation of key industries belonging to the monopolies, the establishment of workers' and democratic control at all levels from factories to the country as a whole, the re-orientation of industry to fulfil urgent social needs, and so on. Will not the realisation of these demands shake the political structure of capitalist states?

Relying on their rich revolutionary experience, Communists consider democratic movements in their dialectical connection with the struggle for socialism. They proceed from the advice offered by Lenin when he wrote: "It would be a radical mistake to think that the struggle for democracy was capable of diverting the proletariat from the socialist revolution or of hiding, overshadowing it, etc. On the contrary, in the same way as there can be no victorious socialism that does not practise full democracy, so the proletariat cannot prepare for its victory over the bourgeoisie without an all-round, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy."¹

This thesis of Lenin's is wholly applicable to the present, and it strikes a blow against malignant Trotskyites and other Leftists, who reiterate arguments that have been refuted by many years of revolutionary practice, stating that the promotion of general democratic demands is incompatible with the proletariat's struggle for its ultimate aims.

On the basis of their contempt for the general democratic movement, the Trotskyites try to prevent the use of parliament in the anti-monopoly struggle. "The bourgeois parliamentary system," they state, "has become a mere shadow or completely disappeared."²

And again the Trotskyites seek to implant their defeatist notions about the fatal strengthening of reactionary circles in bourgeois parliaments. They consider the working masses incapable of influencing the balance of forces in parliament and preventing its use for an attack on democracy.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 144.

² *Fourth International*, No. 3, Winter 1968/69, p. 105.

Lenin called parliament a field of class battles. Only defeatists would refuse to use this form of struggle against the monopolies. Here too the Communists are guided by the need to rally broad sections of the working people.

In June 1969 at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties it was noted: "While making use of all possibilities of parliamentary activity, Communists emphasise that the mass movement of the working class and of all working people is the decisive factor in the struggle for democracy and socialism."¹

The Trotskyites repeat statements that can be found on the pages of most reactionary publications, which evince considerable concern over the mounting influence of Communists among the working masses in capitalist countries.

The bourgeois press does not hide its satisfaction with the attempts of various Trotskyite groups to worm their way into the mass organisations of the working class behind the smokescreen of the slogan: "Abstain from the Communist parties' election fights!" Paris television, on May 17, 1969, readily gave a candidate from the Trotskyite "league", Alain Krivine, a chance to speak during the presidential election campaign. He accused the Communists of spreading a "paralysing myth: a belief in the ballot paper", and called for votes against the candidate of the French Communist Party.

The election activity of the Communists is criticised in various ways. The apologists of imperialism see in the Communists' election programmes a threat to the capitalist system. Trotskyites, however, regard them as an attempt to "contain the struggle within the framework of the capitalist regime". The aim of both is the same—to tear the masses away from the Communists.

The Communists and Left-wing forces allied with them manage not only to repulse reactionary attacks, but on various occasions to get progressive laws through parliament (nationalisation of some branches of industry and enterprises during the postwar years in France, a ban on the dismissal of workers without grounds, building of cheap housing in Italy, and so on). Under pressure from the Communist members of parliament, supported by the masses,

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*, p. 27.

ruling bourgeois and social-reformist parties sometimes have to pass relatively progressive acts.

The objective role of Trotskyism as the handmaid of the monopoly bourgeoisie is evident in its attempts to discredit the idea of a united anti-monopoly front. It rejects the unification of anti-monopoly forces as passionately as Trotsky opposed the Popular Front, when he announced that "in every coalition the leadership is inevitably seized by the Right wing, that is, the propertied class". The present leaders of the "Fourth International" openly say that their attitude to the anti-monopoly front is the same as it was to the Popular Front in the past, and they call upon their supporters to defend the "traditional Trotskyite line".

Following these "traditions", Trotskyites allege that the policy of setting up an anti-monopoly front "postpones the tasks of socialist revolution" and "blunts the edge of the class war for the sake of class co-operation".

In the capitalist countries, they claim, there are no forces that could become active allies of the working class.

At the congress of the "Fourth International" in 1963 they talked of the absence of "an explosive agrarian question" in Western Europe.¹ The Trotskyites shut their eyes both to the increasing onslaught of monopolies on the peasantry and to the growing ruination of the peasant masses. They march in step with the bourgeois propagandists, who, contrary to the facts, paint a rosy picture of the peasants' affluent existence. Both try to prevent common action by the workers and peasants in a united anti-monopoly front.

Besides this the Trotskyites sow doubt in the possibility of creating an anti-monopoly front in the towns. The British Trotskyites from the Socialist Labour League announced at the conference in June 1968: "All 'popular fronts' and so-called 'united fronts' . . . weaken the fight."²

In searching for arguments against the slogan of a united anti-monopoly front, the Trotskyites have produced a "theoretical proposition" according to which this slogan does not correspond to contemporary conditions. Thus the French followers of Trotsky have announced that the Communist parties' orientation on a united anti-imperialist

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 19, 1963, p. 12.

² *The Newsletter*, June 18, 1968.

front "throws the working-class movement back a hundred years or more".

In actual fact it is the Trotskyites themselves who want to throw back the revolutionary movement from the positions it has gained, and slip in "recipes" for class struggle that are Leftist in form and defeatist in content. They advocate only a "policy of class confrontation" and the tactics of "class against class".

The slogan "class against class", as is well known, has its own history. In the late twenties it was adopted by the international working class and the Communist parties. Its purpose in those particular circumstances was to establish the organisational basis of a united proletarian front, strengthen class self-awareness and increase the fighting potential of the proletariat. At the same time the task was set of exposing the conciliatory policy of the Social-Democratic leadership and ridding the working class of reformist illusions.

However, sectarian mistakes were made in the course of the practical realisation of the tactics of "class against class". No distinction was drawn between the Right-wing leaders and the rank-and-file members of the Social-Democratic parties. As a result all co-operation with the Social-Democrats was rejected on principle, as they were looked upon as a "bourgeois workers' party", or the "third bourgeois party". This policy made it difficult to establish co-operation with non-proletarian sections of the working people.¹

In wishing to transplant this slogan of "class against class" into the completely different historical conditions of today, the Trotskyites see its basic value in precisely those sides of its practical application which were crudely sectarian in character and did much harm to the cause of uniting all the anti-imperialist forces.

The Trotskyites regard any rallying of forces around the working class as a mortal sin, an abandonment of revolutionary principles. "The Left-wingers," stated Krivine in his television broadcast on May 18, 1969, "live by two myths which mesmerise them: belief in the ballot paper and

¹ See *The Communist International. Brief Historical Survey*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1969, pp. 284-85.

belief in that notorious alliance of Left-wing forces. As far as we are concerned, we clearly state that we are against this alliance of Left-wing forces, since the word means nothing today."

Trotskyites do not wish to face the self-evident fact that nowadays the basis for the anti-imperialist movement has broadened. The working class is acquiring even such allies as were on the side of its enemies or took a non-committal stand a short while ago.

Noting this new development, Dolores Ibarruri wrote: "We, Spaniards, are daily coming up against the factor to which we cannot close our eyes. The point is that the old division of political forces into Left and Right, established thirty to forty years ago, nowadays often does not correspond to reality. And it would be a serious mistake on our part if we did not take note of these changes in our political activity. . . . Communists march shoulder to shoulder with young Socialists, who in many cases do not agree with their leaders. For the first time Communists occupy the same platforms as Catholic workers, students and intellectuals who hold different political and philosophical convictions."¹

Putting into effect the slogan of a united anti-imperialist front, the Communists proceed from the following fact. In our time there is a closer interconnection between vitally important proletarian interests and the major economic and political problems that face society as a whole. In present-day conditions, the historic role of the proletariat as a force standing for general national progress and calling all progressive social strata of society to struggle against the monopoly oppression is clear for all to see.

At the same time the working class loses none of its special character and does not dissolve its class interests in the general democratic movement, as the Trotskyites assert. On the contrary, awakening the exploited sections of the population to political activity, it ensures far more favourable conditions for the fulfilment of its own mission as the leader of the revolutionary movement, for increasing the activity and fighting potential of its organisations, and for the successful realisation of the great aim of

¹ See *The Great October Revolution and the World Revolutionary Process*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1967, pp. 83 and 84.

emancipation of the working people from the yoke of capitalism.

Communists continually emphasise that the creation of a united anti-monopoly front is an exceedingly difficult task. It cannot be accomplished by the simple addition of all those forces that oppose the monopolies. To carry it out there must be conscious, co-ordinated actions by various social strata and groups within capitalist society. Communists are prepared to do a great deal of hard work to bring together the anti-monopoly forces into one, solid front.

Trotskyites try to weaken these efforts by their malicious attacks on the idea of an anti-monopoly front. Not content with disseminating doubt in the possibility of the working class acquiring allies among the non-proletarian sections of the population, they go even further, trying to preserve the split in the ranks of the working class itself.

Contemporary Trotskyism rejects the efforts of the Communist parties to achieve working-class unity. Any steps the Communists take in the direction of co-operation with Social-Democratic parties are branded as "concessions to capitalism".

The French Trotskyites, who call themselves the Internationalist Communist Party, devoted their congress in January 1967 to an attack on the efforts of the French Communist Party to work towards an agreed programme of action with other democratic parties and organisations. The Trotskyites raved particularly about the agreement reached at the end of December 1966 between the French Communist Party and the Federation of Left Democrats and Socialists on common strategy during the election campaign in France. Accusations of bureaucracy, conservatism and senility were mixed with cries about retreat from class positions.¹

The Trotskyites were maddened by the fact that the efforts of the Communists towards co-operation with other democratic organisations and parties met with understanding and support.

Discussing this agreement, the General Secretary of the French Communist Party, Waldeck Rochet, said: "The wording adopted by the two delegations certainly does not

¹ *La Quatrième Internationale*, No. 15, February 1967.

contain all of the reforms and demands that are contained in our programme for a genuine democracy. But ... the agreement does not have a single measure that contradicts our programme and our policy."¹

The results of the parliamentary elections in March 1967 showed how right the Communist line had been. Not only did the Communist Party candidates receive a million votes more than at the last elections. There was an increased understanding that the alliance of Left-wing forces was a guarantee of the successful development of the anti-monopoly struggle.

Despite all obstacles, the Communists of France do not cease their efforts to win over Socialist workers to their side, so as to secure the success of the class struggle. As experience has shown, those who oppose mutual understanding between Communists and Socialists only assist the monopoly bourgeoisie, who show unconcealed alarm at the prospect of a unification of democratic forces.

Since the second half of the sixties, Trotskyites have more often launched open attacks against the emergent united anti-monopoly front. Their disruptive tactics are becoming more and more refined.

For a long time words like "parliamentary elections", "presidential elections", "referendum" have maddened the Trotskyites. "Parliamentary narrow-mindedness", "electioneering machinations" are the epithets hurled at the policy of the Communist parties, which make use of all forms of struggle, including those that are legal.

But now the Trotskyites have decided, in the course of developing and perfecting their undermining methods, to take an active part in election campaigns.

The new devices of the contemporary adherents to the "Fourth International" can be particularly clearly seen in the behaviour of French Trotskyites. In June 1946 they called for the boycott of the referendum on the first draft of the constitution. Incidentally, it was more progressive than the draft which was ratified as a result of the referendum in October of that year. Similarly the Trotskyites demanded abstention from the referendum of April 1969 which decided de Gaulle's retirement. This was an attempt

¹ *Cahiers du Communisme*, No. 1, 1967, pp. 11-12.

to prevent the mass of the nation from saying a decisive "no" to a regime that had compromised itself.

One might have expected the French Trotskyites to take up the same position in the presidential election in June 1969. But they decided to put forward their own candidate—Krivine, although a few weeks before the election he had zealously opposed participation in the referendum. For some time they even ceased their internal wrangling and formed a "united co-ordinating committee" in support of Krivine. It is true that some of them did not miss the opportunity of accusing him of being "unprincipled" and "inconsistent".

Why did the French Trotskyites decide to put up Krivine as their presidential candidate?

First of all, they intended to make use of the election campaign to advertise their views widely. And in this they were helped by the bourgeois media, which organised radio and television broadcasts for Krivine and provided facilities for meetings and gatherings. At the time he was doing his military service as a soldier and was given leave for the whole period of the election campaign.

Secondly, any votes he gained would be lost to the French Communist Party candidate. Here too Trotskyite interests coincided completely with those of the reactionary forces. Although they only polled 236,000 votes (just over one per cent of the electorate),¹ the Trotskyites justified the hopes of official bourgeois propaganda.

Thirdly, their candidate made use of the opportunities given him by the government to seek out new targets on which to concentrate his propaganda.

Italian and Belgian Trotskyites act in the same way. Occasionally, by putting forward their candidates in local elections, they attempt to confuse the electorate and set a definite section of it against the Communists.²

Just how cynical Trotskyites have become can be seen from their activities in Britain. At the time of the 1970 parliamentary election, they organised a noisy propaganda campaign under the slogan: "Labour—yes, Communists—no". This was a direct appeal to vote against the worker candidates of the Communist Party. The Trotskyite press

¹ *L'Humanité*, June 3, 1969.

² *Rivista Marxista Europea*, No. 5-6, 1968, pp. 10-11.

explained this as a desire to "do down" the Communists and prevent them from increasing their influence.

Trotskyites stop at nothing when sowing hatred for the supporters of the anti-imperialist unity. Playing on the explosiveness of the politically immature youth, they even provoke physical violence. In France they have ganged up with hooligans to attack activists of the Communist Student Union.¹

To counterbalance meetings and gatherings held by various trade union branches, the Trotskyites have started arranging separate demonstrations, thereby discrediting the efforts to achieve unity of the trade union organisations and safeguard the rights and liberties of the working people. Such was the case in London on June 5, 1969, when the Trotskyites managed to organise a 500-strong march.² They organised a similar demonstration on May 1, 1971. They got together a small trade union affiliated to the Socialist Workers' League, and tried to set it up against the other trade unions. They distract the working class from the task of strengthening their unity, and call for a complete change in the trade union leadership and for a "political and theoretical struggle in the trade unions".³ Propaganda of adventurist assessments and views is yet another way in which the Trotskyites attempt to undermine the united anti-imperialist front.

Defeatism in the Guise of "Leftism"

All over the world they try to don the armour of revolutionaries and to impress those they want to dope with the idea that they are a force operating from a "latter than left" position. In order to do this, they maliciously falsify the strategic and tactical aims of the communist movement on the one hand, and on the other, let fly "ultra-revolutionary" phraseology.

The Trotskyites' pet method of falsification has always consisted in picking one particular slogan out of the whole complex of strategic and tactical propositions of the Com-

¹ *L'Humanité*, February 5, 1969.

² *The Newsletter*, June 10, 1969.

³ *The Newsletter*, June 15, 1968; March 1, 1969.

munists and then raising a hysterical cry about the "one-sided reasoning", the "stifling of revolutionary initiative", and so on. As Otto Kuusinen justly remarks in his work, *Notes on Historical Experience*, if Trotskyites "honestly interpreted the views of their opponents, no one would be fool enough to believe their own slanders; but if the opinions of others are shamelessly distorted, then it is possible to blame one's own political sins on some innocent head".¹

One of these tricks is to suggest that the Communist parties advocate only the peaceful development of revolution and do not consider the necessity for armed methods of struggle. The Trotskyites do not stop at distorting even generally known programme propositions of the international communist movement and the very idea of the peaceful development of revolution.

Marxists-Leninists talk of the peaceful development of revolution as a possibility of creating a decisive superiority in strength on the side of the working class and its allies which would prevent the monopoly bourgeoisie from resorting to armed force. Marxists-Leninists are convinced that even if the development of revolution is peacefully oriented, it is essential to be ready for armed conflict, if the circumstances demand it.

At the Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties it was noted: "The Communist and Workers' Parties are conducting their activity in diverse, specific conditions, requiring an appropriate approach to the solution of concrete problems. Each Party, guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and in keeping with concrete national conditions, fully independently elaborates its own policy, determines the directions, forms and methods of struggle, and, depending on the circumstances, chooses the peaceful or non-peaceful way of transition to socialism, and also the forms and methods of building socialism in its own country."²

Utterly false are the Trotskyite claims that the Communists entertain hopes that the bourgeoisie will one day "hand over power to the people amiably and without resistance". As is well known, the bourgeoisie does not give up power

¹ O. W. Kuusinen, *Selected Works (1918-1964)*, pp. 683-84.

² *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*, p. 37.

without a struggle. In any case—whether the course of revolution is peaceful or not—certain measures of coercion will be needed to crush bourgeois resistance. If the bourgeoisie does not submit to the political demands of the masses, revolutionary tasks have to be accomplished by force of arms. In this way peaceful and violent forms of conflict may complement each other, and there can be no absolute dividing line between them.

In certain circumstances the use of armed force is inevitable in a revolution. Communists certainly do not consider that the peaceful course of revolution is the only one. They reckon with the imperialists' ability to force matters to the point of armed conflict and call upon the workers to be ready for this.

Contrary to various extreme Leftists, the Communists do not urge the masses to wait passively for "X day", or to take part in precipitate or rash action. They aim at creating a broad, social base for the revolutionary struggle and bringing together an anti-monopoly coalition independently of whatever form the revolution will take. The Communists advance a programme of action that will not "weaken" or "demobilise" the masses, as the Trotskyites claim, but, on the contrary, will awaken revolutionary energy in broad sections of the population of capitalist countries.

Twisting the facts, the Trotskyites assert that the peaceful development of revolution is an "invention" of the contemporary communist movement and that no such form of revolutionary struggle was ever envisaged before.

The mendacity of the Trotskyite assertions is clearly proved by the well-known theoretical principles worked out after February 1917, by numerous statements made by Lenin on the varied forms of transition to a proletarian dictatorship, and finally by the practical experience of a socialist revolution achieved by peaceful means in Hungary in 1919 and the peaceful transformation of people's democratic revolutions into socialist revolutions in a number of European countries. These lies were called for so as to blacken the present-day policy of the Communist parties in every possible way and to disorientate and confuse the ranks of anti-imperialist fighters.

The Trotskyites counter joint action by the working class and its allies with separatist slogans and adventurist solu-

tions. The putsch and sporadic actions unsupported by the masses are the trumps of their pseudo-revolutionary strategy.

“An incompetent crew is no substitute for one specialist” is the sort of aphorism that is used by British Trotskyites in opposing mass action. The “incompetent crew” is presumably the mass of the people, while “the specialists” are apparently a bunch of adventurists in no way connected with the people.

The Trotskyites argue that the revolutionary activity of the masses depends on the will and aims of a separate group of “hard-core” revolutionaries, capable of “organising revolution”. This isolation from actual reality, from the problems and demands of day-by-day revolutionary struggle has cast contemporary Trotskyites in the role of successors to the notorious “petty-bourgeois revolutionism”, which always called for action on the day of the “decisive attack”, but did not wish to do anything to prepare for that day and bring it nearer.

The British Trotskyites, for instance, have for long been enticing youth with promises of the speedy arrival of “X day” when all will be decided by one swift blow, one quick action. Trying to fill up their ranks with fifteen- and sixteen-year-old adolescents, they assure them that “revolution is just round the corner”, and for this event there is a Trotskyite revolutionary programme ready.¹

This emphasis on “X day” also resounded at the congress held in June 1968 of the Socialist Labour League, when the Trotskyites were warned to “prepare for sudden changes . . . in the immediate future”.² A year and a half passed, and at the rally of Trotskyite youth in January 1969 there was a new slogan—“make 1969 a year of revolutionary decision”.³ At the beginning of 1970, the Trotskyites again sounded a warning that “great struggles are ahead of us”.⁴

The Trotskyites continue to hold on to the pseudo-revolutionary formula “everything or nothing”, which has always served as a justification for carrying on a passive policy of waiting for some sort of changes that are about to

¹ *Marxism Today*, No. 3, 1965, p. 95.

² *The Newsletter*, June 11, 1968.

³ *Ibid.*, January 11, 1969.

⁴ *Workers' Press*, January 13, 1970.

dawn. In other words, they are again coming closer to Right-wing opportunist positions. Using other sorts of arguments, they also deny the necessity for revolutionary struggle, rely on future changes and preach inertia.

Thus one group of British Trotskyites even tried to stop strikes at factories and justified their strike-breaking by the argument that only general political strikes can be of any use. While another group stated: "And it is no use talking about a political strike if one is not campaigning for this strike by raising the question of power."¹

The reasoning of the French Trotskyites is on the same level. Krivine rattled off a "programme": "The power of the workers is in the streets, not in the ballot boxes."² He tried to instil the idea that all forms of class struggle were useless, except the armed struggle. And this is viewed not as a conscious action by the masses, but as a "conspiracy of revolutionaries", who stand outside and above the "crowd".

The harm that this way of reasoning can bring was shown in the actions of the Trotskyites during the May-June events of 1968. They called for an "immediate armed uprising", although the working people of France had not been prepared for this. And armed and repressive forces were only waiting for a favourable moment to "suppress the disorders". As was stated in July 1968, at the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party, to embark on this road would have meant luring the workers to the slaughter and bringing about the defeat of the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party.

In actual fact, the irresponsible blathering of the French Trotskyites about the necessity of "coming out into the streets with weapons in our hands", and the fires on the barricades lit by young people incited by them, provided the authorities with an excuse for "restoring order". Their "Left" phraseology became not only an instrument for splitting the anti-monopoly forces, but gave direct aid to the reactionary forces, who made use of the pseudo-revolutionary attitude.

Trotskyites show an astonishing helplessness when there

¹ *The Newsletter*, May 27, 1969.

² *International Socialist Review*, No. 4, 1968, p. 3.

is any discussion about the form that the present-day struggle of the working people for their rights can take. They either say straight out that until the abolition of capitalism there can be no question of any change in the conditions of the working people, or they again reiterate various pseudo-revolutionary slogans in order to mask their own lack of purpose.

The Marxist-Leninist understanding of the dialectical connection between the struggle of the working class for reforms and the struggle for the ultimate aim, with its prospect of the revolutionary transformation of society, is alien to the Trotskyites.

The policy statements of the American Trotskyites, calling themselves the Workers' League, contain demands for wage rises, shorter working hours, and the establishment of workers' control in industry. However the *Bulletin* published by the League states: "We must fight . . . for a consciousness in the working class that these demands can only be realised if the workers come to power."¹

Thus under cover of Left phrases the Trotskyites have elevated their defeatist line of behaviour to the status of a principle and disseminate among the working class disbelief in their own strength and potential.

More than that, they try to convince the workers that their struggle for general democratic demands and economic reforms deflects them from revolutionary problems and aims. The same *Bulletin* says: "There are, of course, some demands which are completely co-optable by capitalism despite its crisis. Whether fought for militantly or politely such demands do not move the working class towards the struggle for power but rather tie the workers even closer to their oppressors. . . . They propose changes in the way capitalism and its administration is structured without raising any demands which interfere with the capitalists' battle to re-establish economic equilibrium at the expense of the working class."

Stating that in the USA the conditions are not yet suitable for political warfare on such a scale as would allow the working class to impose its will on the monopolists, the Trotskyites suggest waiting for the development of events

¹ *The Newsletter*, April 5, 1969.

in Europe. "Because of the present interdependence of American and European capital," they assert, "revolutionary developments in Europe are and will continue to forcefully upset the political equilibrium in the United States."¹ In other words, according to the Trotskyite conception, the American workers can do nothing more than wait "to be made happy" and to be delivered by outside forces.

Other American Trotskyites, calling themselves the Socialist Workers' Party, take up a similar position. At their conference in October 1967 there were pessimistic assessments of the possibility of carrying on a successful economic struggle, for this could only take place if in the future there would be "a broader struggle in the form of a political offensive".²

The Ninth "Congress" of the Paris "Secretariat" in April 1969 also showed a contemptuous attitude to the essential demands of the working people. While earlier some of its documents had urged fighting for shorter working hours, increased pay and even for "free bread", the resolutions of the congress said not a word about all this.

Expatriating on "the entry of the world revolution into a new stage" and the necessity of preparing for "the coming battles", the congress limited itself to a recommendation to the French Trotskyites to work out "a programme of transition".³ Since defending vitally important interests of the working people was stated at the congress to be "reformist", the recommendation obviously played a secondary role. Its purpose was to cover up the Trotskyites' lack of interest in such questions, which they consider to be petty.

Besides this type of Trotskyism, which shows its contempt for vital workers' demands, there are the groupings who announce that they have "reliable recipes" for speedily satisfying them. Their phrase-mongering pursues the same aim of disrupting the revolutionary struggle of the working class.

Trotskyites siding with the British Section of the "International Committee of the Fourth International" announce that the seizure by the workers of factories can be the "only

¹ Ibid.

² *International Socialist Review*, No. 1, 1968, p. 26.

³ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 37, 1969, p. 17.

effective reply to the monopolies". Demagogically, and without any regard for the balance of forces, they suggest: "To start with, the banks, building societies, finance and insurance companies and the land, together with the big industrial monopolies and large enterprises of all kinds, should be nationalised without compensation, under workers' control."¹

The same sort of "immediate action" is advocated by the supporters of Posadas. The Belgian Trotskyites announce that all the problems of the struggle of the working class for its rights will be solved "if immediate workers' control is established by the seizure of all industrial enterprises".² They also demand the immediate introduction of "dual power". "The working class," according to this strategy, "must establish dual power at all enterprises. Then all sections of the exploited masses, including the petty bourgeoisie, who are subject to the influence of the proletariat, will force the university and school authorities to accept the methods of the working class, that is, dual power."³

The supporters of Pablo also have their own "master key" to solve all the problems that confront the working class. They struggle for the immediate establishment of "workers' power, based on autonomy", and they criticise all the other Trotskyite groupings for the absence of such a slogan in their programmes.⁴ They maintain that self-management is, in fact, socialism, "the model of the socialist reorganisation of society".⁵

This Trotskyite howling about their own "most effective", universally reliable methods of solving every sort of problem reflects their ideological poverty and political inadequacy. Standing aloof from the class struggle, they propose rash adventurist actions that are inevitably doomed to failure.

As can be seen, Trotskyite conclusions are contradictory and inconsistent logically. They are constructed on the following system: (1) the working class should immediately do this or that; (2) the workers do not do it; (3) this means

¹ *The Newsletter*, May 31, 1969.

² *Lutte ouvrière*, January 1, 1969.

³ *Ibid.*, January 10, 1969, pp. 17-18.

⁴ *Sous le drapeau du Socialisme*, No. 49, 1969, p. 33; No. 55, 1971, p. VIII.

⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 55, 1971, pp. 5, VI.

that they do not want the revolution and are passive and apathetic. This is the Trotskyites' standard trick for confusing the working class and for catching those who, owing to their political inexperience or gullibility, can fall into the net of propaganda spun for them.

Do the Trotskyites themselves believe in the possibility of the immediate achievement of what they propose? Surely not. Their position is that of onlookers, who have no responsibilities. They work on the assumption: "If we could sing, then we would sing quite differently."

Sometimes the Trotskyites are quite frank and openly say that they have no sort of clear-cut programme for the development of revolutionary struggle in capitalist countries. In the resolution "Development of the Revolution in Europe", passed by Posadas' supporters in 1967, it is stated that none of the West European sections of the "Fourth International" have any answer to the questions that worry the exploited masses.¹

But admissions of this sort are rare. More often instead of a programme there are slanderous attacks on communist policies and established forms of class struggle.

The sort of revelations reached by the Trotskyites can be seen from the following example. In 1965 the Spanish Trotskyites published a book in Paris under the bold title *For a Second Communist Manifesto*, which discussed the harm done by nationalisation. They stated that no matter in what country nationalisation has been carried out—be it a capitalist country or one in which the proletariat is just coming to power—it "strengthens and prolongs the general tendency of capitalist economy". A typically anarchistic attitude can also be seen in their demands for "absolute freedom" and "the refusal of all regimentation from above".

The inability soberly to analyse the processes going on in capitalist countries is also apparent in Trotskyite prophecies that only a serious economic crisis can advance the cause of the revolution. In the resolution of the congress of the Paris "Secretariat" in 1963, they talked openly of the favourable conditions for the revolution in the event of a "catastrophic fall in the living standard of the American and West European workers due to a major economic crisis".² The

¹ *European Marxist Review*, No. 1, 1968, p. 116.

² *International Socialist Review*, No. 4, 1963, p. 123.

leader of the American Trotskyites, Cannon, spoke in the same spirit: "A new economic crisis will set the stage for a revival of the movement."¹

Contemporary Trotskyites continue to stick to their position "the worse, the better" and see a sudden deterioration of the material conditions of the working class as a source of its revolutionary spirit.

The paper *Workers' Press* (this is what the Trotskyite *Newsletter* was renamed as from September 27, 1969) wrote: "As the crisis deepens, it also becomes clearer that the employers are unable, because of international competition conditions, to make the concessions which were possible in the past. Even wage gains can have only a temporary significance in a period of inflation. . . . An understanding of these dominating economic trends in world capitalism is very essential."²

The experience of history shows that shattering economic crises (there have been fourteen of them in 140 years of capitalist economy³) inflict the heaviest blows on the working class and, undoubtedly, revolutionise the working people.

This by no means signifies that crises are the only stimulus to revolution, as Trotsky and his latter-day followers assert. Crises have failed to produce revolutions in more than one case. This was also proved true at the end of the twenties, when the whole of the capitalist world was shaken by an exceedingly severe and prolonged economic crisis.

In contrast to the Trotskyites, the Communists do not expect the working class to turn to revolution because of suffering and deprivation and do not wait for crises to stimulate the class struggle. They consider that even in periods of comparative capitalist stability, even when there is a high level of economic prosperity, it is essential continually to develop the revolutionary movement for general democratic demands, the promotion of far-reaching social reforms, and socialism.

The Trotskyites' complaints of the lack of opportunities for the development of class struggle in conditions when

¹ J. P. Cannon, *The First Ten Years of American Communism*, New York, 1962, p. 34.

² *Workers' Press*, October 3, 1969.

³ See *The International Revolutionary Movement of the Working Class*, edited by B. N. Ponomaryov, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1966, p. 68.

there are no economic crises clearly show their defeatism, their actual policy of putting off the revolutionary movement till the distant future.

For the same reason they arm themselves with Trotsky's slogan about the "United States of Europe". Never mind the fact that for years they have been trying unsuccessfully to discover the actual meaning of the slogan. Speaking at the so-called reunification congress in 1963, one of the Trotskyite leaders, Germain, announced: "We must give a more concrete significance to the slogan, the workers' United States of Europe."¹ Trotskyite documents of the following period do not make matters any clearer, but this does not prevent Trotskyites of all kinds from talking about the necessity for preparing for the creation of the "United States of Europe".

It is significant that the Trotskyites began to peddle the slogan the "United States of Europe" just when the Right-wing social-reformists began to talk of it. The latter call for a united Europe in the form of some sort of third force which could oppose both the USA and the socialist countries. In November 1962 at a meeting of the leaders of the six parties represented in the European Common Market, the Social-Democrats announced that "the unification of Europe" would do away with "age-long rivalry", and therefore they would be marching in "the vanguard of the struggle for European unity". Excelling itself in demagogy, the Right-wing Social-Democratic press even promised a "socialist future" in the event of the creation of a "United States of Europe".

The putting forward of this slogan is a proof of more than the hopeless bigotry of the Trotskyites. Again the cosmopolitan character of the whole Trotskyite scheme becomes fully apparent. Calls not to confine the working-class movement within a national framework, but to make ready "for the European general strike so as to prepare the way for the overthrow of capitalism and the construction of the United States of Soviet Socialist Europe",² hinder the development of the revolutionary struggle in any specific country. They orient the working masses on wait-

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 20, 1963, p. 53.

² *Red Flag*, June 25, 1968.

ing passively for the right moment for the establishment of a European revolution. The slogan of the "United States of Europe" is one of the features of the policy of "revolutionary idleness".

The British Section of the "International Committee of the Fourth International" preaches that without the creation of the "United States of Europe" no success is to be hoped for in national revolutions. "The proletariats in the various European countries," it stated in the beginning of 1969, "are linked not only by tradition and historical ties, but also by the fact that no European proletariat can take the power without raising the problem of a United Socialist States of Europe. The reorganisation of the economy on socialist foundations is inconceivable in any European country unless it is extended to the whole of Europe."¹

Often the Trotskyites use the "Socialist United States" slogan as a mask. Hiding behind it, they make themselves out to be revolutionaries, slander every sort of revolutionary programme advanced by the working class of any one country and accuse it of national "exclusiveness" and "limitation". Hence, apparently, their insistence on the "United States of Europe" slogan.

Such is the essence of the Trotskyites' "theories", and the value of their clamorous declarations that the working class in capitalist countries does not follow "the right course". All their ideas are aimed at disrupting the revolutionary struggle in capitalist countries, breaking up the anti-monopoly front and disseminating defeatist views and opinions in the ranks of the working class.

Adventurism, which always characterised Trotskyite activities, reaches still greater proportions when the Trotskyites turn their disruptive efforts on peoples who have risen up in the struggle for national liberation.

3. HOW THE TROTSKYITE "LEFT-WING" LINE HARMS THE NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE

The collapse of the system of colonial oppression under the impact of the national liberation movement comes second

¹ *Fourth International*, No. 3, Winter 1968/69, p. 107.

in historical significance only to the formation of the world system of socialism.

The colonial empires, created by capitalism over the course of centuries, have crumbled in less than two decades. Hundreds of millions of people have thrown off the chains of slavery, and young sovereign states have emerged.

The international communist and working-class movement sees in the national liberation revolutions a characteristic trait of our epoch—the epoch of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism. The Communists, who are striving to create conditions for the successful solution of problems concerning the socialist re-building of society on a world scale, regard the peoples fighting for national independence as the allies of the international working-class movement in the common anti-imperialist struggle. They look upon the national liberation movement as one of the most important revolutionary forces of our time. The Marxist-Leninist parties therefore work tirelessly to strengthen their ties with the other revolutionary streams in conditions of the formative influence of world socialism on the process of uniting the forces of revolution and social progress.

At the Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties (June 1969) it was stated: "*It is of paramount importance for the prospects of the anti-imperialist struggle to strengthen the alliance between the socialist system, the forces of the working-class movement and national liberation.*"¹

Generalising the experience of the national liberation movement, the Communist and Workers' parties put forward a clear and precise programme for the struggle of peoples for complete national and social liberation. They draw attention to the qualitatively new features in this movement.

In the epoch of the undivided sway of imperialism, national liberation revolutions could open the way only for the development of capitalism, but nowadays real conditions have arisen which are favourable for the breaking up of the system imposed by imperialism. The revolutions themselves clearly take on a specific anti-imperialist character. Prerequisites have arisen for by-passing the capitalist stage in the transition to socialism. This alternative to capitalist

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*, p. 30.

development has become a political reality thanks to the possibilities for strengthening the links between the working class of the socialist camp and the peasantry of the developing countries.

In spite of some defeats and retreats, the national liberation movement continues to widen the front of the anti-imperialist struggle. Its role in the world revolutionary process continuously grows. The counter-attacks of imperialist reaction in various parts of the world have not broken the will of those who fight for national and social liberation. When and where progressive forces could unite and repulse aggression, imperialism suffered defeat. The Communists at the International Meeting in 1969 stressed: "The way to carry out the tasks of national development and social progress and effectively rebuff neo-colonialist intrigues is to raise the activity of the people, enhance the role of the proletariat and the peasants, rally working youth, students, intellectuals, urban middle strata and democratic army circles—all patriotic and progressive forces. It is this kind of unity the Communist and Workers' parties are calling for."¹

The Communist parties of the countries of the Third World show themselves by their actions to be the most consistent champions for national and social progress, and for the basic interests of all who work and are exploited. It is no accident that imperialist reaction directs its attacks first of all against them. Brutal methods of persecution and terror are combined with other means, such as the propagation of anti-communist views among the masses, and distortion of the tasks and aims of the Communist parties.

And again the Trotskyites make common cause with the imperialist propagandists, slandering the Communists, their strategy and tactics, and countering the Communist parties' line with adventurist recipes and actions.

The Policy of Isolating the National Liberation Movement

For the past ten years or so the majority of Trotskyite groups have been saying that only colonial revolutions can

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*, p. 29.

inflict serious blows on imperialism. The rest of the revolutionary movement, they allege, is in a condition of crisis.

This theory was put forward for the first time at the Fifth "Congress" of the "Fourth International" in 1957. In a resolution on "Colonial Revolution after the Second World War", the "congress" announced: "... since the end of the Second World War and up till the present day it (the national liberation movement.—*Ed.*) forms the most important element of world revolution."¹ By the time of the next, Sixth, "Congress", in 1961, the national liberation movement was considered the key to the world situation. And at the so-called reunification congress in 1963 a resolution was passed simply stating: "Colonial revolutions at the present stage are the principal part of the world revolutionary process", and, therefore, "the main centre of the revolutionary movement has shifted for a certain period to the colonial countries".² The supporters of Pablo, at their conference in November 1969, also spoke of "the permanent central place occupied by the colonial revolution in the global process of world revolution".³

The Latin American grouping led by Posadas took up an analogous position.

This means that the Trotskyites have reversed the course laid down by Trotsky himself, who considered that under the conditions of imperialism any serious national liberation movement was impossible. His followers at the time treated the struggle of the colonial peoples for liberation with contempt. They announced that it was unworthy of the attention of "real revolutionaries", and even reactionary. When fascist Italy marched into Abyssinia, the Trotskyites announced that Socialists could have nothing to do with it and "in any case Abyssinia itself was a feudal state and therefore could not be supported".⁴ As Frank, an "expert on Trotskyism", admits, the question of national independence does not constitute any essential part of the theory of permanent revolution.

It should be noted that after the "congress" of 1963 an argument started between the Trotskyite groups as to wheth-

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, December 1957, special number, p. 41.

² *Ibid.*, No. 19, 1963, pp. 23, 48.

³ *Sous le drapeau du Socialisme*, Supplement to No. 51, 1970, p. 1.

⁴ *Marxism Today*, No. 9, 1964, p. 276.

er too much value was being placed on the significance of the national liberation movement in the "Fourth International". British and French Trotskyites accused the other Trotskyite groupings of "overstating the role of colonial revolutions".¹ They were criticised, in their turn, for "turning their backs on the colonial revolution", and "minimising its role in different ways and by various pretexts".²

There were also some who maintained that Trotsky's prewar line should be taken as the basis for policy-making under present-day conditions. "And let it be said that all national struggle is reactionary," declared the Spanish Trotskyites.

However the Paris "Secretariat" emphasised once again in a special resolution in 1966, that colonial revolution "has appeared as the most important event in socialist revolution in the course of the last twenty years".³ And it was only in 1969 that the Paris "Secretariat" made certain alterations in its position, and admitted verbally the significance of the class struggle in capitalist countries. There then followed the stipulation that while all previous assessments given at the congresses should remain in force, the present-day Trotskyite reliance on students as the "revolutionary vanguard" of the class struggle in capitalist countries "does not mean any underestimation of the role of the peasantry, and in particular of the poor sections of the peasantry, and also of the petty bourgeois radical strata".⁴

Why should Trotskyites, who had always ignored the national liberation struggle and considered it unworthy of their attention as being a political wilderness, begin to think of it as "the most important event in world socialist revolution"?

In this instance, too, one can see peculiarly Trotskyite elements of political speculation and unprincipled compromise for the sake of the attainment of narrow, selfish aims. To strengthen their own position the Trotskyites have decided to make use of the involvement in the revolutionary process of new social strata, who sometimes vacillate and often find themselves influenced by petty-bourgeois preju-

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 26, 1965, p. 50.

² *Sous le drapeau du Socialisme*, No. 41, 1967, p. 9.

³ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 29, 1966, p. 81.

⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 37, 1969, p. 60.

dice. The Trotskyites are out to profit by the theoretical and organisational weaknesses of these strata.

As far back as 1960 Germain announced that in the regions of the national liberation movement Trotskyites had "the very best chances".¹ It was in these regions that they were most likely to find people who would back their policy.

The Trotskyites openly admitted that this was "the last bet" of the "Fourth International". One of the leaders of the Paris "Secretariat", Hector Lucero, emphasised the need to infiltrate into countries that were rising up to struggle for independence. He said: "If in practice, organisationally and in action ... the International cannot carry out its tasks ... then it will have played out its theoretical role, and will simply become a keeper of texts." The "Secretariat" considered the question as to whether contemporary Trotskyism should "re-group its forces", and send its representatives to the regions of the national liberation movement. Some suggested that they should adopt a system by which the "international moved about from place to place".²

Calls for a "reorganisation of the Fourth International" were also heard at the Sixth "Congress" held in 1961. One of its resolutions stated: "For historical reasons the Fourth International grew up mainly in developed capitalist countries, which were regarded before the outbreak of the last war as the Number One centre of the world revolution. Now we have to reorganise the activity of the Fourth International to conform with the basic sector of the world revolution, which is now the colonial revolution, and we must transfer our main efforts for a whole period to this region."³

In line with these directions the Trotskyites hastened to amend their traditional refutations of the political role of the peasantry. Although they remained as contemptuous as ever of the peasantry of capitalist countries, they began to acclaim the peasantry of regions of the national liberation movement as the leading revolutionary force of the present age. Posadas' grouping affirms that the whole mass of peasantry ... suffering from malnutrition and living in bad

¹ *Bulletin intérieur du Secrétariat international de la IV^e Internationale*, December 1960, p. 5.

² *Ibid.*, p. 15.

³ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 12, 1961, p. 70.

conditions possess a revolutionary consciousness as never before. . . . Seventy per cent of the peasants of the world, it maintains, possess a socialist consciousness. From this the conclusion is drawn that the peasantry is a force capable not only of solving the problems that confront the countries of the Third World, but also of promoting socialism in the rest of the world.

The Trotskyites who rallied behind the Paris "Secretariat of the Fourth International" expressed themselves in much the same way at the congress held in 1969. After lengthy statements on the "demoralisation" of the working class of capitalist countries they said that the colonial revolutions were the fundamental factor stimulating the revolutionary struggle of the whole world.¹

The leaders of the "Fourth International" stop at nothing in their efforts to adapt Trotsky's "teaching", and make it fit modern conditions. They are sufficiently unprincipled to defend today what they attacked yesterday, and to denounce their own former views and ideas.

In 1963, in support of the notion of the exceedingly important role of the national liberation movement in the world revolutionary process, the Trotskyites put forward the so-called theory of revolution in backward countries, borrowed in fact from bourgeois anti-communist literature.

What is the essence of this "theory"? The Trotskyites make an absolute condition of the fact that in a number of countries where revolutions took place the economy was comparatively backward. This brings them to the conclusion that since the Second World War there has been a persistent tendency for revolutions to take place "in one backward country after another". For the sake of their "theory" the Trotskyites are prepared to count as backward such countries as Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic.

As was mentioned earlier, in 1930 Trotsky wrote in his book *The Permanent Revolution* that the insufficiently prepared proletariat of backward countries "is deprived of the possibility of carrying the democratic revolution to the finish". Now his successors prefer to forget this remark. They are convinced that the revolution will take place first of all in the poorly developed countries of Asia and Africa,

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 37, 1969, p. 14.

then in the "middle range" of capitalist countries, and finally in the "advanced" capitalist countries.

The "theory of revolution in backward countries" once again displays the oversimplified, subjective interpretation of facts and an attempt to fit them into prearranged formula, which is characteristic of Trotskyism.

History does not forecast what the sequence of revolutions in countries that are economically underdeveloped or more developed will be. For example, after the Second World War revolutions were successful first of all in the countries of Eastern Europe. If we were to follow the primitive logic of the Trotskyites, then the revolutions should have taken place first of all in the African countries, which were at a considerably lower level of economic development.

It stands to reason that among those countries where revolutions have taken place, there are some that were backward in their economic development. But does this circumstance serve as a basis for such forecasting of the future as the Trotskyites do?

The experience of revolutionary struggle shows such a variety of ways to the successful achievement of revolution that it is impossible to decide where and in what sequence new revolutions will take place. In any case, it can definitely be said that, as in the past, the decisive factor will not be the level of economic development alone. The decisive factor remains the presence of objective and subjective conditions necessary for a socialist revolution. These conditions can appear in countries with different levels of development.

The "Fourth International", in its efforts to prop up the "theory of revolution in backward countries", affirms that in these countries there are more favourable conditions for revolutionary struggle because of the weakness of the class enemy. The resolution of the "Fourth International's Congress" of 1963, on "the Contemporary Dialectic of World Revolution" said: "The weakness of the enemy in backward countries opens possibilities of seizing power with easier means."¹ This thesis was repeated at the conference held in November 1969 by Pablo's followers: "The struggle for power in the countries where there are colonial revolutions is always easier than in the developed capitalist countries."²

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 19, 1963, p. 13.

² *Sous le drapeau du Socialisme*, Supplement to No. 51, 1970, p. 1.

But can it be believed that those who fight for the social liberation of the peoples of Asia and Africa have a weaker foe than the workers in capitalist countries? They have the same common enemy—imperialism, monopoly capital. This enemy is prepared to take any sort of measures, political, economic or military, to hold these countries in the framework of the world imperialist system, and to prevent them from developing along non-capitalist lines. Surely it would be nearer the mark to speak of a certain weakness of the anti-imperialist forces in a number of countries where there is neither an organised working class, nor that experience of revolutionary struggle which the international working-class movement has acquired.

The Trotskyites have definitely got tangled up in their generalisations about the national liberation movement and their prophecies concerning the paths of world revolution. It is no accident that, having announced this movement as the main revolutionary force inflicting blows on imperialism, they then made this curious admission: "Paradoxical as this may seem, it has proved itself incapable even of undermining the relative economic stability of the imperialist powers."¹

In fact, there is no paradox. The national liberation movement is undermining the imperialist system. But the outcome of the struggle depends on the joint efforts of the world socialist system and the working-class and national liberation movements.

In trying to isolate the national liberation movement from other revolutionary trends, the Trotskyites peddle the notion that the world socialist system and the working class of capitalist countries are not helping the peoples who are fighting for their independence.

The Trotskyites attempt to discredit the economic aid rendered by the socialist countries, particularly that of the Soviet Union. But this economic aid, as is well known, has reached considerable proportions. It consists not only of credits amounting to 6,000 million convertible rubles, but also of 2,500 projects that have been built or are being built, and of instruction given in the countries that are

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 19, 1963, p. 14.

members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance to thousands of students from nearly a hundred developing countries.¹

The Trotskyites, when faced with these facts, slanderously assert that the aid rendered by socialist countries does not help to strengthen the economic independence of the developing countries. They even claim that this assistance is harmful, because "the government set-up and the nationalised sector remain as the feeding ground for the strengthening of private capital and privately owned enterprises".

This conception fully echoes the views of Trotsky, who considered that even countries in which revolutions occur, have no prospect of becoming economically independent of the capitalist world. The experience of building a people's economy in the Soviet Union and in other socialist countries completely refuted these defeatist assessments.

But the Trotskyites do not wish to reckon with facts. They believe the economic dependence of these countries to be a permanently active factor, which can only be overcome by the liquidation of the capitalist system and the victory of socialism in the whole world.

In the meantime the world socialist system not only helps the poorly developed countries to win political independence, but helps to create conditions which enable them to wrench themselves out of the web of economic dependence on imperialism.

The restriction and ousting of foreign monopolies, the nationalisation of industry, the consolidation of the state sector which is objectively spearheaded against foreign capital and private capitalist anarchy, the introduction of democratic reforms,—all this would be exceedingly difficult without the support on the part of socialist countries. They help countries that have chosen a non-capitalist way of development to carry through the anti-imperialist revolution and solve the problems of their own development independently.

Imperialist attempts to keep the developing countries within the limits of the capitalist system are thus opposed by the combined effort of the progressive forces of the

¹ *World Marxist Review*, No. 11, 1969, pp. 47-49.

countries themselves and the peoples of the socialist countries. Co-operation is one of the main factors making it easier for the peoples who have won political independence to achieve economic independence as well.

Besides discrediting the economic help given by socialist countries, the Trotskyites make use of yet another manoeuvre. For many years they have been alleging that the Soviet Union is not taking measures to develop the national liberation movement "at a more rapid pace" or to "spur socialist revolution in the colonial and semi-colonial countries". Posadas' grouping blames the socialist countries for not "pushing on with revolutionary policies, exporting the revolution".¹

The followers of Posadas now speak plainly about "exporting revolution". Prewar Trotskyites used to dodge the issue with general statements on "the defence of the revolution", and pretended to be insulted and misunderstand when their position on the "exporting" of revolution was challenged. Present-day adherents of Trotsky act in a more straightforward and open manner.

In distributing "recipes" in the spirit of the notorious theory of spurring revolutions, they try to sow mistrust in the policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries among participants in the national liberation movement. The "Fourth International" took this line from Trotsky, who wrote in the *Bulletin of the Opposition* in 1938: "The policy of the Soviet Union is the chief obstacle on the road to the liberation of backward and oppressed peoples."

The Trotskyites count on those insignificant strata of the petty bourgeoisie who are attracted by the idea of "bringing happiness from outside", and speeding up the social process by force. At the same time, with the help of pseudo-Left slogans, they try to make themselves out as "revolutionaries", and create the impression of some sort of validity to their harsh attacks against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

No less violently do the Trotskyites accuse the working-class movement in capitalist countries of unwillingness to help in the struggle for national liberation. The workers

¹ *European Marxist Review*, No. 1, 1968, p. 123.

are accused of being "cowards" and even "traitors in their attitude to colonial revolutions".

In reality the Communists have done a great deal of work in getting the peoples of the former metropolitan countries to support the national liberation movement actively. About the difficulties of this sort of problem Lenin wrote: "However, as a result of the extensive colonial policy, the European proletariat *partly* finds himself in a position when it is *not* his labour, but the labour of the practically enslaved natives in the colonies, that maintains the whole of society. . . . In certain countries this provides the material and economic basis for infecting the proletariat with colonial chauvinism."¹ Imperialist propanganda has always tried to enflame tendencies towards colonial chauvinism by predicting a severe worsening of the national economic situation in the event of the loss of the colonies.

In capitalist countries the Communists have been and are in the lead of the mass movement for the granting of independence to the colonial peoples. On February 1, 1960, and April 27, 1961, the French Communist Party organised demonstrations and strikes in support of the struggling people of Algeria. About ten million people took part in actions that spread throughout the whole country and had a considerable effect in prompting de Gaulle's government to re-consider its position with regard to the Algerian question.²

International working-class solidarity with the Vietnamese people in their struggle against American aggression, and with the Arab nations in resisting the attacks of the Israeli militarists, is not to be denied.

Trotskyite intrigues and their attempts to sow mistrust of the socialist countries and the working-class movement in the capitalist countries are actually aimed at leaving the peoples alone and face to face with imperialism in their fight against colonial and neo-colonial dependence. Trotskyite talk of how the anti-imperialist struggle should be waged is also aimed at weakening the national liberation movement.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 77.

² *XVII^e Congrès du Parti Communiste Français*, Paris, 1964, p. 95.

Adventurist Recipes in the National Liberation Movement

In the sixties there was not a single "congress" at which various Trotskyite groupings did not try to dwell on the character and forms of the struggle for national and social liberation. Their propaganda in the countries of the Third World constantly plugs the idea that they have a plan of action answering to the demands of revolutionary struggle.

In actual fact, in this field as in others, the Trotskyites have nothing to offer but a few pseudo-revolutionary slogans. Since they have so little influence among the peoples of the Third World, the Trotskyites try to attract attention to themselves by means of various pseudo-revolutionary "recommendations". Sometimes, however, with the help of those they have duped with their pseudo-Left phrases they try to take practical action and this brings them into conflict with the interests and demands of the national liberation movement to the serious detriment of the latter.

The gulf between their words and actions is widening. This means that there are built-in contradictions in the ambivalent Trotskyite position.

Their method of approach to the problems of the struggle of the peoples of the Third World for national and social liberation is basically faulty. They do not stop to think what processes are going on in the Asian, African and Latin American countries, and what possibilities there are for anti-imperialist struggle there.

The characteristic features of their approach are adherence to a cut-and-dried scheme and reluctance to consider the internal political problems of individual peoples and countries. Indeed, they actually boast of their disregard of national peculiarities.

At the "congress" held by Posadas' grouping in 1967, they emphasised: "We are not interested in the particular analysis of each country . . . it is not this that determines history."¹ The Latin American Trotskyites, who take their orientation from the "Paris Secretariat of the Fourth International", make the same kind of pronouncements. They speak without any proof of ". . . conditions, which are similar in all the

¹ *European Marxist Review*, No. 1, 1968, p. 96.

countries of Latin America and in the majority of colonial countries".¹

However in the countries that are struggling for national and social liberation conditions are far from identical. They have different levels of socio-economic development. Some have taken the path of non-capitalist development, others keep their capitalistic orientation even after they have gained political independence or else a struggle is going on there about forms of future development. Yet others are still fighting to destroy colonial domination. Therefore, the problems of revolutionary struggle in each of these groups of countries differ.

As in other cases the routine political position of the Trotskyites only helps imperialist reaction, which wants to make sure that the revolutionary and progressive forces in the separate countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America have no clear prospects of revolutionary struggle.

The policy statements of the Trotskyites on problems of the national liberation movement deliberately aim at depriving the movement of any clear-cut aims. As usual, they cover up their manoeuvres with pseudo-Left phraseology.

The Trotskyites renounce the concept of an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution, and call for "immediate war for socialism everywhere".

In 1961 the Trotskyites stated: "To advocate a series of steps like a stairway means beyond dispute to turn away from the revolution."² They continually affirm that "the scheme of a revolution in stages exists only in the reformist and opportunist mentality",³ and they clamour for an immediate accomplishment of socialist revolutions, and the creation of worker-peasant governments.

Here Trotskyism remains true to itself; again it aims at undermining the unification of patriotic, democratic forces. And without such unity it is impossible either to liquidate the imperialist yoke or to destroy feudal practices. Theoretically the Trotskyites are just as muddled as ever about the question of the relationship between democratic and socialist tasks, and of the motivating forces of revolution.

¹ *International Socialist Review*, No. 2, 1968, p. 10.

² *Ibid.*, No. 3, 1961, p. 86.

³ *Ibid.*, No. 2, 1968, p. 8.

The anti-imperialist national liberation movement has great and difficult problems to solve. Imperialism will only yield ground when faced with a wide front of patriotic, democratic forces. The calls of the international communist and working-class movement for united struggle against imperialism and feudalism, therefore, meet with understanding among peoples who have spent any length of time under a colonial regime. The appeal for unity is in line with their own expectations and strivings.

Trotskyites talk a great deal about the need for the national liberation movement to inflict blows upon imperialism, but at the same time they do all they can to blunt its anti-imperialist tendency.

In their opinion the chief enemy is the national bourgeoisie. "The only possible way to defeat imperialism is to remove the power of the national bourgeoisie."¹ This idea of priority for the struggle against the national bourgeoisie is always reiterated at Trotskyite congresses.²

Concrete analysis of the internal political situation in the given country is again shelved by the Trotskyites in favour of general observations. Of course, one or another section of the national bourgeoisie may be more or less inclined to fall in with imperialist plans. As social differences become more marked in countries that have won independence the conflict deepens between the working class, the peasantry and other democratic forces on the one hand, and those elements of the national bourgeoisie who are more and more acting in collusion with imperialism on the other. The conflict takes on particularly bitter forms in cases where the national bourgeoisie resists such socio-economic measures as agrarian reform and the strengthening of the state sector of industry.

All the same, a definite section of the national bourgeoisie supports the struggle against imperialism, and stands for economic reform. When working out their tactics in respect of the national bourgeoisie, the Communist parties take into account the position the bourgeoisie takes up in any particular country, at any particular stage of its historical development. In Chile and in several other Latin American countries, the Communist parties analysed the situation and

¹ *International Socialist Review*, No. 4, 1961, p. 111.

² *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 37, 1969, pp. 49-52; *European Marxist Review*, No. 1, 1968, pp. 119-31.

have come to the conclusion that some sections of the national bourgeoisie may be considered as part of the anti-imperialist movement.¹ Communists of some other countries, noting the tendencies among the national bourgeoisie to come to an agreement with imperialism, have decided that it cannot in the given circumstances join the motive forces of the revolution. They accordingly aim at neutralising it.

The facts show that the Trotskyites are guilty of slander when they declare that Communists reconcile themselves with the national bourgeoisie's collaborationist leanings towards imperialism.

It is well known how hard imperialist reaction is trying to sow mistrust of the strategic and tactical slogans of the Communist parties, and to enflame anti-communist hysteria. The Trotskyites pursue the same goal, although they follow their own path, under cover of ultra-revolutionary phrases.

As in the questions relating to the anti-imperialist struggle in developed capitalist countries, the Trotskyites also maliciously attack the Communists for urging the countries of the Third World to set up a wide patriotic and anti-imperialist front, embracing the working class, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the rural bourgeoisie. Once again all efforts to rally progressive, democratic forces are considered to be "sins".

What do the Trotskyites offer instead? All the Trotskyite groupings hold the characteristic belief that, irrespective of the political situation in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, "the norm of activity of revolutionaries" everywhere should be armed conflict. In this connection they do not draw any distinction between countries that have taken the road of non-capitalist development and countries that are still struggling for liberation.

Blatantly ignoring the significance of the achievements of the national liberation movement, the Trotskyites announce that in those countries where independence has been attained "neo-colonial forces have won", or "traitors have come to power". In this way they not only cast a shadow on the

¹ See the article by the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Chile, L. Corvalan, published in *World Marxist Review*, No. 7, 1967, pp. 24-28.

successes already achieved by the national liberation movement, but they also play into the hands of the imperialist forces which are trying to provoke dissension and internal strife in those countries who have embarked on the road of non-capitalist development.

Proceeding from the position that armed conflict should be developed everywhere, the Trotskyites have produced their so-called "theory of epicentres". According to this theory, only those countries where the guns have already begun to speak or the situation is leading that way may be regarded as key points in the national liberation movement. The "Fourth International" even referred to the hostilities between China and India as an "epicentre".

The "theory of epicentres" was used to assess the current state of the national liberation movement at the Ninth "Congress" held in 1969 by the Paris "Secretariat". In the resolution "A New Rise of World Revolution", the highly involved process of the people's struggle for national and social liberation was reduced to the simple listing of the "breeding grounds of armed conflict" and to some mutterings that as such "breeding grounds" dwindle so do colonial revolutions tend to collapse.¹

Trotskyites take their arguments in favour of armed conflict everywhere to the point of absurdity. Their logic suggests that the main thing in the national liberation movement is civil war and insurrection, and not the solution, by one means or another, of the problems of national and social emancipation.

The Trotskyites take a very one-sided view of armed conflict itself. Their universal remedy is guerrilla warfare, which they recommend should be started everywhere, no matter what the actual political conditions are.

This position is characteristic of all Trotskyite groupings. The Latin American Trotskyites affirm that the above-mentioned method of struggle "is suitable for all undeveloped countries". Pablo's supporters state just as decisively: "The only possible road for national and social liberation is the road of guerrilla warfare."² The "congress" of the Paris "Secretariat" in 1969 called for "the use of all pos-

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 37, 1969, pp. 27-32.

² *Sous le drapeau du Socialisme*, No. 40, 1967, p. 8.

sible opportunities to enlarge the breeding grounds of the guerrilla movement".¹

Naturally the question arises why the Trotskyites are now so unanimous in urging guerrilla warfare, whereas they used to ignore this form of revolutionary struggle altogether. The explanation lies in political speculation and open adaptation. Seeing that in some countries guerrilla warfare has begun to spread, and not hiding their hopes to acquire new supporters there, the Trotskyites hasten to announce: "We are for guerrilla warfare." Wishing to appear "more revolutionary than all revolutionaries", they publicise views that inflict serious harm on the guerrilla movement.

In particular the Trotskyites have begun to oppose guerrilla warfare to other forms of revolutionary struggle. Initially they proclaimed that only military methods should be used in the struggle for national and social independence in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and even got to the point of limiting armed struggle to guerrilla attacks, quite divorced from any other forms of struggle.

Their tactics have nothing to do with the real problems and demands of the national liberation movement. They only give rise to adventurism, and thus alienate from the anti-imperialist struggle those sections of the population who are not prepared to take part in armed insurrection.

Lenin stated repeatedly that it is impossible to give a recipe or a general rule that will be applicable to all situations. This assessment of Lenin's wholly applies to the present stage in the development of the national liberation movement and Communist parties are guided by it when working out their strategy and tactics.

The Communists of Asia, Africa and Latin America, like those of developed capitalist countries, strive to make use of all forms and methods of revolutionary struggle. They work together with patriotic forces on anti-imperialist fronts, in both armed and unarmed struggle against imperialism.

In countries where conditions exist for peaceful anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution, the Communists strive to make the maximum use of these opportunities. "The thesis of the peaceful way," states the Programme of the Communist Party of Chile, "is not a tactical formula. It is

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 37, 1969, p. 63.

a policy demand of the communist movement. The proletariat and its party never take to coercion for the sake of coercion. *We are for the way that will involve the least sacrifices, which will if possible avoid bloodshed and the destruction of material and cultural values. This completely corresponds to the interests of the movement forward to socialism and to the deeply humanitarian character of the theory of Marxism-Leninism.*"¹

In some of the countries of Latin America the popular anti-imperialist movement is using armed methods of struggle.

In deciding whether to use peaceful or non-peaceful forms of revolution, Communists see that there are no hard-and-fast boundary lines between them. The two forms may supplement each other or be used as substitutes depending on the situation that arises and the strength of the opposing class enemies.

Among the armed methods, the Communists realise the importance of guerrilla warfare as one of the forms of the revolutionary action by the masses.

In a specially written article, entitled "Guerrilla Warfare", Lenin said that guerrilla war may be inevitable in certain conditions, and at the same time he emphasised that "this method must be subordinated to other methods, that it must be commensurate with the chief methods of warfare, and must be ennobled by the enlightening and organising influence of socialism". He also pointed out: "... the party of the proletariat can never regard guerrilla warfare as the only, or even as the chief, method of struggle."²

The world revolutionary movement has plenty of experience of guerrilla warfare, and knows its positive and negative sides. Significantly the Communists of Latin America have recently been devoting a great deal of attention to studying the experience of the past, and trying to apply its lessons to present-day conditions.

The attitude of the Latin American Communists to guerrilla warfare is fundamentally different from the adventurist views of the Trotskyites, who strive to isolate the guerrilla movement from the masses. These Trotskyite ideas are

¹ *Programa del Partido Comunista de Chile*, Santiago, 1962, p. 42.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 221.

all the more dangerous because they raise into principle such nightmare notions as that armed insurrections, event if poorly prepared and continually suffering defeat, must follow one after the other. When the "action stage" has been reached, it is not important what the result will be. The main thing, in their opinion, is the "permanent mobilisation of the unions in order to attain the revolutionary objectives",¹ "opening new fronts", and continually maintaining "mobile columns".

How harmful and dangerous the Trotskyite tactics are was shown by the events of 1963 in Peru. They managed to improvise a rising of unco-ordinated peasant detachments in the Cuzco department under the banner "Land or Death". Headed by the Trotskyite Hugo Blanco, the detachments were soon broken up by the regular army, and 200 peasants, accused of taking part in guerrilla action or of giving help to guerrillas, were thrown into prison.

The Trotskyites themselves, analysing the results of this "operation", openly spoke of the "isolated actions led by Blanco, who could rely only on a small group already crushed by cruel repressive measures".²

In 1965-66 the Blanco supporters again managed, with the help of ultra-Left slogans, to attract a small group of peasants, who called themselves a guerrilla detachment. The government saw in this a convenient excuse for wholesale reprisals against the Left-wing forces.

In a letter published in the newspaper *l'Humanité*, the Peruvian Communist Carlos Zamora, wrote: "This was a pretext, for it was clear to everybody that a few dozen guerrillas, completely isolated from the people, did not present any serious threat to the government. However the latter made use of the occasion to inflict a heavy blow on all the Left opposition. Hundreds of activists, trade union members unconnected with the guerrillas, were arrested."³

Substantial harm was done by the irresponsible actions of the Ecuador Trotskyites. In the summer of 1963 they called for an immediate armed insurrection against the government, although essential conditions for this did not exist in

¹ *International Socialist Review*, No. 2, 1965, p. 43.

² *Ibid.*, No. 5, 1967, p. 10.

³ *l'Humanité*, January 2, 1968.

the country. Their proclamations were used by the military junta for bringing about a coup d'état in July 1963. As a result the people of Ecuador found themselves under the heel of a harsh military dictatorship. The Communist Party was driven underground, and many of its leaders were arrested. The activities of trade unions, democratic, youth and other public organisations were forbidden.

The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ecuador, Pedro Saad, discussing the experience of political warfare, noted the dangerous results of extremist aims on guerrilla activities divorced from the masses. "We are convinced," he wrote, "of the necessity for armed conflict in Ecuador for the sake of liberation. However action limited only to attacks by guerrillas that are of necessity a mixed bunch can only bring about two possible results: either the defeat of the guerrillas themselves because of their isolation from the masses, or, in the case of improbable victory, to the handing over of power to the bourgeoisie."¹

Clamouring for guerrilla warfare, the Trotskyites try to suggest wherever they can that only those who support their adventurist views can be revolutionaries. They call on the guerrilla detachments to accept all newcomers without any sort of check up and at the same time they brand as enemies of the revolution all those who refuse to take part in the adventures they embark on.

They persistently strive to instil into the guerrilla movement an atmosphere of anarchy. The time for propaganda is over, "it is time to finish with propagandism", let us start "open struggle" as soon as possible,² proclaim the Latin American Trotskyites in the words of Blanco, one of their leaders.

In this way the Trotskyites seek to prove that the guerrillas can act quite apart from the working class, without the leadership and guidance of the Communist parties. The Trotskyites maintain that as the guerrilla movement develops in country districts, it will give rise to organisations

¹ *Documentos políticos. Revista de política nacional e internacional*, No. 4, 1967, p. 59.

² See *International Socialist Review*, No. 2, 1965, pp. 41-46; No. 5, 1967, p. 10.

which will take upon themselves the leadership of the whole revolutionary struggle.

At the "congress" held in 1967 the Latin American group led by Posadas brought out the slogan: "Convert the nationalist guerrilla movement into a revolutionary party for the socialist revolution." This was followed up with: "The most profound conclusion must be reached that starting from a handful of two or three people who can provide a centre of support in the conviction that a nationalist movement has to be converted into a socialist one and then into a party, that conversion can be made and organisation of the party and guerrilla activity can be made, as part of peasant and proletarian organisation."¹

Affirming that the guerrilla detachments could turn into a "revolutionary mass party",² the Trotskyites again pursue their far-reaching but narrow selfish aims. In the detachments in rural districts they count, in the first instance, on being able to deal more successfully with the Communists. The Trotskyites do not hide their plans "to fight the Communists", and endeavour "to be the centralisers of open struggle of the *campesino* (peasant) organisations".³

However, their plans do not work out in practice. The Latin American masses are coming to realise that the pseudo-Left notions of contemporary Trotskyism only serve the cause of dividing the revolutionary forces and helping reaction.

Exposing Trotskyite intrigues in Latin America at the tri-continent conference in Havana in January 1966, Fidel Castro described the programme of the "Fourth International" as "a deceitful thing composed by elements who have obviously put themselves at the disposal of American imperialism". He emphasised the great harm which the Trotskyites do to the revolutionary movement, and said that they "pursue aims which would isolate this movement from the people, which would isolate it from the masses and infect it with nonsensical notions".⁴

It is precisely these aims that are served by the Trotskyite attacks on the efforts of the Communist parties to make use

¹ *European Marxist Review*, No. 1, 1968, p. 122.

² *International Socialist Review*, No. 5, 1967, p. 17.

³ *Ibid.*, No. 2, 1965, pp. 43, 44.

⁴ *Cuba Socialista*, No. 54, 1966, pp. 93, 94.

of all opportunities for class struggle. Clinging to the "everything or nothing" attitude, the Trotskyites try, for instance, to sell the workers the idea that it is futile to struggle for an improvement in material conditions. Behind generalisations to the effect that the revolution would settle everything, one can again clearly see the Trotskyites' unwillingness to accept the validity of any form of struggle which is not armed.

In several Latin American countries the Trotskyites use the slogan "Revolution—yes, elections—no". The leader of the Chilean Trotskyites, Louis Vitale, based calls of this sort on the grounds that a pre-revolutionary situation existed in the country, and that the need was for armed action rather than participation in elections.¹ In Ecuador the Trotskyites together with other ultra-Leftists also called for "non-participation in elections".² In Peru the Trotskyite slogan was "Down with elections".³

In 1967 Posadas' grouping announced that the agrarian problem could only be solved by introducing socialist land ownership and by setting up communes⁴. One of the leaders of the Bolivian Trotskyites, Hugo Gonzalez, dealing with the hopelessness of other forms of struggle, said that agrarian reform can only be brought about at bayonet point.

Violently attacking the programmes of the Communist parties and discrediting the existing forms of struggle of the working masses, these "drawing-room revolutionaries", as the Venezuelan Communists call them, do all that they can to "push the revolutionary movement into the abyss".⁵

Among the propaganda slogans, with which the Trotskyites are trying to deflect the national liberation movement from resolving the problems that confront it, one finds the slightly revised call for a "United States". In one instance they clamour for a "socialist federation of Latin America", and in another, for a "socialist United States of Africa".⁶

¹ *International Socialist Review*, No. 3, 1964, p. 72.

² *Documentos políticos. Revista de política nacional e internacional*, No. 4, 1967, p. 60.

³ *Lutte ouvrière*, No. 115, June 20, 1969, p. 26.

⁴ *European Marxist Review*, No. 1, 1968, pp. 125-26.

⁵ *Documentos políticos. Revista de política nacional e internacional*, 1967, No. 4, p. 24.

⁶ *Under the Banner of Socialism*, 1964, No. 3, p. 5; *International Socialist Review*, 1968, No. 2, p. 17.

The whole of the Trotskyite "programme" concerning the national liberation movement is a mixture of ultra-revolutionary phrases disguising defeatism and open anti-communism. Wherever the Trotskyites appear they conduct themselves as opponents of the united revolutionary forces, and as supporters of reaction.

4. CONTEMPORARY TROTSKYISM AND PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE

After a thorough analysis of the contemporary international situation, the Communists have come to the conclusion that there are real possibilities of preventing world war. This conclusion, which has had a mobilising effect on the whole course of the anti-imperialist struggle, is reflected in the documents of the Communist and Workers' parties.

Deep qualitative changes have taken place, which have a historic significance for the fate of mankind, since the world socialist system came into being. In the era when imperialism was an all-embracing system questions of war and peace were decided by separate groupings of capitalist powers. Nowadays its aggressive ambitions are opposed by the economic and military might of the socialist countries. This compels any would-be aggressor to reckon with the possibility of the ruin of the capitalist system in the event of world war.

Life has confirmed the correctness of the political assessment made by the 24th Congress of the CPSU: "Joint proposals and political actions by the socialist states have been exerting a positive influence on the development of the whole international situation. Many plans of the imperialist aggressors have been frustrated thanks to active resistance on the part of the socialist states."¹

The struggle for peace is also carried on by the international working class, and many peace-loving states of Asia, Africa and Latin America, who are neutral countries and will have nothing to do with an imperialist course towards unleashing a war. The peace movement has become worldwide, and has joined together people of different political persuasions and of various social standing.

¹ *24th Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, 1971, p. 212.*

The Communists realise that, while imperialism exists, the forces of reaction will try by means of every sort of military provocation to bring mankind to the brink of world war. The opportunity for preventing war will not come of itself. It demands of the peace-loving forces the greatest energy in fighting for peace, and the greatest wariness with regard to imperialist intrigue. The Communists give the peoples confidence that a world war is not a fatal inevitability, and call for the unity of all the peace-loving forces.

"The main link of united action of the anti-imperialist forces," maintains the Moscow International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties (1969), *"remains the struggle against war for world peace, against the menace of a thermonuclear world war and mass extermination which continues to hang over mankind. A new world war can be averted by the combined effort of the socialist countries, the international working class, the national liberation movement, all peace-loving countries, public organisations and mass movements."*¹

Calls for Atomic Blackmail and a Preventive War

Contemporary Trotskyites are trying (for the umptieth time!) to oppose the Communists with a system of ideas that is Leftist in form but defeatist in content.

The Trotskyite groupings have a great deal to say and write about the problems of war and peace. Occasionally they even find themselves in bitter argument, accusing each other of departures from "classical Trotskyism". However, these arguments are only for internal consumption. An analysis of the statements made by different branches of the "Fourth International" leads to the conclusion that they all have one and the same anti-social basis of hatred for the human race. All of them preach the traditional Trotskyite adventurism with regard to problems of war, peace and revolution.

The difference between the positions of the groupings

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*, p. 31.

consists only in whether they make any attempt to cover up their vindication of war, or consider camouflage to be unnecessary.

The so-called Paris Secretariat of the "Fourth International" has made a law of the thesis put forward by Trotsky in March 1939 in a talk with the correspondent of the *Daily Herald*. He said then: "Yes, world war is unavoidable, if it is not forestalled by revolution." The Paris "Secretariat" likes referring to this statement of its teacher, and assesses the world situation in precisely the same way.

On questions of war and revolution the Trotskyites seem to be moving round and round in the same circle. While maintaining that war can be prevented only by revolution, they have no clear idea, as has been noted above, of the ways in which the latter develops. So the thoughts of the Trotskyites turn again to war, which is now depicted as a means for hastening social progress, and as a forerunner of revolution.

The Trotskyites show surprising energy in their efforts to prove the historical inevitability of world war. They are not even embarrassed by the serious contradictions in which they become involved.

What arguments does the Paris "Secretariat" produce as a proof of the impossibility of preventing a nuclear war in our time? Fundamentally their thesis is that imperialism will not leave the scene of history "without banging the door", without involving mankind in a nuclear war. As far back as the Fifth "Congress" in 1957, the Trotskyites stated in a manifesto: "If the international proletariat does not disarm imperialism, and first of all US imperialism, in time, the latter would rather drag mankind into a nuclear war than surrender without a struggle to the revolution."¹

This theme has been constantly reiterated in subsequent documents on questions of war and peace. In 1957 the Paris "Secretariat of the Fourth International" announced that US imperialism, having "in fact to choose between surrender without a struggle and the last desperate battle", will prefer to drag mankind into a nuclear war.²

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, décembre 1957, numéro spécial, pp. 6-7.

² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

"The Fourth International" does all it can to instil the idea that nuclear war is imminent. American Trotskyites, at a conference they held in October 1967, asserted that mankind is moving nearer and nearer to the brink of a nuclear catastrophe, and "no opposition effective enough to compel a retreat has yet appeared".¹

The Trotskyites deny the ability of the socialist bloc and all peace forces to paralyse the efforts of the imperialist powers to drag mankind into a nuclear war, and to force militaristic circles to reject such plans as threatening them with their own destruction. Believing that the fate of the world depends entirely on the imperialist powers, and first of all on the USA, the Trotskyites proclaim the defeatist idea of the futility of any sort of effort directed at the preservation and stabilisation of peace.

Moreover, the Trotskyites assert that the threat of nuclear war increases in proportion to the growth of the political and economic might of the socialist countries, and the activation of the anti-imperialist struggle. Even in 1957 the "Congress of the Fourth International" maintained that in a situation of spreading anti-imperialist struggle and growth of the political and military might of the socialist camp, world imperialism had no other prospect except to start a third world war.²

This makes it appear that only the weakening of the socio-economic and political potential of the socialist countries can for a time postpone the beginning of the third world war. Starting off with hot revolutionary talk, the Trotskyites once again take the road of defeatism.

These politically harmful conceptions have driven the Paris "Secretariat of the Fourth International" into a blind alley. In their efforts to find a way out, they have thought of yet another trick. The working out of a "realistic and fully responsible strategy", they stated, is only possible if account is taken of the fact that an absolute majority of the population of capitalist countries does not want nuclear war, and is afraid of it. This fear, the instinct for self-preservation, according to the Trotskyites, can be utilised to force even those who do not see the evils of capitalist

¹ *International Socialist Review*, No. 1, 1968, p. 11.

² *Quatrième Internationale*, décembre 1957, numéro spécial, p. 6.

society and do not think of its revolutionary overthrow to rally to the banner of revolution and socialism.

In the document "For the Speedy Unification of the Trotskyite International Movement," adopted by the "Fourth International" in 1963, it was stated: "The world Trotskyite movement always clearly emphasises that mankind faces the chief alternative: either world socialism, or nuclear annihilation. . . . It would be a mortally dangerous illusion to think that peace could be assured . . . without the liquidation of capitalism, especially in America."

In this way the "Fourth International" clamours for adventurism in international politics, maintaining that "it is necessary to choose now not between socialism and the preservation of a less humane, unjust and even barbaric society: it is necessary to choose between socialism and atomic death, between whether there would be a socialist world, or whether it would not exist at all!"¹

Extremes meet, as they say. The ultra-revolutionary phraseology of the Trotskyites is close to the announcements of the "lunatic fringe" of the USA and other imperialist countries. They also dream of forcing the socialist states to surrender or at least to retreat before imperialism by means of atomic blackmail and an unrestrained nuclear armaments race.

This is yet another manifestation of the pre-eminence Trotskyism attaches to violence and fear as motivating forces of the historical progress. Following the "teaching" of their idol, who announced that "intimidation" is the mightiest political method, both internationally and internally, present-day Trotskyites preach intimidation by means of atomic warfare.

Socialism does not need wars or threats of war in order to spread its ideals. An adventurist policy that consists of senselessly brandishing nuclear weapons and terrorising people with the threat of using them is quite alien to it.

Of course, Trotskyites have no hope that their advice concerning "nuclear blackmail" will be taken seriously by anybody. What they want is to display their revolutionary

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 19, 1963, p. 9; Op. cit., No. 18, 1963, p. 3.

fervour and to show that they have their own, special "programme". Nevertheless the conception of "nuclear blackmail" is produced in order to hide the defeatist character of their views on questions of war, peace and revolution.

The Posadas group occupies a particularly irresponsible and adventurist position.

The followers of Posadas decry any sort of force that might prevent imperialism from starting a nuclear war. "The war is inevitable. It cannot be prevented."¹ This was the main theme of the congress which they held in 1967.

Posadas argues with the Paris "Secretariat" and maintains that war is inevitable even if it is forestalled by revolution. In an article published in the Belgian Trotskyite paper, *Lutte ouvrière*, he wrote: "Even revolution cannot prevent an atomic war. It could lessen it, weaken its effects. But revolution would in fact result in war, for capitalism has the force to launch an atomic war."²

This shows that, while disagreeing over some points with the Paris "Secretariat", Posadas wholeheartedly agrees with them regarding the view that the danger of a nuclear war grows as the class conflict sharpens. In another article Posadas suggests a direct connection between workers rising in defence of their urgent demands and the increasing threat of an atomic war. "Capitalism," he writes, "can no longer satisfy the usual demands of the masses, who can no longer be passive and uncomplaining. Capitalism does not possess the forces to crush the masses in their struggle for everyday, general demands. . . . That is why capitalism is preparing for a nuclear war in great haste."³

The effect of the Posadas reasoning is to make the people who read this sort of rubbish wonder whether in fact it is worthwhile opposing monopoly capital, if every success in the struggle brings humanity nearer nuclear war.

The defeatist germ in Posadas' ideas is hidden by his "comforting" reflections that in fact there is no point in fearing a nuclear war, for it is highly desirable.

The starting point of the position taken up by Posadas and his supporters is the Trotskyite slogan that appeared

¹ *European Marxist Review*, No. 1, 1968, p. 101.

² *Lutte ouvrière*, July 10, 1969, p. 9.

³ *Ibid.*, January 10, 1969, p. 7.

as long ago as 1940: "War is the mother of revolution." At a conference in 1962, with the help of elementary arithmetic (after World War I there was a revolutionary victory in one country, and eleven such victories after World War II) they made the "discovery" that the more destructive wars are, the greater their revolutionary role in the development of human society. "The most destructive of wars will necessarily have the most progressive consequences,"¹ they stated.

The conference maintained that a nuclear war should not be feared, since "it would be the essential method for the defeat of capitalism, and would settle accounts finally between capitalism and the socialist revolution". The loss of life and destruction, according to the Trotskyites, would be a hardship that humanity could not escape, and having survived such trials it would with all the more revolutionary energy set about rebuilding what had been destroyed and constructing something new. "Communist society," Posadas announced, "could rapidly be constructed on the wreckage." The conference stated that the "genuine revolutionary" "is he who is prepared to face the last settlement of accounts between capitalism and the socialist revolution and the workers' states—which will be settled within the nuclear war."²

This irresponsible chatter is yet another proof of how far the Trotskyites are from the humanitarian concepts of the proletariat. Incidentally, Posadas' followers consider humanitarianism "a principle of bourgeois life, arising out of the instinct for self-preservation".³

Tens of millions of people perished during World War II. The war was a heavy burden on the working class and all working people. All the same, just as in the thirties, the Trotskyites are clamouring for war, and maintaining that it is a necessary stage on the road to revolution. They do not wish to consider the fact that another world war would be the greatest tragedy for mankind, and, even if it buried imperialism, it would hold back the establishment of communism for an indefinitely long time.

¹ *International Socialist Review*, No. 4, 1963, p. 134.

² *Ibid.*, p. 132.

³ *Revista Marxista Latinoamericana*, No. 14, 1968, p. 207.

In exposing the provocative character of the Latin American Trotskyite calls to prepare for a "nuclear war that would be followed by revolution", Victorio Codovilla said: "We surely cannot ignore the consequences of a nuclear war for mankind, since it has been estimated by physicists that the energy released in the explosion of only one hydrogen bomb of a few dozen megatons would be greater than the energy of all the explosions that had taken place in all the countries and in all the wars experienced by mankind, including the First and Second World Wars. It would surely be impossible to create anything harmonious, anything worthy of admiration, on the ruins of a nuclear war, which would erase whole countries from the geographical map and would destroy not less than a third of the population of the world, to say nothing of the fatal consequences of radioactivity, which would inflict suffering on several generations of mankind."¹

The followers of Posadas, like the Paris "Secretariat", dare to produce "recommendations" for the socialist countries. While the Paris "Secretariat" demands that they should start "nuclear blackmail", Posadas considers such a measure insufficient. He urges the socialist countries to start a "preventive nuclear war" immediately. As he presents it, this would be the "minimum programme" dictated by the political situation.

A manifesto adopted by the Posadas group in 1967, states in so many words: "It is necessary to take the initiative and the offensive, not delaying so that capitalism takes the offensive and decides when, how and where it is going to start the atomic war. One must take the offensive, this is the minimum strategy which the world class struggle demands."²

In urging the launching of a nuclear preventive war because this would be a way of gaining time historically, Posadas states that the war would only last a few days and would be "the least evil for humanity, if one measures and compares historically, because the initiative comes from the revolution and not from capitalism".³

¹ Victorio Codovilla, *La posición de los marxistas leninistas frente a los cismáticos trotskistas del Partido Comunista Chino*, Buenos Aires, 1963 p. 23.

² *European Marxist Review*, No. 1, 1968, p. 55.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

The Trotskyite apologia for an atomic war reflects to some extent the views of some numerically insignificant sections of the petty bourgeoisie. They back down in face of the difficulties of the class struggle, and do not believe that the quantitative changes gradually accumulating in the balance and alignment of class forces will lead to far-reaching qualitative changes. Their pessimistic view of the future of revolutionary struggle has reduced them to an attitude of despair.

Under the increasing pressure of capitalist exploitation, poverty and hardship, these strata are receptive to every sort of adventurist idea that promises them instant relief, at a "single blow". This is where the Trotskyites look for support, in circles where the conclusion is often reached that "a terrible end is better than terror without end".

Underestimation of the destructive character of a nuclear war prepares the ground for such views. It is no accident that Trotskyite ideas have spread in certain petty-bourgeois circles in Latin America. Evidently they labour under the illusion that their part of the world would be spared by nuclear war.

Underestimation of the consequences of atomic war is also expressed in the conclusions held by the Posadas grouping that such a war need not be feared, since, they allege, humanity is psychologically prepared for it at the moment. A statement published by this group in May 1968 said: "Humanity confronts the nuclear war without fear. . . . The masses do not fear the nuclear war. Quite the contrary. The influence . . . of the world revolution shows that the masses do not fear the nuclear war. They feel that it is a terrible event which capitalism is going to unleash but they are ready to face it and they are disposed to conquer."¹

This pathetic bunch of irresponsible babblers obviously want to appear as strong personalities, capable of speaking in the name of the masses, who, incidentally, have no idea of their existence. It is not a new tactic. Trotskyites have always tried to present their notions and conceptions as the demands of the masses. But never before have their claims been as inept as they are today.

¹ *Red Flag*, May 25, 1968.

The London "International Committee of the Fourth International" occupies the same sort of position as the Posadas grouping. There was a time when the British Trotskyites used to say openly that only a war between the socialist system and the capitalist system could give the working class "the decisive opportunity for seizing power". They called on the workers to prepare "for the dreadful destruction"¹ But having seen that an open advocacy of nuclear war did not meet with support, the British Trotskyites resorted to camouflage.

Their leader, Gerry Healy, makes rather transparent hints that the working masses must accept the idea of the necessity for war, since without it things would be still worse for them. "The alternative was either a Third World War of a nuclear kind or mass unemployment and the impoverishment of millions of people in all parts of the world,"² he announced in a speech at a meeting of the Trotskyite youth organisation in January 1968.

The British Trotskyites do not dare to talk straight out of a "preventive war" against capitalism, as does Posadas. Nevertheless it is clear from their speeches that they are not far from this idea. They talk, for instance, of their hostility to Soviet foreign policy, but "not to the use of particular weapons, however dangerous".³ In other words, they imply that they "would not oppose" the use of nuclear weapons by socialist countries first.

Hence, an openly adventurist approach to the question of the possibility of preventing a new world war is characteristic for the majority of Trotskyite groups. Some urge nuclear blackmail, others a "preventive war", but always with the same consequences—an atomic war. The former announce that humanity should be given the choice—either atomic death, or the liquidation of capitalism. The latter assess a nuclear war as the only means for the victory of socialism on a world scale.

¹ *International Socialist Review*, No. 4, 1963, p. 132.

² *The Newsletter*, January 13, 1968.

³ *The Newsletter*, April 13, 1968.

Hostile Attitude to the Anti-War Efforts of the International Working Class

The Trotskyites defend adventurist views of all sorts, and violently attack any action taken by the socialist countries in the defence of peace and international security. Their platform is the same as before the Second World War. Then the struggle of the Communist parties against the threat of fascist aggression was described as sacrificing "the interests of the world revolution..."¹ Trotsky accused the Soviet Union of being "hysterically afraid of war".² In his book *The Permanent Revolution*, he alleged that the Communist parties had "transformed the struggle against war into a self-sufficing task". Anything that was said in defence of peace was slandered as bourgeois pacifism. The Trotskyites maintained that the struggle for peace could bring nothing but self-humiliation.

Their present-day followers accuse the Soviet Union of carrying on "a policy of lost opportunities" after the Second World War. In their opinion the war ended too soon and the end should have been different. As the Soviet Union had at its disposal the most powerful armed forces, it should have turned its weapons against its allies in the anti-Hitler coalition and in this way stimulated world revolution—that is what these adventurists, who are far from understanding historical processes, think.

Because events proceeded contrary to their wishes, the Trotskyites allege that since the late forties, the socialist countries have stopped carrying on "the independent class line of the revolutionary proletariat" and "become absorbed in the struggle for peace".

Trotskyite attacks on the actions taken by the international working class in defence of peace are developed along various lines. These are the well-known charges of "bourgeois pacifism", the claims that any effort to preserve peace is a waste of time, and the flourishing of pseudo-Left slogans designed to sow discord in the ranks of the peace movement.

¹ *Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution*, N. Y., 1940, p. 18.

² *Die neue Weltbühne*, No. 42, 1933, p. 1312.

According to the Trotskyites, conditions do not exist for the preservation and strengthening of peace at the present time. The main trend of international politics, they claim, is the strengthening of the imperialist position and of reaction. At a conference in October 1967, the American Trotskyites came to the conclusion: "It must be granted that US imperialism stands at a pinnacle of power that is absolutely unprecedented whether in its own history or in world history."¹

Trotskyites can be amazingly eloquent when they are trying to prove the power of imperialism. Ascribing to it the role of disposer of the fate of mankind, they "overlook" the fact that there are forces that oppose imperialism.

Presumably it is obvious to everybody, even without the rhetoric of the Trotskyites, that imperialism, and particularly American imperialism, is a powerful opponent. At the same time, imperialism is weaker than it has ever been. It can no longer stake its hopes on achieving its chief class aim (the destruction of socialism and the suppression of revolutionary movement) by provoking a world war without at the same time risking its own existence.

Whether it likes it or not, imperialism now has to act in international politics with great care. It is forced to do this by the present-day balance of forces, which includes the war potentials of the two world systems.

Of course, it would be an oversimplification to think that the possibility already exists of making the imperialists reject the use of force in pursuing their foreign-policy aims in one or another region in the world, but experience has shown that the organisation of a collective rebuff to aggression can thwart such aims, and that the local wars they unleash more and more often end in failure.

It is impossible to use any other word but defeatist to describe the Trotskyite assertions that "the initiative has passed for a definite period to American imperialism",² and that it achieves one victory after another. It is enough to recall such facts as the defeat of the American ventures in connection with Korea and Cuba, in order to see that these assertions are groundless. And, as has already been men-

¹ *International Socialist Review*, No. 1, 1968, p. 11.

² *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 37, 1969, p. 12.

tioned, were not the plans of the imperialist circles for the defeat of the progressive Arab states foiled? Can it be said that the USA is waging a victorious war against the people of Vietnam, who are receiving the effective and resolute support of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries?

The defeatist allegation that the initiative in international affairs now belongs to imperialism is being used by the Trotskyites as a handle for discrediting the efforts of the peace-loving powers to preserve and strengthen peace. The Trotskyites maintain that instead of carrying out a "policy of confrontation with imperialism" the socialist countries have made "concessions" to imperialism all along the line. Every success that has been achieved in the struggle for peace and for the prevention of nuclear war is counted as such a "concession".

Everyone who wants peace accepted the signing of the Moscow agreement on the prohibition of nuclear tests in the three environments with great satisfaction, seeing in it the tangible result of many years of struggle waged by the broad masses against the pollution of the earth's atmosphere. Trotskyites of all the groupings of the "Fourth International" denounced the agreement as "a criminal and demoralising act", "an instrument for the demobilisation of the masses", and "a counter-revolutionary action by Washington and Moscow". In this, too, they showed themselves to be on the same side as the forces of extreme reaction and imperialism, who did not welcome this step of great importance to humanity.

The Trotskyites also reacted with hostility to the measures taken by the Soviet Union to regulate the military conflict that had flared up between India and Pakistan. They are still twisting the facts to this day. Of the part played by the Soviet Union at the time, they declare, "At Tashkent, with the congratulations of world imperialism, it arranged a compromise between the Indian and Pakistani bourgeoisies. A continuation of the war between India and Pakistan could have brought disaster to the bourgeoisies of those countries, with their precarious economic and social equilibrium, and thereby opened up a revolutionary situation throughout Asia, in the rear of imperialism."¹

¹ *Fourth International*, No. 3, Winter 1968/69, p. 104.

The Trotskyites, with their pseudo-Left phraseology, help the imperialist forces, who have for long dreamed of conflicts between the countries of Africa and Asia that would push into the background any question of a struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism. Imperialist circles do not hide their calculations that such conditions would make it easier for them to secure their rear, and, under pretext of "aid", attach to their aggressive political and military blocs many countries that maintain a policy of neutrality.

The Trotskyites have reacted with unconcealed irritation to the steps taken by the Soviet Union and other peace-loving forces to achieve a political settlement of the conflict in the Middle East, brought about by the aggressive forces of the Israeli bourgeoisie with the support of US imperialism.

They berate the USSR for not using nuclear weapons in the Middle East. Making use of the favourite trick of talking "in the name of the people", Posadas announced: "The masses feel that war is coming, they live it every day, they are not afraid. For that reason in the Middle East, they are not afraid. Let the atomic war come. The masses do not make any distinction between this war and the atomic war. They feel that it is an inevitable war. . . ."¹

The Trotskyites go about assessing the struggle of the Vietnamese people against the US aggressors in the same way. Posadas regards it as "the beginning of the preventive nuclear war". "Marxism in our day," this time he claims to speak in the name of Marxism, "consists of understanding that atomic war is inevitable, of understanding that preventive war is inevitable. And the war in Vietnam is precisely a preventive war."²

It is not surprising that Trotskyites get angry as soon as they hear the words "peace in Vietnam". In their opinion this is a pacifist, harmful slogan. They describe the talks between the representatives of the USA and DRV in Paris as "compromise", and "retreat from revolutionary aims".

The longer the war in Vietnam goes on, say the Trotskyites, the more opportunities there will be for promoting world revolution. They care nothing for the sacrifice and

¹ *European Marxist Review*, No. 1, 1968, p. 5.

² *Lutte ouvrière*, July 10, 1969, p. 7.

hardship experienced by the Vietnamese people. They clamour for war until "American imperialism is exhausted", although it is the American workers that have to suffer, while the military-industrial complex and the monopolies grow rich on the war.

Soon after the beginning of US aggression in Vietnam the Trotskyites proclaimed the slogan of opening "new fronts" against the USA. In 1965 the supporters of the Paris "Secretariat" raised a rallying cry: "Make use of the fact that American imperialism has flung its main forces into Vietnam, and increase the number of new fronts."¹

From their subsequent announcements it became clear that they wanted the "new fronts" to be opened by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. These calls to find areas on the geographical map for "new fronts" reflect the adventurism of modern Trotskyism, and its provocative approach to the fate of the world.

The socialist countries have always been guided by the idea that the only reasonable way of curbing imperialist aggression consists not in provoking new armed conflicts, but in giving such support to peoples experiencing aggression as would destroy the aggressor's willingness to repeat such assaults. This is the line that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries follow undeviatingly, and they give increasing help to the Vietnamese people in its struggle with the US interventionists.

Intentionally silent on Soviet aid to the fighting people of Vietnam, the Trotskyites shout about the unwillingness of the USSR "to take effective counter-measures for the defeat of American aggression". They have even found a recipe for "increasing activity". "The immediate and massive intervention of the Soviet air force", was the "recommendation" of the Paris "Secretariat" on June 22, 1965.² If one considers that later the "Secretariat" itself called the war in Vietnam the "principal seat fraught with the danger of world war",³ then the inflammatory character of such "recommendations" is apparent.

It might not have been necessary to recall these "recipes",

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 27, 1966, p. 8.

² *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 25, 1965, p. 6.

³ *Ibid.*, No. 33, 1968, p. 51.

the more so as Trotskyites realise that no one is going to follow their "advice" and "recommendations". But this attitude of theirs inevitably provokes the question why give "advice", if convinced that it is unnecessary. In other words, what are they? Are they politically blind? Or political intriguers?

The position taken up by the Trotskyites over the war in Vietnam gives the answer.

All the statements made by the Trotskyites relating to Vietnam follow the usual pattern. They start by saying what measures the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries should have taken to help the people of Vietnam more effectively. Then come lengthy disquisitions on "compromise", "capitulation", and so on. Finally, there is the typically Trotskyite conclusion that struggle should not be waged in the first place against American imperialism, but against the socialist countries, since they "do not concern themselves with the interests of the Vietnamese and world revolutions".

Thus the problem of repulsing the American aggressors' attacks is replaced by a call to fight the socialist countries, the reliable allies of the Vietnamese people.

The same quality of intrigue is to be found in the irresponsible statements that real revolutionaries should, so they allege, not be afraid of a nuclear war. It is hardly likely that the Trotskyites themselves believe their own "recipes". This propaganda trick is used so that, on the one hand, they can show off their "heroism" and "super-revolutionarism", and on the other hand, cover up their attempts to disrupt the organisation of widespread international solidarity with fighting Vietnam.

The Trotskyites have no concern for the interests of the Vietnamese people. The London "International Committee of the Fourth International" talks with casual cynicism of the movement which is unfolding in capitalist countries for the support of the Vietnamese people. "All those who campaign for peace in Vietnam..." emphasised the "committee", "are thus acting in support of a particular variant of imperialist policy and they stand *against* the independent, internationalist struggle of the working class."¹

¹ *International Correspondence*, No. 1, 1967, p. 2.

The British Trotskyites demand that "the Communist Party's 'Peace in Vietnam' campaign must be rejected by the working-class movement".¹ Not confining themselves to general slogans, they tried to wreck a meeting held in London, on October 27, 1968, in support of fighting Vietnam, having spread around beforehand the announcement that the purpose of such meetings of workers "was to wall off . . . young people from revolutionary politics".²

The Trotskyites use their beloved formula "everything or nothing", in their attempts to justify their sabotage of political meetings in support of the people of Vietnam. "The only possible means for supporting the Vietnamese revolution consists in actions aimed at revolutionary overthrowing of one's own capitalist governments,"³ they maintain. The British Trotskyite paper, *The Newsletter*, has been particularly active in this "talking big".

Although they make themselves out to be friends of the Vietnamese people, they actually harm them by hindering the development of the movement of protest against American aggression. These "revolutionaries in words" follow in the wake of imperialist propaganda playing all kinds of tricks to prevent the mass outburst in support of the Vietnamese people.

The objective role of the Trotskyites as supporters of imperialist reaction is apparent not only in their attitude towards help for fighting Vietnam. They behave in the same way over other questions relating to the preservation and strengthening of world peace.

Trotskyites from all sorts of "Fourth International" groupings declare the growing movement for peace to be "utopia" and "seeking co-operation with bourgeois trends".

They hold that the only movement for peace that has a right to exist is one that would immediately propose the overthrow of imperialism. In the resolution "The International Situation and Our Tasks", adopted by the so-called reunification congress of the "Fourth International" in 1963, it was stated that Trotskyites must orientate supporters of peace "on to political solutions based on the seizure of power

¹ *The Newsletter*, March 5, 1968.

² *Ibid.*, January 18, 1969.

³ *The Newsletter*, February 20, 1968, quoted from *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 28, April 1968, p. 8.

by the working-class movement".¹ Trotskyites demand a "radical" peace movement, which would become "a revolutionary alternative".²

These plans actually aim at undermining the peace movement, and alienating from it the large number of supporters who oppose the threat of nuclear war without holding communist views. It is also well known that a considerable proportion of the population of capitalist countries still takes no active part in the peace movement, because of the influence of imperialist propaganda, which presents this movement as pro-communist. The Trotskyite demands to make "seizure of power" the prime task of the peace movement only play into the hands of imperialist reaction, which has long been seeking ways of disorganising the ranks of peace supporters.

The Trotskyites have made attempts to distribute leaflets on their ultra-Left demands at meetings of peace supporters taking place in capitalist countries. At the youth festival in Helsinki in 1962 they handed out to the delegates leaflets and pamphlets which they themselves summarised in the following terms: "... to explain that there cannot be peace on earth, except in the event of the final victory of socialism in the main capitalist countries—the USA and Great Britain". It was, therefore, necessary to fight for world revolution "as the only solution to the problem of peace". Although the "Fourth International" had to admit that many of the delegates tore up the leaflets without reading them, it still urges Trotskyites to distribute similar material during international forums of fighters for peace.³

The "Fourth International" has always tried to discredit the mounting world movement for general and complete disarmament. In this it is guided by Trotsky's directives, which called the slogan for disarmament "weakening", and demanded that it should be countered by a "slogan for winning over the army and arming the workers". It maintains that the proposal for general and complete disarmament is an "unattainable dream".

The Communists realise the difficulties of solving the

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 19, 1963, p. 48.

² *Ibid.*, No. 33, 1968, pp. 5-6; *International Socialist Review*, No. 1, 1968, p. 64.

³ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 17, 1962, pp. 33-39.

problems of general and complete disarmament. An exceedingly active and resolute struggle against the aggressive forces of imperialism will have to be waged before it can be put into practice. The Communists urge that even now persistent efforts ought to be made to obtain practical results—the prohibition of testing and production of nuclear weapons, the liquidation of military blocs and military bases on foreign territory, the significant reduction of armed forces and armaments, thereby clearing the way for general disarmament.

The Communists are thus setting goals that are attainable in our day. The struggle for general and complete disarmament strengthens the position of peace-loving forces, widens the base of the peace movement and openly isolates militaristic circles.

The Trotskyites substitute their ultra-revolutionary phrases for these actual tasks. They maintain that the struggle should be only for “the unilateral disarmament of imperialist countries”.

This is just one more example of historical inadequacy and contradiction in the arguments of the Trotskyites. When they are trying to prove the inevitability of world war, they have only one argument—imperialism will not leave the scene without banging the door. But when they need to discredit the peace efforts of the socialist countries, they talk in a quite different way. They maintain that imperialism may surrender voluntarily and lay down its arms, if suitable pressure is applied. The slogan of the “unilateral disarmament of imperialism” is thus shown up for what it is—a crude propaganda trick. It is a resounding phrase used to cover up the defeatist character of the Trotskyite conceptions of war and peace.

The same purpose is served by the noisy demands for an immediate launching of civil wars in all the capitalist countries that have nuclear weapons. In a resolution of the Paris “Secretariat” on “The Dialectic of World Revolution” (1963) there is the following statement: “Atomic weapons cannot be used in civil war without the capitalist class committing mass suicide, which appears to be unlikely, in spite of the content of a quite crazy slogan: ‘Better dead than red.’”¹

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 19, 1963, p. 27.

The Trotskyite arguments on civil war, always ultra-revolutionary in form, again clearly show the characteristic Trotskyite striving to swamp concrete actions for the prevention of a third world war in irrelevant, abstract wordiness.

The directives of Trotskyism on questions of war and peace again show the futility of its conceptions, and their isolation from actual reality. Refusing to acknowledge the life-giving strength of those who stand up against imperialist military circles, the Trotskyites denigrate any action aimed at preserving and strengthening peace, and sow defeatist opinions about the prospects of these efforts.

In this too the provocative role of contemporary Trotskyism is again clearly revealed. It is trying to spread disbelief in socialism, the working class and the national liberation movement. It would very much like to throw a shadow over their power and ability to overcome all obstacles on the road to the establishment of lasting world peace, as a favourable basis for the development of the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle. The Trotskyites are an obvious example of how the "Left" phrase can serve the cause of war and reaction.

* * *

These are the "theoretical" views of contemporary Trotskyism. Many of them are echoes of the notorious "theory of permanent revolution", which various groupings of the "Fourth International" have tried to adapt to present-day conditions.

The absurd thesis on the impossibility of building socialism in one or several countries, the repudiation of the general democratic movement, the disbelief in the revolutionary capabilities of the working class and the broad masses, the orientation on "revolutionary wars" and the export of revolution, the substitution of struggle against the vanguard forces of the world revolutionary movement for struggle against imperialism, the adventurism and subjectivism—all these aspects of Trotsky's "teaching" have been preserved and to some extent brought up to date by the "Fourth International".

Contemporary Trotskyites also give pre-eminence in all

their pseudo-revolutionary conceptions to the "theory of violence", which is an indispensable part of their theories on world revolution. This comes out both in their vindication of war, and in their plans to "spur" revolutions, as well as in their attacks against the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, and their denial of the possibility of a peaceful path of a socialist revolution.

At the same time they have re-examined certain propositions in the "theory of permanent revolution", and this is particularly noticeable in the declarations by a number of Trotskyite groups that the peasantry of the countries of the Third World are the most radical force of the present time.

As the Trotskyites are only capable of hindering the efforts of others, they see the main purpose of their existence in carrying on undermining activities in the international revolutionary movement.

Chapter IV

DEVICES AND METHODS OF TROTSKYITE DISRUPTIVE ACTIVITY IN THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

Having been driven out of the organised working-class movement, the Trotskyites looked for new ways and means for subversive, anti-revolutionary activity. They had always cynically relied on double-dealing, jesuitically elevating it to the level of a political creed. To start with they armed themselves with the policy of so-called "entrism", which they have perfected and refined over a period of many years.

What Is "Entrism"?

It is no use looking for this word in any dictionary. It is a term coined by the Trotskyites themselves without much concern for language, and was originally derived from the French verb *entrer*—to "go in". "Entrism" means entering into other parties and mass organisations. Since this road is closed to the agents of the "Fourth International" when they openly acknowledge their devotion to Trotskyism, it means a secret, disguised penetration into these organisations.

"Entrism" has to be infiltration into parties and mass organisations, with an outward show of loyalty and agreement with their aims and tasks. The purpose of "entrism" is to undermine from within, bringing disorganisation into the work, seeking out people who can be lured away to Trotskyite positions.

The Trotskyites hope with the help of the strategy of "entrism" to change the fortunes of the "Fourth International" which, by its own admission, "has not yet achieved a lasting influence over the masses in a single country".¹

The initiator of the tactics of political smuggling and ideological provocation was Trotsky. Isaac Deutscher, who had an unconcealed sympathy for him and his ideas, describes the conditions in which Trotsky decided to turn to

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, 1963, No. 19, p. 29.

“entrism” as a means of supporting the “Fourth International”, in one of his books. “From personal experience, writes Deutscher of Trotsky’s plans with regard to the “Fourth International”, “I know how great were the hopes he placed on it. A group of his co-thinkers, to which I belonged at the time, warned him in vain that he was embarking on a futile venture. Soon indeed it turned out that the ‘Fourth International’ was still-born. Trotsky nevertheless desperately tried to breathe life into it; and he had just instructed his followers to enter the Socialist parties, and there to try to recruit adherents for the new International.”¹

This strategy had been recommended even in 1934 by the “International Left Opposition”, the forerunner of the “Fourth International”. British Trotskyites ought to “work” in the Labour Party, the French in the united socialist party, the Belgians in the working-class party, and the Americans in the Socialist Party.²

At the same time they carried out similar disruptive work in the trade unions. The leader of the American Trotskyites, Cannon, instructed his agents “to be the best trade unionists, to do the most work for the unions, be most attentive, most active in the union work . . . to become influential”.³

To force the pace of recruitment, Trotsky proposed expelling any member from the Trotskyite groups who within six months failed to bring in a new recruit.

In a somewhat amended form his proposal was reflected in a motion passed by the American Trotskyites in the thirties. They were then discussing reducing party members to the status of “sympathisers” if they had not brought in “new fighters” “within a reasonable period”.

However no such stern measures or “raids into the enemy rear” could swell the ranks of the “Fourth International”. Trotsky’s hopes in “entrism” were not justified. There was even talk in the “Fourth International” as to whether these

¹ I. Deutscher, *Ironies of History. Essays on Contemporary Communism*, London, 1966, pp. 175-76.

² Pierre Frank, *La Quatrième Internationale. Contribution à l'histoire du mouvement trotskyste*, Paris, 1969, p. 67.

³ *Socialism on Trial. The Official Court Record of James P. Cannon's Testimony in the Famous Minneapolis "Sedition" Trial*, New York, 1944, p. 37.

tactics did not lead to a "dissipation of resources" and the loss by the Trotskyites of their "own character".

Nevertheless after the Second World War the "Fourth International" again took to developing the policy of "entrism" on a large scale.

At the "congresses" they held in the fifties and sixties the Trotskyites from the various groupings of the "Fourth International" tried to work out a policy of differential penetration into parties and mass organisations, depending on the relative strength of the revolutionary tradition of the working class and the influence of the Communist Party in any given country. They openly stated that "entrism" was a last resort, which should help them to prolong their existence and also strengthen and broaden their positions.

"The Trotskyites," they said in a resolution of the "reunification" congress of 1963, "have no choice but to practice 'entrism'; that is, to participate as an integrated component in the internal life of the mass movement."¹ In 1969 the Trotskyites again announced: "The sections of the Fourth International are as yet too small to lead the masses in their own name and under their own banner in a decisive struggle for power."²

Deducing their own potential from these facts, the Trotskyites emphasise that the policy of "entrism" is not just a task for today or tomorrow. What we are talking about, say Pablo's supporters, is the working out of our long-term "entrist work".³ This is what the American Trotskyites are also orientated on. Going into mass parties and working there must continue for a prolonged period, they consider.

The range of objectives for infiltration established by the "Fourth International" is fairly wide—from bourgeois parties to trade unions and cultural organisations. At the "congress" in 1963 the Trotskyites reached a general conclusion on how the policy of "entrism" is to be carried out: "... they penetrate into big mass organisations, which have a national, cultural or political character. They propagate the ideas and programme of Trotskyism as far as is possible

¹ *International Socialist Review*, No. 4, 1963, p. 129.

² *Ibid.*, 1969, p. 69.

³ *Sous le drapeau du socialisme*, No. 37, 1967, p. 21.

among the members of these organisations, and attempt to bring them over to their position."¹

Another Trotskyite centre, the Posadas grouping, too, adopted a wide range of objectives for "entrism", including even Left-wing Catholic organisations.²

Trotskyites are prepared to get in under any sort of banner into any sort of organisation, if only they can recruit new supporters. They are determined, with the help of "entrism", to make use of any divergences of opinion that inevitably arise between members of the parties and organisations.

Unity of action, the French Trotskyites declare, is not always unity of opinion. Differences of opinion always arise among the leadership and at all levels of organisation. The British Trotskyites also want to play on differences of opinion and ideas: "In so far as the working class is far from being monolithic, and the paths to socialism are not determined in advance, there can and should be a wide range of difference in the assessment of strategy and tactics."

Hence the task not only of "worming one's way into the cracks of differences in opinion", but also of speaking in support of views that may play into the hands of the Trotskyites in their subversive activity. "Ideas, like money, don't grow on trees", is an aphorism that has come to govern the policy of the Trotskyites in their search for ideas that might in some way be close to their own.

The mechanism of "entrist" activity was worked out at a meeting of the "Secretariat of the Fourth International" in December 1960. "Part of the activists remains in the mass organisations, the rest falls out of the game, and forms an independent off-shot of the organisation." The first group are given the task of "attracting even a few members at any price". The "Secretariat" said there should be no fear of "dissolution" or "dissipation of Trotskyite resources". "If Trotskyites are sufficiently dynamic, a revolutionary organisation, by the use of methods of subversion and practising entrism, can be by 100% certain that the necessary forms of parallel work will also be found."³

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 19, 1963, p. 32.

² *Rivista Marxista Europea*, No. 5-6, 1968, p. 245.

³ *Bulletin intérieur du Secrétariat international de la IUe Internationale*, December 1960, p. 9.

By "parallel work" is meant the activity of groups, who openly declare themselves to be Trotskyite, publish the requisite journals and papers, and, without using "underground" methods are active in Trotskyite propaganda.

Speaking at the same meeting of the "Secretariat", the Trotskyite "ideologist", Germain, called for "an ability to use underground methods of work" in the various mass organisations that are targets for "entrism". He reproached the Dutch, Austrian and Danish Trotskyites for failing to see the value of these methods, and thus causing "degradation" and "a block in activity". The "Secretariat" urged these groups to give more attention to the tactics of "entrism".

Appealing to their co-thinkers to make more active use of underground methods of work, the leaders of various Trotskyite groupings try to put a good face on their shady tactics. They even hold forth on the theme that illegal methods have always been part of the armoury of revolutionaries. But how can anyone call himself a revolutionary if he turns to such methods not for the sake of destroying the system of exploitation, but in order to disorganise and break up from the inside the political organisations of the working class and the alliance of the working people? Trotskyites who often assume four or even five pseudonyms are not trying to save themselves from government repression, nor from the police. They go in for this sort of temporary "alienation" from their own selves and their own ideas to achieve aims that have nothing in common with the revolutionary struggle.

This is not underground work in the sense that revolutionaries understand it, but an ideological subversion in the revolutionary ranks. And it is very similar in its methods to the actions of paid police agents, who penetrate into organisations to undermine them from within. These police agents, as is well known, also hide their face under the mask of good-will and loyalty. The Trotskyites have voluntarily taken upon themselves the functions of enemy agents in the revolutionary movement.

What results have the Trotskyites obtained through the notorious policy of "entrism"? The documents of the various groupings of the "Fourth International" are silent about this. Apparently it is not to the advantage of the Trotskyites

to publicise their shady activities. It is no accident that in the reports published after general discussions on the necessity for a more active policy of "entrism", whole sections, presumably giving more detailed instructions, are often cut.

It is quite obvious that the Trotskyite hopes on "entrism" as a universal means of raising their numbers and turning their groups into "mass organisations", have not been justified. Double-dealing has never prospered those that see it as their basic political capital.

It is interesting to note that, in trying to strengthen their positions, the smaller Trotskyite groups practise "entrism" even towards each other. The British Trotskyites from the "Socialist Workers' League" admit that the followers of Pablo practise "entrism" in their ranks. And at the same time they do not hide the fact that they themselves do the same thing in a third British Trotskyite group associated with the journal *International Socialism*.¹ Obviously this is not done because their affairs are flourishing.

Nevertheless the Trotskyite tactics do cause a certain amount of harm to the revolutionary struggle. From the evidence that can be gleaned from the materials of the "Fourth International", as well as from the information published in the foreign communist press, some impression can be formed of the amount of harm that has been done, and of the influence of Trotskyite subversive activity.

Activities of Trotskyite "Entrists" in Capitalist Countries

The devices and methods used by Trotskyites acting in developed capitalist countries differ in some respects from those which they employ in countries engaged in anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle.

In these countries the Trotskyites have given a great deal of attention in post-war years to evolving methods of covering up their anti-communist ideas as having nothing in common with Trotskyism.

They have attempted, in particular, to publish journals and even to set up organisations, which, not only do not

¹ *The Newsletter*, January 14, 1969, April 12, 1969.

emphasise their Trotskyite connections, but even demonstratively repudiate Trotsky and his views. In Britain in the late forties, a journal *Socialist Outlook* was published which had little to distinguish it from the Trotskyite journal *Socialist Appeal* that was also appearing at that time. The only difference was that it maintained the Trotskyite line without any mention of Trotskyism. Also the pages of *Socialist Outlook* sometimes carried articles in which "indignation" was expressed at the journal being accused of Trotskyism. Only later did the Trotskyites admit that it was they who published the journal.

The publication of the British Trotskyite paper, *Newsletter*, was organised in the same sort of way, in 1957. At first it was presented as an "independent publication", as an open "platform for Socialists of the most varied views". In actual fact the paper soon became the platform of the Trotskyites who made slanderous accusations against the Communist parties and the socialist countries. For some time it avoided any reference to Trotskyism, and even repudiated its connection with Trotskyism, but later the mask was lowered.

Then the Trotskyites thought of something else. They began to make out that the groups they had got together were "independent". February 1959 saw the formation of the so-called "Socialist Workers' League" in Britain. This "league" was conceived as an organisation "not presenting itself as a working-class party, but standing on the road to the creation of such a party". In its documents Trotskyite views were propagated without any mention of Trotsky or the "Fourth International". It was only in May 1960 that the leaders of the "league" made an announcement in which they admitted their adherence to Trotskyism.

The "Fourth International" devoted a great deal of study to the "experiment" of the British Trotskyites, and reached the conclusion that it was fully justified as the prejudice against Trotskyism was thus evaded. The Paris "Secretariat" recommended this method of disruptive activity to all its "sections".¹

Not content with the distribution of pseudo-independent papers and journals, the Trotskyites put out anonymous bulle-

¹ *Bulletin intérieur du Secrétariat international de la IV^e Internationale*, December 1960, p. 6.

tins and leaflets, giving anti-communist advice and arguments, which, they hope, may be picked up by some people.

Not risking a full-scale exposition of their ideas, the small Trotskyite groups often pursue "a pin-prick tactics", speaking today on one question, and tomorrow on something different. Each time the aim is the same—to sow doubt in the correctness of the political line of the Communist parties, and slander the international communist movement as a whole, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. As is pointed out in the organ of the Communist Party of Canada, *The Marxist Review*, they sometimes "use half-truths as a basis for their attacks as being, in their opinion, more effective than outright lie".¹

In this, too, the Trotskyites have shown a continuity with the pre-war policy of their forerunners, who, working in capitalist countries, "developed to a high degree a technique of screening their opposition to Marxism-Leninism by emphasis upon matters of detail and methods of application".²

In carrying out their policy of "entrism" the Trotskyite chameleons are up to any cunning trick to draw attention to themselves. When they were publishing the *Newsletter* as "an independent paper", they pretended to champion the vital demands of the working class (wage claims, reduction of working hours, and so on), although these questions, as is well known, have always occupied an insignificant place in their programme. After the paper had been openly declared a Trotskyite publication, their interest in speaking out in defence of working-class conditions was exhausted. Its pages were enlivened by the usual ultra-left phraseology and throw-away remarks about the struggle for the workers' economic interests.

In capitalist countries one of the main targets of "entrism" were the Social-Democratic parties.

Even in the thirties the Trotskyites in France chose as the object of their intrigues the socialist party SFIO, as well as the organisation "Socialist Youth". By 1947 they

¹ *Marxist Review*, No. 172, 1960, p. 18.

² Tim Buck, *Thirty Years 1922-1952. The Story of the Communist Movement in Canada*, Toronto, 1952, p. 59.

had infiltrated the leadership of the youth organisation, and its paper *Red Banner*. Having wrecked this organisation, they created a new one—*The Revolutionary Youth Movement*, which was not officially a Trotskyite organisation.¹

The Japanese Trotskyites are very active in the Socialist Party. They strive to use it as a platform for the propaganda of their ideas. The decreasing influence of the Socialist Party and its severe defeat at the elections to the Chamber of Representatives in 1970 are regarded by some Japanese socialists as the result of Trotskyite activity.

It is not by accident that the Trotskyites have for a long time been interested in the British Labour Party. They consider that the crisis it is experiencing, the growing dissatisfaction of its members with the policy of its leadership, and the party's organisational instability open up favourable conditions for carrying out the policy of "entrism".

In 1947 the leadership of the "Fourth International" announced: "Our movement which is now stagnating dangerously in Britain can become reanimated and considerably strengthened if it begins to put into operation a long drawn-out, carefully studied and systematic work as a tendency within the Labour Party."²

In obedience to this instruction, the Trotskyites formed within the framework of the Labour Party the so-called "Socialist Brotherhood", which set about foisting its views on party members. The activities of the Trotskyites were curtailed when the "Socialist Brotherhood" was expelled from the Labour Party. However, the leader of the British Trotskyites, Healey, maintains that a substantial number of his followers continue to advocate Trotskyite views in the Labour Party.

For a long time the Trotskyites carried on the same sort of work in the young socialist organisation affiliated to the Labour Party. In 1965 they managed to draw some of its members away, and hold a conference which elected its national committee. As its official organ, the conference adopted the Trotsky sheet *Keep Left*, which had already

¹ Léo Figuères, *Le trotskisme, cet antiléninisme*, Paris, 1969, pp. 190, 198.

² *Marxism Today*, No. 9, 1964, p. 277.

been published for some years with youth in mind by the British Trotskyites. Because the splinter group had taken over the organisation's former name, the Labour Party had to call its own youth organisation "Labour Party Young Socialists".

The Trotskyites try to adopt the policy of "entrism" in connection with the Communist parties. One of the leaders of the "Fourth International", Frank, has pointed out the great difficulties which must be overcome, in order to do subversive work in the Communist parties. He has noted, in particular, that Communists would not be so patient with the actions of the Trotskyites, as, for instance, socialists, whose loose organisation and ideology allows more open and aggressive "entrist" activity.

In 1964 the Trotskyites set up a special group in Britain and made it responsible for evolving tactics for infiltrating into the Communist Party of Great Britain and into the communist youth organisation. They were only able to win over a few students who succumbed to ultra-revolutionary phraseology.

As the theoretical organ of the Communist Party of Great Britain *Marxism Today* wrote, the Trotskyite resolve to intrigue among the Communists is bound to fail. "Secret work inside the Communist Party, however, is a difficult business. Your Trotskyist cannot do his work unless he opens his mouth, and when he does the stock Trotskyist talking points come out. . . . Our Rules guarantee the right to raise difference and to reserve opinion. Membership of our Party is not open to those who do not agree with our programme, our rules, our present policy."¹

Marxism Today alerted Communists to the need for greater watchfulness with regard to the Jesuitical tactics of the Trotskyites. "Communists must combine the utmost readiness to discuss political problems with the capacity to recognise individuals who have no identity of views with us and who must not be allowed to make use of the Party as a platform. There is the danger of intolerance, of labelling genuine differences as Trotskyist. . . . Nothing could be more harmful to our Party than any stifling of discussion or loose labelling of people as Trotskyist. But equally harmful is to

¹ *Marxism Today*, No. 9, 1964, p. 282.

allow these experts in 'entrism' to try their tricks, and it is the political fight for our ideas and policy by our members which will defeat them. . . ."¹

In carrying out their "entrism" tactics, Trotskyites try to make contact first of all with youth.

In 1969 the "congress" of the Paris "Secretariat" supporters adopted a resolution on "work among young workers and students". This emphasised: "The Ninth World's Congress reaffirms that work with both young workers and students presents a fundamental problem, which the International should be prepared to face in the immediate future." The congress called on all the sections to mobilise their best resources for the promotion of this work".²

Contrasting the young with the older generation, the Trotskyites maintain that the young are free from "the burden of past mistakes and inherent scepticism". They make many remarks of this sort: "Youth has no prejudice in its attitude to Trotskyism", "Trotskyism is not a bogey to it". Such comments indicate that the "Fourth International" has decided to make use of the misguided views of some of the young people about Trotskyite activities in the past and in the present.

The Trotskyites are highly interested in the growing participation of youth in movements for peace and against American aggression in Vietnam. Having decided at their "congresses" that youth has become "the most radical wing" of this movement, they have announced that they are going to "burrow" actively into the ranks of the young fighters for peace.

The supporters of the "Fourth International" are determined to make use of the young people they have worked on for a particularly refined form of "entrism". The Trotskyites believe that when this section of youth has assimilated Trotskyite ideas they will become a better propagator of them than the emissaries of the "Fourth International", which has compromised itself in the eyes of the masses. At the conference of the British "Socialist Workers' League" in June 1968, it was stated that these young people should

¹ Ibid., p. 283.

² *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 37, 1969, p. 89.

be engaged in plans for pursuing "entrism" in works and factories in order to establish contact with the workers.

In this way, by promoting "entrism" in the revolutionary movement of capitalist countries, the Trotskyites seize every opportunity of luring other strata of the working population away from the working class. Stopping at nothing, they pursue a policy everywhere which helps imperialism, and creates helplessness and withdrawal in the face of the vital problems and demands of the class struggle.

The same role has been adopted by Trotskyite "entrists" in countries engaged in the struggle for national liberation. Contemporary Trotskyism has there become "a primitive tool in the hands of imperialism and reaction". This is what Fidel Castro called it, speaking at the Tricontinental Conference in Havana in January 1966. This apt description reflects the pro-imperialist, anti-revolutionary character of Trotskyite activity in the sphere of the national liberation movement.

How Trotskyites Help the Enemies of the National Liberation Movement

With no less vigour than their colleagues in Western Europe and the USA, Trotskyites try to disrupt the unity of the national liberation movement and push anti-imperialist fighters along a path doomed to failure. They are doing what the imperialists have been doing for a long time, and the imperialists deliberately repay the Trotskyites with good relations for their subversive efforts.¹

The fundamental method of Trotskyite provocative activity remains the notorious policy of "entrism". It is so widely used by Latin American Trotskyites that at the "congress" of 1967 they contended for the "honour" of being its initiators, and ascribed it to their leader, Posadas, "who worked out the theory of 'entrism'".²

¹ Most of the Communist parties of Latin American countries have to act in semi-legal or illegal conditions. In many of these countries, however, the Trotskyites freely distribute their propaganda, and in Uruguay (see *European Marxist Review*, 1968, No. 1, p. 198) they have been allowed to speak regularly on the radio, and have been doing so for several years.

² *Rivista Marxista Europea*, 1968, No. 5-6, p. 31.

Latin American Trotskyites use the policy of "entrism" first of all in movements of insurrection and in the trade unions.

With the help of ultra-Left slogans they sow discord and dissension in the ranks of the insurrectionists. This was just the kind of double-dealing the Trotskyites employed in Guatemala.

For a long time the organisation the "Insurrectionary Armed Forces" has been active there as a military-political union. All the political groups and movements supporting or co-operating with the popular armed struggle belong to this organisation. The development of the struggle under their united leadership was an important victory for the revolutionary forces.

Among the other organisations within the Insurrectionary Armed Forces was the "Revolutionary Movement of November 13", consisting of patriotically inclined officers. This group was chosen by the Trotskyites as their target, when they arrived in Guatemala from Mexico. In July 1964 they began an "entrant" campaign aimed at destroying the unity of the Insurrectionary Armed Forces, and at discrediting the political line taken by the Guatemalan Communists. They managed to get their views printed in *The Socialist Revolution*, a journal just started by the "Movement of November 13".

In the first issue there was a declaration published under the heading "Problems and Prospects of the Revolutionary Movement of November 13". It consisted of attacks on the views of the Guatemalan Labour Party concerning the popular-democratic character of the revolution. The Communists were described as having abandoned the course towards a socialist revolution, and of striving "to yield the leadership of the revolution" to the bourgeoisie. The Guatemalan Labour Party was accused of not setting sufficient value on armed struggle, and of attempts to "dissolve" this struggle in a popular movement. The declaration called for the accomplishment of a socialist revolution "already tomorrow", "the creation of local communes with the function of Soviets", and for a "general revolutionary strike to seize enterprises and the formation of armed forces for self-defence". Any necessity for united leadership of the insurrectionary forces of Guatemala was rejected.

The declaration was written by Trotskyites, who, however, kept quiet about their allegiance to the "Fourth International", and made themselves out to be simply "radically-minded intellectuals".

In August 1964 the Central Committee of the Guatemalan Labour Party addressed an open letter to the members of the "Movement of November 13". It emphasised that calls to action made without consideration of the actual conditions and the potential possibilities of the revolutionary forces of the country, could only isolate the "Movement of November 13" from the other revolutionary forces and especially from the Guatemalan Labour Party, and would make it easier for irresponsible provocateurs to harm the common revolutionary struggle in Guatemala. As was mentioned in the open letter, to follow the "advice" of the authors of the declaration and to refuse to undertake various kinds of activity essential for the defence of political, economic, social and cultural national demands would mean the isolation of armed struggle and hasten the defeat of the armed forces by the enemy.

Having exposed the provocative character of the calls for an immediate socialist revolution (such slogans could only hinder the consolidation of all the patriotic forces), the Central Committee of the Guatemalan Labour Party announced that Communists recognise the national-democratic revolution as an essential historical stage. It would enable Guatemala to go on later to socialist revolution.

The Central Committee of the Guatemalan Labour Party called on the leaders of the "Movement of November 13" to speak against slogans that were Leftist and provocative in character and that threatened to disrupt the democratic forces.

The Trotskyites, however, continued their efforts to split the revolutionary forces of Guatemala.¹

All those who did not agree with the Trotskyite line left the "Movement of November 13". They created an organisation "The Insurgent Armed Forces of Guatemala".

Just at this time a propaganda campaign about the activities of the "Fourth International" in Guatemala was

¹ See *World Marxist Review*, No. 8, 1965, pp. 30-31; No. 10, 1966, pp. 22-23; No. 3, 1969, pp. 27-30.

launched in the USA. In May 1965, the journal *Monthly Review*, which had often allowed Trotskyites to make use of its pages, alleged that their group in Guatemala had proved the possibility of revolution without the formation of any sort of coalition. "They have instead," the journal said, "adopted a straightforward socialist programme and have declared that the means to its realisation must be a workers' and peasants' state." It looks as if some people in the USA wanted other countries to follow this example. There is no reason to assume, wrote the *Monthly Review*, that "the Guatemalan masses see things in a qualitatively different way than their brothers in Central and South America".¹

As Fidel Castro emphasised, such remarks in the American press are not accidental, especially as American imperialism had employed extremely subtle counter-revolutionary tactics in connection with the "Movement of November 13".²

The Trotskyites openly congratulated themselves on the "success" they had achieved in Guatemala, and announced their intention of working along the same lines in future. At the 1967 "congress" Posadas said: "Trotskyism has not yet enough strength to direct the revolution, but it has demonstrated its capacity to influence a revolution as in Guatemala, because the objective conditions allow it. For that reason we prepare ourselves."³

The Trotskyites call for "spreading the Guatemalan experience" in other countries in Latin America, where armed struggle is or will be taking place.

Trotskyism has an equally shameful record of promoting "entrism" tactics in the trade unions of Latin America. Its adherents say that "the strategic aim" is to undermine the trade unions and bring under one roof all those whom they can win over, and thus set up a workers' party "based on the trade unions".⁴ By this they mean a Trotskyite party.

For many years the Trotskyites have been trying to wreck the trade unions of Bolivia.

¹ Quoted from *World Marxist Review*, No. 10, 1965, p. 29.

² *Cuba socialista*, No. 54, 1966, p. 93.

³ *European Marxist Review*, No. 1, 1968, p. 98.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

Even in December 1946, under the influence of Trotskyite elements who had wormed their way into the miners' union, its leaders created a National Working-Class Centre. This centre opposed the Trade Union Confederation of the Workers of Bolivia, and even tried to take its place. The activities of the Trotskyites thus increased the split in the Bolivian working-class movement.¹

In 1965 the Trotskyites tried to stop the activity of the trade unionists altogether in Bolivia. Under the pretext of Bolivian government repression, they advocated transferring the trade unions to an illegal position. In this they were in step with the generals who were in power, and who were impatient to destroy the trade union movement.

The Communists were outright critical of these views, which threatened serious harm to the Bolivian working class. At meetings of local organisations and at conferences of the leaders of the trade unions, as well as in print, they proved convincingly that it was impossible to agree with the transference of trade union organisations on to an illegal footing, since their existence is all the more essential in the most difficult moments.

In view of the danger of these Trotskyite manoeuvres when reformist elements were becoming more active, the Bolivian Communists set themselves the task of "overcoming the consequences of anarcho-syndicalism and petty-bourgeois nationalist reformism, and at the same time of striking a crushing blow at Trotskyism and destroying its positions in the mass movement".²

For a long time the Trotskyites have also been intriguing in the trade unions of Chile. They have tried to foist on them a frankly provocative line: "The slogan is—all or nothing, and the tactics are—general strike for an indefinite period."³ These rallying cries were all the more harmful, because they responded to the desire of the employers to drag out conflicts and thus weaken the working class and its trade unions.

¹ Raúl Ruiz González, *Bolivia. El Prometeo de los Andes*, Buenos Aires, p. 210.

² *World Marxist Review*, No. 4, 1967, p. 43.

³ See *Chile. Politics. Economics. Culture*. Edited by S. Gonionsky, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1965, pp. 85-86.

The Trotskyites, together with the anarchist elements, managed at one time to work their way into the leadership of the Single Centre of Chilean Workers, which they opposed to the Communist Party. With the slogan "Power to the Trade Unions", they tried to narrow the position of the working-class party.¹

Besides their tactics of "entrism" in connection with guerilla detachments and trade unions, the Trotskyites carry on intrigues in other mass organisations of Latin America.

In Chile the Trotskyites opposed joint action by socialists and Communists. They intended to make use of action by certain groups in the Socialist Party of Chile which, on the eve of the 20th National Congress of the Socialist Party of Chile (February 1964) relying on some of the young people, came out with a platform which would have destroyed the unity of the party, and were defeated. The dissenters' attempts to foist their own views on the party also ended in failure at the 21st Congress of the SPC (June 1965). The congress announced that with every day the growing unity between the socialists and the Communists was becoming the foundation stone of the whole revolutionary movement of Chile.²

The victory in Chile of the national unity bloc in the autumn of 1970 was brilliant proof of the political wisdom of this orientation.

Argentinian Trotskyites are also continuously intriguing. Trying to infiltrate the Perón movement, they slander the strategy and tactics of the Communist Party there, oppose the creation of a united anti-monopoly front, and call for "immediate revolution" and "immediate insurrection".

The Trotskyites also bring disorganisation into the movement supporting Cuba, which has developed in the countries of Latin America. They try to bring about ill-prepared uprisings with their slogan "The best support for Cuba is to follow the example of Cuba". In Uruguay the Trotskyites slandered the actions of those who supported the revolution in Cuba; the Bolivian Trotskyites behaved in the same way, calling on the members of the movement in defence of Cuba

¹ See *XII Congress of the Communist Party of Chile (Santiago, March 13-18, 1962)*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1963, p. 96.

² See *The Political Parties of the Countries of Latin America*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1965, pp. 266-68.

to the speediest establishment of a worker-peasant government, and the immediate use of the "new methods of struggle, revolutionary methods similar to those that ensured the triumph of Fidel Castro on Cuba".¹

The provocative and double-dealing role of the Trotskyites showed itself in the fact that even while they were urging these measures, they distributed propaganda material designed to sow doubts about Cuba among the Latin American nations. Some of the Trotskyite groups (followers of Posadas) announced: "Its submission to the line of 'peaceful coexistence' and its conception of the building of socialism in one country can isolate the Cuban revolution from the rest of the Latin American peoples." They accused Cuba of not doing anything to further revolution in other Latin American countries.

One of the leaders of the Cuban Communists, Blas Roca, stated: "Yankee imperialism and its hirelings also say that their attack on the people of Cuba was for the sake of 'liberating it' from communist tyranny. There is absolutely nothing to choose between the cynicism of the Trotskyites and that of imperialism."²

The Latin American Trotskyites organised special training to co-ordinate the tactics of ideological "entrism", and also to co-ordinate subversive activity. In March 1963 in Uruguay, as was stated in the West German bourgeois press on information received from Montevideo, a training session was attended by 65 Trotskyites from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, Peru, Venezuela and Uruguay. Posadas presided and they heard talks on "Problems of the Fourth International", "The Tactics and the Technique of Political Revolutions" and "The Principles of Colonial Revolutions". They also worked out the tactics for each of the groups and adopted a resolution to hold such sessions regularly.

A similar "exchange of experiences" was held by the Latin American Trotskyites in Mexico in July 1967.³

Although on the whole the influence of the Trotskyites in the political life of Latin America is insignificant, it is

¹ *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 21, 1964, p. 8.

² *Cuba socialista*, No. 56, 1966, p. 88.

³ *European Marxist Review*, No. 1, 1968, p. 202.

no accident that the Trotskyites are making themselves felt there. In the countries of this part of the world the tendency towards "petty-bourgeois revolutionarism", is an enduring one. In Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Peru and Chile, anarchism was an independent political trend even in the first decades of the twentieth century.

The ideas of "direct action", "spontaneous risings", and "a militant minority", have been spread in the working-class movement for a long time, increasing its separatism, and making it more difficult for class consciousness to grow.

The General Secretary of the Communist Party of Chile, Louis Corvalán has noted that the Latin American Communist parties "have had to withstand the assault of their class adversaries and also to combat anarchism, Trotskyism and other petty-bourgeois trends in their own ranks".¹

The struggle of the Latin American Communists against petty-bourgeois extremists, failure of adventurist plans, loss of influence among the masses—all this has broken the spirit of anarchism.

However, here and there, some semi-proletarian, anarchistically inclined elements have survived and are impressed by the Trotskyite ultra-revolutionary phrase. Their haphazard calls for an uprising, which are sometimes supported by extremist, petty-bourgeois elements, do a definite amount of harm to the revolutionary movement of Latin America.

The Trotskyites have long been planning subversive activities in Africa. This task has repeatedly been stated by the "Fourth International", although it has still not been carried out. True, in Algeria, as was mentioned in the journal, *International Socialist Review*, the Trotskyites were "very active".² What did their activity consist of? As far back as 1954 the French Trotskyites spoke out in support of the Messalists (as the members of the petty-bourgeois party led by Hadj Messali were called). They set themselves up in opposition to the National Liberation Front. Among the Messalists were quite a few French police agents, while Governor-General Soustelle, announced in 1955: "Messali is my last trump-card."³

¹ *World Marxist Review*, No. 7, 1967, p. 26.

² *International Socialist Review*, No. 4, 1963, p. 134.

³ Colette et Francis Jeanson, *L'Algérie, hors la loi*, Paris, 1955, p. 264.

Even later there existed in Algeria several Trotskyite groups, which, according to the Algerian paper, *El Moudjahid*, received direct instructions from the "Fourth International" on how to conduct disruptive activity.¹

The Trotskyites have had no success in the young independent countries of Asia. All they have been able to do is to splinter off a small group from the Singhalese Lanka Sama Samaja Party. This little bunch of "orthodox" Trotskyites uses the same characteristic methods of disruptive activity as some Latin American Trotskyite groups; quite irresponsibly they urge the immediate establishment of worker-peasant governments, and attempt to slander the Communist Party of Ceylon whose line is to unite all the democratically inclined forces of the country.

Contemporary Trotskyism has not given up trying to broaden the area of subversive action in the international revolutionary movement. Adapting themselves to the conditions of different countries, the Trotskyites feverishly seek new possibilities for increasing their influence.

Trotskyism's subversive role in the international revolutionary movement is expressed not only in concrete actions, undertaken by the "Fourth International" itself and separate Trotskyite groups. The anti-revolutionary role of Trotskyism is also apparent in the fact that it is widely used in bourgeois propaganda hostile to the working class. The bourgeois press announces and advertises Trotskyite views more energetically and with greater vigour than the Trotskyites themselves. For bourgeois propaganda Trotskyism is a sort of Trojan horse in the revolutionary movement.

¹ *El Moudjahid*, September 22, 1965.

Chapter V

HOW BOURGEOIS PROPAGANDA USES TROTSKYISM FOR ANTI-COMMUNIST AIMS

Bourgeois propaganda began wooing Trotskyism as early as in the twenties. At that time reactionary imperialism made no secret of its hopes that under the influence of Trotskyism the communist movement would lose its unity, and that the Soviet state would be broken from within. At a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in January 1925, it was stated that the enemies of communism wanted to see in Trotsky "a figure that would shake the iron dictatorship of the proletariat, split the party, and transfer Soviet power on to another path".¹

These hopes were not to be realised. Having expelled the Trotskyites the communist movement became even stronger and more monolithic. The political exposure of Trotskyism and its ideological and organisational defeat showed the whole world the Soviet people's determination to follow undeviatingly the road of building socialism laid down by Lenin.

However, the imperialists continued to give Trotskyism every support and responded favourably to Trotsky's intention to form an international anti-communist organisation.

To help Trotsky form an "opposition" to the world communist movement, bourgeois propaganda took to advertising his "teaching". The doors of all kinds of bourgeois publishers opened before him. It became the fashion to publish Trotsky; his books were rushed through by the printers. They came out in almost all the European languages. The big Berlin publishing house, Granat, obligingly published in a rush his book *The Permanent Revolution* in Russian in 1930, obviously intended for illegal distribution in the Soviet Union.

Journalists from every continent flocked to Turkey where Trotsky first lived to get an interview, or commission an article. The Hearst press in the USA considered it "an

¹ *The CPSU in the Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee*, Russ. ed., Vol. 3, p. 147.

honour" to offer him their columns. When Trotsky visited Copenhagen in 1932 in order to make a speech there, Fox Films paid a great deal of money just to take a few shots. The Columbia Broadcasting Company paid lavishly for the rights to record his speech and transmit it to America.

There was ample evidence to show that the interest in Trotsky was not simply a rush for sensation. Responding eagerly to the requests of bourgeois publishers, he became a regular exponent of anti-Soviet ideas. Imperialist propaganda agencies added commentaries to his writings to the effect that they were from the pen of "an eye-witness of events in Soviet Russia".

Trotskyite insinuations became a dainty dish in the bourgeois propaganda kitchen. The sworn enemies of Soviet power combed the works of Trotsky for arguments that could be used in the slander campaign against the USSR. Even Hitler, according to the West German journal *Die Neue Gesellschaft*, once said that he had learnt a great deal from Trotsky.¹

"Monographs" and "studies" were written, presenting the history of Soviet Russia in the Trotskyite interpretation. Among such publications was a book by the renegade Arthur Rosenberg *The History of Bolshevism*, which appeared in 1932.² He was one of the first to make use of Trotskyite views for what was alleged to be an unbiased assessment of the history of the Soviet state. Assigning himself the modest role of "an objective historian", he commented on statements by Trotsky which, as he put it, "hit at the very essence of Bolshevism".

Rosenberg's method of presenting himself as an "unbiased commentator" was judged on its merits by bourgeois "sovietologists". Many of them followed his example, and began to refer to Trotsky's conclusions and arguments as first-hand information, thus lending a note of credibility to their anti-Soviet propaganda. In other words, the quoting of remarks by Trotskyites, who are made out to be "Marxists" and "revolutionaries", helps to give an appearance of objectivity and non-bias to the anti-Soviet con-

¹ *Die Neue Gesellschaft*, Part 3, 1962, p. 216.

² In 1966 it was again published in West Germany with the comment that its author was an "independent and thoroughly German Marxist".

ceptions produced in literature of this sort. Many bourgeois historians actually hide behind Trotskyites and their views. The propaganda band wagon they mounted in the thirties serves them well to this day.

But it was not only because of anti-sovietism that bourgeois propaganda met Trotsky with open arms. It saw the usefulness of his slanderous attacks on the whole of the international communist movement.

In a number of West European countries in the thirties a worker could expect to be dismissed or even receive a prison sentence if communist literature or leaflets were found on him. Yet in these same countries there were factory managements that freely distributed a hastily contrived pamphlet *What Does Trotsky Say?* and recommended the workers to acquaint themselves with the propaganda of various Trotskyite groups.¹

In Poland even the police took to advertising Trotskyite views. The Polish security forces printed Trotsky's books in their own press, and handed them out to political prisoners.

But even this help from bourgeois propaganda did not save Trotskyism. It failed to build up a political force capable of any sort of serious attack on the international working-class movement. Bourgeois propaganda seemed to lose interest in advertising Trotskyism among the ranks of the anti-imperialist fighters, and during the Second World War and in the first decade after the war, much less was written about Trotskyism.

Since the late fifties bourgeois propaganda has started another round of publicity for Trotskyite views. Its sweep seems to be greater than that of the first one. The name of Trotsky is again splashed across the pages of anti-communist publications. His books are being re-issued in editions running into millions. Studies are written about Trotskyism, and its theories are also popularised in pamphlets, journals and newspapers.

This "second love" of the bourgeoisie for Trotskyism has its own purpose.

Speaking of the subtle methods of contemporary anti-communist propaganda, L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the

¹ See *Communist International*, No. 7, 1937, p. 122 (in Russian).

Soviet Union, emphasised in his speech at the Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: "In the capitalist countries, anti-communism has been elevated to the status of state policy. To erode the communist and the whole revolutionary movement from within is now one of the most important directions of the class strategy of imperialism."¹

Behind the current build-up of Trotsky and his views, one can feel an experienced, directing hand. Anti-communism has never been a unified set of opinions. It was always a hotchpotch of ideas, some of them frankly misanthropic, others hypocritically professing love of humanity, but nowadays Trotskyite concoctions are continually given more weight.

Anti-communist propaganda makes a double use of Trotskyism. First of all the assessments and directives of Trotsky serve the bourgeois falsifiers as arguments in their attempts to distort the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and blacken the past and present of the USSR. At the same time they are used to discredit the strategy and tactics of the contemporary communist movement, and to bring discord into the ranks of the fighters against imperialism.

The aims are the same as in the thirties, when bourgeois propaganda hastened to the aid of Trotsky. But the methods used are more varied and more refined, with the mobilisation of the leading "sovietologists" and "sociologists", specialists in all types of questions on communism (it would be truer to say anti-communism), with the generous financing of advertisements of Trotskyite views, and with the cultivation of refined methods of ideological mimicry.

Trotskyism—Provider of Anti-Soviet and Anti-Communist Fabrications for Bourgeois Propaganda

The sixties brought with them a rather curious phenomenon. No one studied Trotskyism so assiduously as "respectable" bourgeois historians and professors. And they could

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*, p. 155.

not be suspected of an inclination to radically Left opinions.

These gentlemen made something in the nature of a pilgrimage to Harvard University. They gathered there from various parts of the world—from Britain, West Germany, France, Japan, and even from distant Australia. Why did Harvard attract them? Here, according to the will of Trotsky, are preserved all his personal archives. They have been carefully studied by such “sociologists”, prominent among the anti-communists, as Daniels, Deutscher, Schapiro and dozens of less well-known specialists in anti-communist propaganda. Each of them has since brought out a series of anti-communist publications.

The Amsterdam Institute of Social History, where Trotsky deposited copies of some of his personal papers during his lifetime, has become the second place of pilgrimage. Apparently, unable to cope with the flow of “researchers”, and wishing to make the Trotsky material more accessible, the Amsterdam Institute produced in 1964 a lavish edition of his letters, containing texts in Russian and in English.

The Trotsky materials are advertised as a unique “documentary museum”, allegedly reflecting revolutionary events in Russia and in the international working-class movement. Isaac Deutscher went to Harvard at the expense of the Ford Foundation, and after studying the personal papers of Trotsky said: “. . . These archives are by far the most important collection of original documents on Soviet history existing outside the USSR.”¹

Bourgeois historians worm out of them anti-communist and anti-soviet fabrications and even find “a source of inspiration” for themselves.

In 1964 the West German “historian” Heinz Brahm openly stated this in the name of his anti-communist colleagues: “All of us,” he wrote in his scurrilous book *Trotsky's Struggle for Lenin's Inheritance*, “proceeded from Trotsky, and this will surely be admitted by a number of historians, when answering the question as to what first served to stimulate their researches”.² Deutscher is equally frank. He states that many “sociologists” in the West “drew, directly

¹ I. Deutscher, *Trotsky, the Prophet Armed*, London, 1954, p. vi.

² Heinz Brahm, *Trozkij's Kampf um die Nachfolge Lenins*, Cologne, 1967, p. 9.

or indirectly, their arguments and catch phrases from this source".¹

There was a time when Trotsky, bent on ideological diversion, hoped to instil his views into the international communist movement, and in this way disrupt the unity of its ranks. The Communists, however, exposed both the anti-revolutionary substance of his "teaching", and the actual role of the Trotskyites themselves as agents of imperialist reaction.

Now the poisoned Trotskyite seeds are cultivated in the soil of the most rabid anti-communism, without any veil of Left-wing phrases. The false revolutionary Trotsky has acquired admirers among those who frankly fight against revolution, against the ideas of scientific socialism, and who strive to keep the masses in a spiritual thrall to the monopoly bourgeoisie, and hinder the inconvertible process of the revolutionary transformation of society.

These anti-communist pamphleteers show a heightened interest in the last period of Trotsky's "literary" activity. In their words his influence as a theoretician becomes particularly apparent after his deportation from the Soviet Union. This interest is quite understandable. Reduced to complete political isolation and painfully aware of his own impotence, Trotsky took to fabricating the most appalling tales against the USSR and the international communist movement. These statements of Trotsky's are greatly prized by the falsifiers.

Imperialist propaganda and Trotskyism have long had much in common. They share a brazen anti-sovietism, which in new historic conditions has burgeoned into an extensive campaign of calumny against the socialist system, ceaseless propaganda against the international communist movement, and falsification of the ideas of scientific socialism and of Marxism-Leninism. Their functions and methods may differ, but their interests inevitably coincide and points of contact are established.

This creates an objective foundation for mutual support and the sharing of "ideas". Thus, Trotskyism not only provides fabrications for orthodox anti-communism, but also

¹ I. Deutscher, *The Prophet Outcast*, p. 322.

arms itself from the arsenal of bourgeois anti-communist propaganda.

The current ideological love-feast between bourgeois ideologists and Trotskyism reflects, to some extent, certain important new tendencies in anti-communism and in its main trend—anti-sovietism.

Bourgeois propagandists cannot now influence mass consciousness with the standard devices and the frontal attacks which were characteristic of their predecessors of the twenties and thirties. Life has exploded many of their myths, such as the inability of the Soviet Union to survive, of socialism as a purely destructive and oppressive force, and of inhumanity as the essence of Marxism-Leninism.

Contemporary opponents of communism, though still using crude methods of propaganda, try to adapt themselves to changed conditions. One of the leading West German "sovietologists", Bochenski, defining the main task in the ideological war with communism, even as far back as 1963, talked of "the necessity to carry on an advancing polemic, in other words, to carry the fire into the enemy's camp".¹

In attempting to fight "on the enemy's ground", the apologists of imperialism still maintain that Marxism-Leninism is "invalidated" and "out-of-date". But more often now they come out as "defenders" of Marxism-Leninism. These newly arrived experts in Marxism try to prove the "discrepancies" and contradictions between contemporary revolutionary reality and Marxism-Leninism. Trotskyism comes in useful for these acrobatical tricks.

In recent years there has been a new development in anti-sovietism. Attempts are being made to prove that socialism is not so very different from capitalism, that capitalism and socialism are different variants of a "single industrial society", growing in one and the same direction. The conceptions of "erosion" and the "gradual diminution" of the class content of socialist ideas, and the blurring of demarcation lines between capitalist and socialist society, are an ideological reflection of the notorious policy of "building bridges", proclaimed at one time by US President Johnson.

According to the authors of these conceptions, after the

¹ I. Bochenski, "Der freie Mensch in der Auseinandersetzung zwischen West und Ost", *Das Parlament*, "B.", 23/63.5, June 1963, p. 11.

lapse of a certain period of time, there must be a "convergence", that is, socialism and capitalism must move closer together according to the workings of some sort of general laws of the development of human society. The theory of convergence is proclaimed to be "above classes" and "common for all humanity". However the true purpose of this theory was given away by one of its firmest supporters, the American Professor Brzezinski, in 1964. He and his collaborator S. Huntington wrote in their book, *Political Power: USA—USSR*: "Thus on closer examination it is striking to discover that most of the theories of the so-called convergence in reality posit not convergence, but submergence of the opposite system."¹

So, even the "theory of convergence" pursues the same strategic aim—the restoration of the capitalist order in socialist countries. The methods of achieving this have somewhat changed, however.

Following the "new fashion", the ideologists of anti-communism lay stress on the compilation of fairy-tales on what they allege to be processes of "transformation" in socialist countries, "the bourgeois renaissance in Soviet economy", and even of the "return to capitalism", which makes inevitable, it is said, first the economic and, later, the political fusion of the two systems.

As was noted at the 24th Congress of the CPSU, the anti-communists have been of late offering all sorts of "advice" on how to "improve" socialism. "But their concern is," L. I. Brezhnev said, "not for socialism of course. They would like to return us to bourgeois practices and, therefore, try to force bourgeois democracy on us, a democracy for exploiters, alien to the interests of the people."²

Seeking to back up their "research" with additional arguments, these critics of the Soviet Union turn to Trotsky. They announce that once there was in history a "Marxist" and "revolutionary" who thought there were no prospects in the task of socialist construction. He said that the "bourgeoisification" of the socialist states was inevitable. And it is not for nothing that the propaganda campaign in the

¹ Z. Brzezinski and S. Huntington, *Political Power: USA—USSR*, New York, 1964, p. 419.

² *24th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1971, p. 99.

capitalist countries linked with the name of Trotsky, his "historical correctness" and "political revenge", moves to the foreground precisely these aspects of Trotskyism. The Trotskyite fabrications about the "degeneration" of socialist states have provided a stimulus for the global ideological strategy of imperialism.

Having set its course on the ideological softening up of the socialist countries, anti-communist propaganda covers up the class aims of imperialism with phrases about "freedom", "respect for the individual", "genuine humanity", and so on. The "Western way of life" is depicted in such a way as to appeal to those who live in the West, and at the same time to tempt unstable individuals in socialist countries with the "delights" of the capitalist paradise.

The anti-communists have set themselves an impossible task to prove that in a world based on exploitation of man by man there are more favourable conditions for the freedom of the individual than where exploitation does not exist. Once again in these ideological speculations those who serve imperialism turn for help to Trotskyism.

Just how useful to them Trotskyism is can be seen from the following example. In West Germany there appeared a few years ago an anti-soviet book with the resounding title of *Communism without a Future*.¹ Its author, Günther Wagenlehner, is well-known as a former war criminal, who in his time was sentenced to 25 years' imprisonment. As not many people would be likely to believe this ex-nazi who set himself the task of proving the absence of democracy in the USSR, he relied mainly on quoting the anti-soviet statements made by Trotsky.

Interweaving their own inventions with those of the Trotskyites the advocates of anti-communism try to prove the necessity of "liberalising" the social order in socialist countries, of their gradual "evolution towards greater humanitarianism". These ideas pursue the same cherished aim of inflicting an attack on socialist positions by washing out ideological boundaries. "The basic assumption of the new approach," writes Brzezinski about the US East European policy, "was that mere verbal hostility would not overthrow the com-

¹ Günther Wagenlehner, *Kommunismus ohne Zukunft. Das neue Programm der KPdSU*, Stuttgart, 1962.

munist regimes... Instead of waiting for the communist regimes to collapse, the United States would henceforth bank on promoting evolutionary changes within them and within the bloc as a whole."¹

The monopoly bourgeoisie realises that the Marxist-Leninist ideology is a powerful weapon for strengthening and developing socialist society. Therefore, it always tries to smear Marxist-Leninist teaching.

Besides bolstering up anti-communist theory, Trotskyite notions, it has been found, serve other purposes.

The more communist ideas are spread about, the more difficult becomes the position of those who use "red imperialism" and "the export of revolution by force" as intimidating phrases. The peaceful policy of the USSR and the other socialist countries, and their opposition to the forces of war, compel the anti-communists to resort to new propaganda devices.

Eagerly citing Trotsky's statements on "promoting revolution" and the necessity for the use of armed force against imperialism, some zealous anti-communists ascribe these aims to the Soviet Union. They reach the absurd point of alleging that after the expulsion of Trotsky from the ranks of the Bolshevik party, many of Trotsky's ideas, instead of being cast aside, were actually put into practice.

In the book of a certain Jan Librach, *The Rise of the Soviet Empire. A Study of Soviet Foreign Policy*, there is this absurd statement: "When, in 1918, Trotsky coined the phrase 'neither war nor peace', he revealed a specific state of mind and correctly expressed the Communist maxim of continuous warfare in international relations."²

No wonder that with all their sympathy for Trotskyism the bourgeois falsifiers have begun to talk about the necessity for the "rehabilitation" of Trotsky, and the "injustice" of his expulsion from the Soviet Union. Distorting the facts, they have taken to depicting the ideological and organisational defeat of Trotskyism as an "act of revenge", "the settling of accounts", and "the struggle for power". The principal differences of opinion between the CPSU and

¹ Z. Brzezinski, *Alternative to Partition*, New York—Toronto—London, 1965, p. 118.

² Jan Librach, *The Rise of the Soviet Empire. A Study of Soviet Foreign Policy*, London, 1964, p. 16.

Trotskyism on questions of vital importance for the Soviet Union, have been reduced to differences of a purely personal nature.

Why do the anti-communists clamour for the "rehabilitation" of Trotsky?

This political gerrymandering is clearly inspired by a desire to awaken an interest in Trotskyism, and support its subversive efforts in the world revolutionary movement. At the same time it is a political reward to Trotskyism for the support it has given to the bourgeoisie in attempting to split the opposition to imperialism.

The motivations of the campaign for the "rehabilitation" of Trotsky can be clearly seen in the clumsy attempts of the anti-communists to present Trotskyism as Marxism.

Who Will Gain From Advertising Trotskyism as a "Species of Marxism"?

In the sixties bourgeois propaganda tried hard to present Trotskyism as "legitimate Marxism". The pervading idea of Deutscher's trilogy is that Trotskyism is a "branch of Marxism". Praising Trotskyism for the "aggressiveness and the comprehensive character of its criticism", Deutscher at the same time affirms that "Trotsky's criticism in all its essential aspects conformed to the traditions of classical Marxism".

Deutscher's misrepresentation of Trotskyism as a "species of Marxism" immediately met with the approval of bourgeois propaganda. Pages of anti-communist studies were filled with discourses about the "Marxist" Trotsky, and his name is treated on the same level as those of Marx and Lenin. Such unison on the part of the servants of the bourgeois propaganda machine is not accidental.

During recent years quite a few anti-communist books have come out which talk of the existence of many different forms of scientific socialism. The term "socialism" itself, maintain the anti-communists, is understood by Marxists in different ways. A book that came out in the USA in 1965, *Marxism in the Modern World*, says: "The word socialism has so many meanings ... that disputes over it between

people who are not talking about the same thing seem pointless.”¹ The Trotskyite slander of socialism is presented as a “Marxist analysis”.

Present-day bourgeois propagandists are not original. In the twenties and thirties, even in the organs of the Vatican press, Trotskyites were called “a consistently revolutionary wing of the working-class movement”.

The apologists of imperialism have long known that the ultra-revolutionary phraseology of Trotskyism does not constitute the slightest danger to the capitalist system. They have duly assessed the “rational kernel” of the Trotskyite ideas, their anti-communist tendency.

The existence of a variety of ultra-Left trends cutting across the general line of the main revolutionary force of the present day is objectively of use to imperialism. As Leo Figuères, a member of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party, rightly remarks: “the capitalists need such a trend, for with all its weakness it gives the appearance of a ‘Left’ position outside the Communist Party”.²

Hostile propaganda is all out to prove that “true communism” exists somewhere outside the communist movement. This movement itself is described as “old-fashioned”, and “out of step with modern times”. Occasionally the bourgeoisie prefers even to see their own children in various ultra-Left groups for a time, hoping that they will then return to their bosoms, with their interest in the aims of the Communist Party effectively stifled.

Those who serve imperialism try to prove that modern Trotskyism is that new, growing force, capable of embracing all those who are alleged to be dissatisfied with the “limitations” and “sluggishness” of the Communist parties. Even church newspapers take part in the chorus of praise for the “characteristically Trotskyite revolutionary spirit”. One of these papers, published in France, wrote, for instance, of the intellectual character of Trotskyism and its passion.

The organisers of the anti-communist campaign hope to popularise Trotskyite views as “a variety of Marxism” and thereby to influence unstable and adventurist elements towards turning their extremism against the communist

¹ *Marxism in the Modern World*, Stanford, 1965, pp. 94-95.

² Léo Figuères, *Le trotskisme, cet antiléninisme*, p. 196.

movement. They note with satisfaction that the leaders of modern Trotskyism consider the struggle with the Communist parties as their main aim. The same French church paper expressed its attitude to Trotskyism by stating that the dissenter Krivine, having left the Communist Party, was fighting against his previous comrades and the beliefs which he now rejected with the passion of a soldier in a religious war.

The steady flow of publicity for Trotskyism from various sources, the advertising of Trotskyism as Marxism, have a direct bearing on the attempts to exploit the differences in the international communist and working-class movement. Deutscher makes no bones about this. Commenting on the way individual Communist parties have taken different approaches to certain ideological questions, he wrote that all these events had sustained his conviction of the topicality as well as the historical importance of his theme.

The anti-communist ideologists do not stop at the publication of "studies" and the results of "research". Other more glaring fabrications are also used. During the sixties there was an abundant flow of so-called well-documented books about communism. In these compilations, along with tendentiously chosen quotations from Marx, Engels and Lenin, there were also references to the writings of Kautsky, Bernstein and, especially often to those of Trotsky.

And, finally, the falsifiers have yet another device. Their "studies" are amply provided with references for further reading of the works of Trotsky, the choice being made on the principle that the more malicious the writing, the more "relevant" it is. In a frankly anti-communist book, Seton-Watson, professor of Russian History at the University of London, after a detailed exposition of Trotskyite views, offers this advice: "The following list contains the names of works that I have found useful, or can recommend as useful to readers who wish to pursue the subject further."¹

The author of the anti-communist book *Teachers of Russian Marxism*, Tronton Anderson does the same thing.

¹ H. Seton-Watson, *The Pattern of Communist Revolution. A Historical Analysis*, London, 1960, p. 409.

Analagous recommendations are to be found in other anti-communist publications.

This method is not in itself new. The tsarist agent Zubatov, trying to drive the working-class movement into the arms of "police socialism", distributed Bernstein's books among the proletariat. Nowadays the organisers of the anti-communist campaign advertise Trotsky with the same sort of aim. In various ways the reader is assured that without becoming familiar with the works of Trotsky, he cannot understand Marxism and the history of the communist movement.

When the anti-communists set themselves the task of "exposing" socialism, they have recourse to the Trotskyite statements about the insoluble problem of building socialism within a national framework. When they want to drive a wedge between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other Communist parties, they attack the building of socialism in the USSR on the grounds that it has allegedly harmed the cause of the international revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, and signified the refusal of the Soviet people to fulfil its internationalist duty. The anti-communists play in two different keys according to their audience, but both their instruments are Trotskyite.

Bourgeois propaganda also tries to cater for the readers who rarely look into the so-called serious publications, political journals and newspapers. Praise of Trotsky as an "orthodox Marxist", has even been presented on stage.

Making out Trotskyism as a species of Marxism, bourgeois propaganda often tries to cultivate a similar attitude to the "Fourth International". Attempts are made to present the Trotskyites of the "Fourth International" as expressing the interests of the proletariat, and the appearance of the "International" itself as the birth of some sort of new Communist Party.

Deutscher, although he called the "Fourth International" a "phantom organisation", described the Trotskyite elements in it as follows: "The groups were small, but their influence could not be ignored. They drew to themselves alert-minded and devoted party members."¹ The West German journal *Wehrpolitische Information*, urging that modern Trotskyites

¹ I. Deutscher, *The Prophet Outcast*, p. 209.

should be regarded as Communists, wrote that it was a mistake to assess the "Fourth International" as a group in opposition to communism, which was too often done in the West.

By this kind of misrepresentation some people are eager to foist Trotskyite views on the communist movement. That this is the aim is evidenced by the statement of Lichtheim, a Research Associate at the US "Research Institute on Communist Affairs" of Columbia University. He urged Communists to make use of Trotsky's "criticism" as a starting point "for critical reflection of their own".¹ Morris, Professor of Government at Indiana University, quoting Trotsky, states that the "Fourth International" "would presumably take up where Lenin left off".²

The shameless lack of integrity on the part of American anti-communist ideologists, their brazen falsifications are, by all accounts, inspired from above. The threads of ideological diversion can be traced to official agencies of the American Administration. It is symptomatic that in the State Department's manual on the international communist movement, published in 1967, several Trotskyite groups were listed as communist organisations.³

Official anti-communism lends an attentive ear to the "policy statements" of the "Fourth International", admitting their propaganda value as a weapon for splitting the revolutionary movement. The falsifiers gladly use these statements in their "studies" and rarely miss the opportunity of emphasising that the "Fourth International" is made up of people who speak "in defence of Marxism".

Judging by the scale of Trotskyite publicity in the West, its bourgeois purveyors are acting on the orders of imperialist reaction.

¹ George Lichtheim, *Marxism in Modern France*, New York and London, 1966, p. 77.

² Bernard S. Morris, *International Communism and American Policy*, New York, 1966, p. 22.

³ *World Strength of the Communist Party Organisations*, Department of State, United States of America, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, 1967, p. 172.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

When modern Trotskyism is discussed, it is often compared with that Trotskyism which suffered ideological and organisational defeat in the international communist movement in the twenties. Certainly the Trotskyite of the seventies looks different from his predecessor. He has a more up-to-date political vocabulary. In some respects he has moved away from the ideas of Trotsky, in some he is directly in opposition to them.

However, in spite of certain changes which Trotskyism has experienced in its development, one can say with absolute conviction that it is the heir of the theory and practice of the Trotskyism of the first three decades of the twentieth century. The "Fourth International" has stated that its ideological bible is Trotsky's notorious "theory of permanent revolution". Wholly approving of Trotsky's political behaviour, his struggle with Lenin, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the international communist movement, modern Trotskyites share with their predecessors the responsibility for all the evil which Trotskyism has inflicted in the past on the cause of revolution and social progress.

All the vices, which were so evident in earlier Trotskyism, are intrinsic in it even at this stage. It is precisely these vices that determined in the past and are determining now the political character of Trotskyism.

Trotskyism consists of unprincipled manoeuvres in various petty-bourgeois strata, and speculation on the weaknesses of the petty-bourgeois section of the revolutionary movement. The history of Trotskyism bears witness to the fact that it has continuously sought help among various strata of the petty bourgeoisie. Like a reckless gambler trying to improve his position by changing his stakes, it has flung itself into the most diverse political combinations, relying on the support of one section of the petty bourgeoisie today, another tomorrow, and a third the day after.

In the course of more than ten years preceding the Great October Socialist Revolution, Trotskyism looked for support among petty-bourgeois and even bourgeois intellectuals, who did not mind using revolutionary phrases, but did not in their hearts want revolution, and feared it. It was this "free-thinking" intelligentsia that, according to Trotskyism, should have won the struggle against the Marxist-Leninist ideas of the revolutionary transformation of society, and against the principles of Bolshevism. But this bunch of petty-bourgeois intellectuals proved powerless in making any sort of impression on the course of historical events and their plans were defeated.

In 1918 the Trotskyites tried to touch the sensitive chords of another section of the petty bourgeoisie. Their calls for a "revolutionary war" were clearly directed at receiving support from the social strata motivated by the petty-bourgeois tendency towards "revolutionarism" and adventurism. Lenin emphasised that advocates of revolutionary wars reflected in that period the psychology of the frenzied petty bourgeois. This Trotskyite gamble also failed. The supporters of the idea of "pushing the revolution" proved incapable of turning the country from the high road of its historic development.

Finally, in the twenties, the Trotskyites tried to find support among those petty-bourgeois elements who opposed the socialist re-building of society. The Trotskyites' venture ended in complete defeat. They lost supporters even among the petty-bourgeois strata, who realised that in the Trotskyite programme there was no place for a consideration of their vitally important interests.

Present-day Trotskyites continue the policy of manoeuvring among various petty-bourgeois strata. This is being done with even more cynicism and lack of principle.

Without a thought for consistency, and quite unconcerned by the contradictions in their utterances, modern Trotskyites rely chiefly on the socially oppressed sections of the urban petty bourgeoisie, while simultaneously appealing now to peasants now to students. These they flatter by assuring them that they are the most revolutionary force of the present time.

At the same time Trotskyites continue to look for support among urban petty-bourgeois intellectuals with extrem-

ist inclinations. They hope to make use of their prejudices in connection with the strategic aims of the Communist parties, of their search for some sort of a "third way" in the development of society.

Recently Trotskyites have been trying hard to present themselves as "well-wishers" of various Left-wing radical organisations. They have even made a great deal of noise about their willingness to act "in a joint union and in co-operation" with these organisations.

Exposing the real motives of such declarations, the theoretical organ of the Communist Party of the USA had every ground to state: "When they speak of 'unity' with such organisations, what they have in mind is to penetrate, disrupt and destroy them."¹

All the political practices of Trotskyism, its manoeuvres among peasants and students, eloquently speak of how far it is from the needs and aspirations of peasants and young people. Trotskyites are filled with one desire—to make use of the weakness of the peasant and youth movement for the sake of their own shallow and selfish interests. Wherever they have appeared, they have done harm to the revolutionary struggle, and brought disorganisation and ideological confusion into the ranks of its participants.

With what can Trotskyism "arm" those peasants and students, if all it has is a choice of "Left" phrases masking its anti-revolutionary content?

Trotskyism is anti-revolution under the mask of "Left" phrases. For several decades now Trotskyites have shown how it is possible to support the revolution in words, while actually undermining and hindering its realisation.

Trotskyism is rather like the limpets that cling to the bottom of a ship and travel with it. Sometimes the limpets can even slow down the speed of the ship.

The Trotskyites have always tried to attach themselves to the organised revolutionary movement. Before 1917, pretending that they were revolutionaries, they spun intrigues within the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party. From 1917 to 1927, having assumed the guise of Bolsheviks, they acted within the Communist ranks in Russia and other countries. Having been expelled from these parties, the Trotsky-

¹ *Political Affairs*, No. 9-10, 1969, p. 52.

ites tried for a long time to speak in the name of the "opposition to the Comintern", which was not recognised by anybody, and in 1938 they formed their "International", proclaiming that it was the "International" of the "world party of the socialist revolution".

At each stage of this political mimicry, the Trotskyites strained every nerve to delay the development of the world revolutionary process.

At first this was apparent in their prophecies that the socialist revolution had no prospects in Russia, later in their opposition to the plan for building socialism in the Soviet Union, later still in their malicious attempts to slander the already existing socialist society and undermine the faith of the revolutionary fighters in the correctness of the strategy and tactics of the Communist Parties.

"The bible on their tongues, and malice in their hearts" used to be said earlier of hypocrites and pharisees, who disguised their wicked deeds and vile intentions by alleging that they were moved by the desire to defend the interests of their religion. This is more or less how the Trotskyites have behaved and behave now.

The Trotskyites accompany their disruptive actions in the international revolutionary movement with declarations that this is demanded ... by the interests of revolution. Whatever wrong the Trotskyites did—whether the creation of an anti-Bolshevik bloc in the pre-October period, the formation of factions in the Party in the twenties, anti-republican manoeuvres in the years of the Civil War in Spain, actual co-operation with the forces of fascism on the eve of the Second World War, or provocations in Peru between 1963 and 1966 and in France in 1968—each time anti-revolutionary activity was justified by the allegation that it was carried out to speed the revolution.

Present-day Trotskyites try to present themselves in their propaganda as "consistent followers of Marx". This trick has obviously been calculated to impress those who know little or nothing about the long-drawn-out struggle which Marxists-Leninists have waged and are waging against the Trotskyites, who are the confirmed enemies of the revolutionary cause.

In a sarcastic reference to Dühring, Engels wrote that if a boot-brush were listed in the same category as the mam-

mals this would not mean that it would grow lactic glands. The attempts to pose Trotskyites as Marxists are just as unsuccessful.

How can Trotskyites have anything to do with such an authentic revolutionary world outlook as Marxism-Leninism, when they have long since rejected the struggle against imperialism, and prefer to fight against the foremost revolutionary force of the present age—the Communist and Workers' parties, against the bulwark of the international revolutionary movement—the world socialist system? How can they consider themselves followers of Marxism, the scientific world outlook of the working class, when they ignore the interests of the proletariat and deny its leadership in the revolutionary struggle?

Trotskyism ignores the revolutionary capacities of the working class. Attitude to the working class—the greatest revolutionary force in history—has always been like a watershed, which has made it possible to distinguish between real and false revolutionaries.

The true revolutionary raises the proletariat up to class struggle, awakens its revolutionary energy, instils confidence in its forces, and, being himself always in the front ranks, shares with the proletariat the joy of victory and the bitterness of defeat.

The false revolutionary, at best, is only capable of paying lip-service to the vanguard role of the proletariat in the anti-imperialist struggle. In practice he is afraid of revolution, and arouses in the working class harmful and dangerous attitudes of distrust in its own strength and an over-estimation of the potential of the class enemy. He belittles successes in the revolutionary struggle, and gloats over misfortunes. His "Left-wing" phrases are intricately interwoven with defeatism.

Throughout its history Trotskyism, this typically false form of revolutionarism, has remained true to itself. Every time that the course of world class struggle demanded a concentration of forces from the proletariat, an enhancement of its organisation and unity, the Trotskyites came out with political assessments that demobilised and weakened the working class. They frightened people with the difficulties ahead and talked of inevitable defeat.

This was how they acted in the years when the most

important question was whether the working class of Russia would be capable of uniting the working masses around it and achieving the socialist revolution. This was the situation immediately after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, when the Trotskyites raised the scare that the working class would not be able to hold power. So it was in the twenties, when the Trotskyites were shouting about the political immaturity of the working class, and its inability to lead the working people of Russia to socialist transformation.

Present-day Trotskyites have gone even further in their malicious calumny of the working class. Having accused it of all the mortal sins, the "Fourth International" admits that they have not any noticeable links with the working class, and that they do not seek supporters in its ranks.

It is no accident that even among Trotskyites (they include some people who got there through misunderstanding or inexperience) voices are now being raised expressing doubt whether one can call himself a revolutionary if he demonstratively turns away from the working class. The discussion in Trotskyite propaganda publications on whether the "Fourth International" is not becoming "petty-bourgeois", also indicates what a complete political blind alley Trotskyism has got itself into.

Contemptuously assessing the revolutionary potential of the working class, Trotskyism naturally evinces hostility towards the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat and even propounds "theories" refuting its necessity.

Trotskyism stands for slander against the Bolshevik party spirit, denial of the significance of the revolutionary vanguard for the working class. Having arisen as a reaction of the petty-bourgeois opportunist elements to the birth of the revolutionary Marxist party in Russia, to the Leninist stage in the development of Marxism, Trotskyism has continually tried to discredit the Party, which is the fundamental weapon in the hands of the working class, its foremost, organised and militant contingent.

At first this showed itself when Trotsky opposed Lenin's ideas with his conception of the party as some sort of loose, amorphous organisation with doors wide open to opportunist elements. In all the pre-revolutionary years Trotsky's line was that the opportunist trend should ride high in the Party,

while the revolutionary, proletarian forces were to be squeezed out of the Party ranks. He propounded a corrupt "theory" on the coexistence of revolutionaries and opportunists, calling for an alliance of all groups and organisations, irrespective of what trend they belonged to.

Trotsky did not abandon these views even after joining the Bolshevik Party in July 1917. He, and those who were of one mind with him, clamoured for the right to existence of the most varied factions, so that the Party would, in effect, have become some sort of debating society.

Modern Trotskyites try to justify this position of Trotsky's. One of the leaders of the "Fourth International", M. Pablo, has alleged, for instance, that Lenin was not right in his views about the Party. He has alleged that the resolution of the 10th Congress of the RCP(B) on Party unity, which was proposed by Lenin, was the source of the Party's "degeneration".

Why did Mr. Pablo have to repeat absurdities of Trotsky's which have long since been disproved by reality? Obviously the purpose is to distort historical facts and make use of these falsifications as a weapon for contemporary political intrigue.

As in the past, the Trotskyites dream of the Communist parties falling apart into dozens of factions, and losing their identity. They consider that in such circumstances it would be easier for them to engage in their notorious policy of "entrism".

It is not accidental that another leader of modern Trotskyism, Posadas, who has opposed Pablo and his views vigorously on many points, shows a remarkable unanimity with him in falsifying events. He resorts to yet another dishonest device.

At about the same time as Pablo, he published an article in a British Trotskyite paper, in which he tried to prove his allegation that Lenin never spoke against anti-party factions and trends in the party. In their twisting of historical facts, the Trotskyites, as can be seen, are ready to turn to any lie in order to prove the necessity for the existence in the parties of factions, groups and cliques.

The present-day "Fourth International" goes much further in this respect than Trotsky did. While Trotsky clamoured for anarchistic laxity in the party, modern Trotskyites often

propagate views that are no different from an anarchistic rejection of the party as such, although they pretend that this is "criticism of the bureaucratic methods of the party" and an "attempt to place the party ahead of the masses".

The Trotskyites would very much like to resurrect a discussion that was settled long ago in the argument between revolutionary and opportunist trends. There is nothing new in their denial of the vanguard role of the party. There was something similar at the turn of the century in the solemn utterances of those who advocated waiting on events and defended adaptation to the level of backward elements who only took part in spontaneous revolutionary risings.

The answer to the opportunists who waited on events was given in the revolutionary theory and in the entire revolutionary practice of the twentieth century. Events justified Lenin's advice that the party could achieve success in the revolutionary struggle if it posed the problem as follows: "not to serve the working-class movement passively at each of its separate stages, but to represent the interests of the movement as a whole, to point out to this movement its ultimate aim and its political tasks, and to safeguard its political and ideological independence".¹

As far as the Trotskyites are concerned, it can be seen from Posadas' ideas that they are not averse to talking about the revolutionary vanguard. But they deprive this concept of any sort of meaning. Surely it is absurd to say that one is in favour of a vanguard, but not a vanguard that would be at the head of the masses?

"It is not enough to call ourselves the 'vanguard', the advanced contingent," wrote Lenin, "we must act in such a way that *all* the other contingents recognise and are obliged to admit that we are marching in the vanguard."² This is just how Communists have behaved and behave now, sparing no effort, and ready, if need be, to give their lives, marching always with the masses and at the head of the masses, pointing out the road to social liberation.

The scholastic Trotskyite reasoning is used in order to slander the Communist parties, and discredit them in the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 368.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 5, p. 426.

eyes of the masses. The Trotskyites expect to be understood first of all by those who are susceptible to petty-bourgeois attitudes of nihilism and anarchistic indiscipline. As in the past, the Trotskyites hope that the rust of anarchism will eat through the unity that they hate in the ranks of the anti-imperialist fighters.

It is obvious that, in opposing the Communist parties, the Trotskyites are attempting to torpedo the class struggle of the international proletariat, and to hinder the development of the revolution.

Trotskyism stands for the absence of any sort of socialist ideal. The anti-revolutionary essence of Trotskyism is also apparent in the fact that it talks about the liquidation of the capitalist system, while at the same time it tries to rob the participants in the revolutionary struggle of any clear idea of what they are fighting for. While the Communists say that the revolution is taking place for the sake of the building of a new, socialist society, the Trotskyites have nothing to say on this score that makes any sense.

Trotsky, who refused to admit any possibility of the victory of revolution in any separate country, considered questions concerning the creation of a new, socialist society academic and without any practical value. He waved aside such problems, thinking that they would become relevant only in some very distant future.

Events have refuted these ideas and one might think it is time for the Trotskyites to re-examine them.

However, Trotskyism has always fought shy of any objective and scientific criteria in the working out of its conceptions. It is least of all concerned that its "theory" should correspond to the actual course of social development. Trotskyism is intrinsically incapable of this, it is too deeply committed to anti-communism in interpreting the world processes that are going on.

The epistemological defect of Trotskyism is crude subjectivism and voluntarism, an unprincipled eclecticism. Dialectical materialism was always alien to Trotsky. Although he would say that he believed in it, he rejected the Marxist materialist world outlook in practice, and therefore inevitably found himself captivated by lifeless schemes and ideological wishful thinking whenever he tried to give his own interpretation to the laws of social development.

Trotskyism has never been capable of embracing and studying all sides of this or that social event, and perceiving it in development. It prefers to indulge in false theoretical reasoning on sophistic and metaphysical foundations.

For instance, if all progressive mankind has admitted that socialism has given a new direction to world development, the Trotskyites obstinately deny the influence of socialism on world history. Having stated that the socialism which has been built or is being built is "not socialism", they find themselves in the same company as the out-and-out anti-communists, the bourgeois apologists of capitalism. These have been slandering socialism and the Communist parties in the same key for a long time. But how can one expect Trotskyites to act in line with the materialist dialectic if they continually break the rules of elementary logic in their arguments? It is no accident that Lenin repeatedly described Trotsky's statements as "empty and meaningless exclamations", "an example of puffed-up phrases", "the most awful muddle of ideas", and said there was no sense in them.

In all these failures of logic, there was one characteristic regularity: Trotskyism became devoid of logic when it was necessary to give an objective assessment of the state of the revolutionary struggle, determine its motive forces, and outline the prospects. Trotskyite one-sidedness and inflexibility in knowing the real world give rise to false postulates and absurd deductions.

Whether the Trotskyites are in alliance with the bourgeois organisers of the anti-communist propaganda campaign, or with the Right opportunists, their words and deeds bear witness to the fact that Trotskyism has definitely taken its place "on the other side of the barricades". Describing the activities of Trotskyite and other pseudo-Left groups, the General Secretary of the French Communist Party, Waldeck Rochet, emphasised with good grounds, at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in June 1969, that these groups play "into the hands of reaction and imperialism, by conducting a provocative policy and never ceasing in their efforts to split the working-class and revolutionary movement, and the anti-imperialist forces".¹

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*, p. 116.

Encouraged by some growth in their ranks and by the support of bourgeois propaganda, the Trotskyites are now shouting that "the wind is blowing into their sails", and that they will "still show what they can do in the future".

But these words are mere bravado. It is said that only he who has understood the past can foretell the future. Both the past and the present of Trotskyism testify to the fact that it cannot have a future.

Trotskyism has existed for nearly seventy years. It has reached a considerable age. For a socio-political trend (and this is what Trotskyism claims to be, having noisily proclaimed itself a "world party") this is a sufficiently long period to test in practice the correctness of its conceptions and soberly assess its political potential and prospects.

Trotskyism has never created anything anywhere, never made any positive contribution. For many years it disappeared from the political scene altogether and its existence was known only to a few fact-grubbing historians.

Trotskyism only came to life at crucial moments in history, when broad non-proletarian masses took part in political events, and vital political problems were fought out in the struggle of proletarian ideology against petty-bourgeois and bourgeois ideology. As is well known, the Trotskyites were particularly active in their disruptive work during the period in Russia when a party of a new type was being created, and also in the years when young Soviet Russia was finding its path of development. Then, too, the Trotskyites imagined that they were in the ascendant.

There is no doubt that the present revival of Trotskyism is also due to a specific, transient combination of factors.

The final defeat of Trotskyism will come all the more quicker the more energetically it is shown up to be the servant of imperialist reaction. However weak Trotskyism may be, it is an enemy which has to be fought decisively and without compromise.

NOTES

* *The Zimmerwald Left group* was formed on Lenin's initiative at the International Socialist Conference in Zimmerwald in September 1915. It combated the Centrist conference majority. The Bolsheviks, the only ones to take a correct and consistently internationalist position, were the leading force in the Zimmerwald Left. The group became the rallying point for internationalist elements in the world Social-Democratic movement.

p. 46

** *Liquidators*—exponents of an opportunist trend that spread among the Menshevik Social-Democrats after the defeat of the 1905-07 Revolution. They demanded the dissolution of the illegal revolutionary working-class party and intended to establish a broad opportunist party which would engage only in the legal activity permitted by the tsarist government. Lenin and other Bolsheviks ceaselessly exposed this betrayal of the revolution by the liquidators. The policy of the liquidators was not supported by the workers. The Prague Conference of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (January 1912) expelled them from the Party.

Otzovists—an opportunist group which emerged among a section of the Bolsheviks in 1908. Under cover of revolutionary phrases they demanded the recall (the Russian word *otzvat* means recall) of the Social-Democratic members of the Third Duma. They also refused to work in legal organisations contending that the Party must confine itself exclusively to illegal activity. The otzovists did immense damage to the Party. Their policy would have isolated the Party from the masses and, in the end, would have turned it into a sectarian organisation.

Bund (General Jewish Workers' Union of Lithuania, Poland and Russia) was composed mainly of semi-proletarian elements. Was a vehicle of nationalism and separatism in the labour movement.

p. 47

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design.

Please send your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

The book analyses the substance of contemporary Trotskyism, reveals its social nature and theoretical irrelevance, and also the political harm it inflicts on the forces fighting for social progress. Drawing on extensive factual material, the author shows whom Trotskyism serves, how reactionary circles use it to the detriment of the world socialist system and the national liberation movement.

Mikhail Basmanov, C. Sc. (Hist.), is the author of topical works on history, some of which were translated into other European languages.



Imported by
**IMPORTED
PUBLICATIONS, INC.**
320 West Ohio Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610
Phone 312/787-9017