

207

1.00

theories
and
critical
studies



progress



A.I. SOBOLEV

**Trotskyism—
the Enemy
of Revolution**

**theories
and
critical
studies**



progress

A. I. SOBOLEV

Trotskyism— the Enemy of Revolution



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian by *Ken Russell*

А. И. СОБОЛЕВ

ТРОЦКИЗМ—ВРАГ РЕВОЛЮЦИИ

На английском языке

First printing 1974

© Политиздат. Москва 1973

© Translation into English. Progress Publishers 1974

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

0303-473
14(01)-74 103-74

CONTENTS

Introduction	
I. Modern Trotskyism—a Weapon of Anti-Communism	
II. The Concept of Betrayal of the Revolution	
III. Trotskyists in Permanent Struggle Against Revolution	

INTRODUCTION

With every new stage in world development the great historical struggle between democracy and reaction, freedom and violence, socialism and capitalism becomes ever more varied in its social content, historic significance and the forms it takes on. In the second half of the 20th century it has acquired a universal, global nature. This struggle has embraced all spheres of class relations and all socio-economic, political, ideological, cultural, moral and ethical aspects of social life. All countries and nations, all classes and social groups, all political and public organisations are involved in the struggle directly or indirectly.

The decisive historical trend is that the forces of democracy, revolution and socialism are growing stronger and stronger. They are gaining new ground, penetrating ever wider areas of social life and winning over more and more working people. On the other hand, the forces of aggression, reaction and imperialism are on the decline and are fast losing their social, economic and political positions, their vitality, authority and influence among the masses.

One of the main phases in the general crisis of capitalism began in the second half of the 20th century.

This phase is marked by closely interwoven processes which express both the quantitative factors in the decay

of capitalism and qualitatively new phenomena, which bear witness to the internal weakening of the very system of state-monopoly capitalism.

Firstly, the scope of capitalist influence is becoming narrower. More newly independent countries are rejecting capitalism, and the number of countries with a socialist orientation is constantly growing.

Secondly, capitalism is suffering one defeat after another in the world-wide competition with the socialist system. Capitalism has proved incapable of answering the historical and social challenge of socialism and has lost the initiative. The historical initiative has now passed once and for all to the international working class and its main creation—world socialism.

Thirdly, capitalism has been unable to solve the most important problems of the age. They have been brought about by the demands of social progress, by the scientific and technological revolution and by the population explosion.

Fourthly, at the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism all its old contradictions have intensified and have assumed ever more painful forms. The contradiction between labour and capital, the growth of the tension and the increasingly mass character of class battles, and the deepening of their social and political significance are a concentrated expression of this process.

The appearance of fresh bitter contradictions is an important indication of the deepening crisis of capitalism. The most important of these are: the discrepancy between the scientific and technological revolution and the conservative and anarchical forms in which it is developing; between the objectively conditioned trend towards production planning on a national scale and the absence of planning and the competitive struggle among the monopolies. A particularly bitter contradiction is the clash between the geographical environment and the monopolies' use of science and technology to boost profits.

The conflict between productive forces and capitalist production relations and the crisis in the economic struc-

ture of imperialist society are evolving at a time when production is developing much more rapidly than it was at the beginning of the century (although sporadically punctuated by slumps). The growth rate, nevertheless, is still far below that of the world system of socialism. This shows that, thanks to the scientific and technological revolution, there is at the present time a vast potential for speeding up production and, consequently, for solving many urgent social problems. But capitalism is unable to use this potential to the full.

The deepening of the crisis that has developed over the political basis for the rule of the monopoly bourgeoisie takes place in the deceptive form of the normal functioning of the parliamentary system, which appears to work when viewed from outside.

The disintegration of the moral and ethical foundations of capitalist society, the downgrading of morality, the cult of violence, the stupendous increase in criminal activity and the strengthening of the process of alienation are happening in the midst of scientific and technological progress, a certain improvement that the masses have gained in material and cultural living conditions, and a relatively broad expansion in the flow of information and knowledge.

While bourgeois culture declines and assumes ever more involved and distorted forms, the educational level in the main capitalist countries continues to rise.

A scientific analysis of these processes, trends and phenomena produces the following vitally important conclusion. Such social development as takes place under state-monopoly capitalism occurs not as a result of, but despite, its reactionary nature. It has to be fought for, and every step forward is a breach in capitalism's defences. These advances result from the demands made by objectively developing material production, the revolutionary blows struck by science and technology and the economic and political struggle of the masses.

All this shows the growing need for a qualitative leap from capitalism to socialism and the vital necessity of the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society. The whole course of the objective development of capital-

ist society has paved the way for the socialist revolution.

The further intensification of the class struggle and the transition of the working class and its allies to actual revolutionary transformation are directly dependent on the subjective factor—the maturity and readiness of the political army of the revolution.

The principal driving force of the revolution is the working class. It grows in numbers and matures politically in the course of fierce class battles in all their forms. It becomes ever more steeled ideologically. The working class heads all anti-imperialist and revolutionary forces and deals increasingly powerful blows against the monopoly bourgeoisie. Constant shifts in the alignment of class forces are taking place in the capitalist countries as a result of working-class action, and the position of those who fight for peace, democracy and socialism is being consolidated.

The guiding, organising and directing role in these class battles belongs to the communist movement, which is the most influential, the most supported and the most organised and active political force in modern times. It stands in the vanguard of the social progress of mankind.

However, while noting the growth in political awareness and the militant organisation of the working class, one should realise that it also contains sections that are less aware and less organised. This is particularly true of the section consisting of those who only recently joined the ranks of the workers. What is more, different groups in the working class have different ideological leanings, while some have not yet determined their ideological and political sympathies. Greater differentiation in ideological and political outlook is to be seen among non-proletarian sections of the working people, the middle strata.

The monopoly bourgeoisie makes use of all this in order to forestall the preparation of the subjective factor in revolution, to prevent unity of action by the working class and hinder the formation of an alliance of Left forces and the creation of a mass anti-imperialist bloc. The struggle for the masses lies at the centre of the decisive

clash between the forces of freedom and violence, democracy and reaction, revolution and counter-revolution.

Faced with action on all sides by the world system of socialism, feeling its loss of historical initiative and subjected to the pressure of the working class and all revolutionary, liberation and patriotic forces, the monopoly bourgeoisie has built up an elaborate and fairly flexible mechanism for self-preservation. It is based on the economic strength of the monopolies, the state apparatus, the mass media, open suppression of the working people coupled with real concessions, social demagoguery and the blatant bribery of waverers, political intrigue and brainwashing.

As they develop their struggle for the masses, Communist Parties are strengthened by the experience and successes of socialism and are guided by Marxist-Leninist theory. They aim to paralyse the influence of the bourgeoisie's mechanism of self-preservation and to bring ever broader masses of the working people to an understanding of the tasks, forms and means of securing peace, democracy and freedom, and of transition to socialism.

The communist vanguard is striving to involve the masses in promoting revolutionary transformation. In this great battle and the struggle to unite all anti-imperialist and anti-monopolist forces the Communist Parties have to overcome not only enormous pressure from bourgeois ideology and policies, but also the subversive influence of reformism, theoretical revisionism and all kinds of political opportunism. The struggle against all shades of opportunism is absolutely essential for raising the fighting capacity of the communist movement itself and the unity of its ranks.

Modern revisionism is a phenomenon that is highly complex as regards its social sources, theoretical arguments and organisational forms. In the workers' movement one can find Right-wing revisionists, "Left"-wing revisionists, nationalists, Maoists, etc. But although there is a whole number of revisionist trends, schools and groups, they all have as their common denominator

a denial of the international significance of Marxism-Leninism, a denial of the dialectic of international and national, and rabid anti-Sovietism and anti-communism.

Considerable harm is also done to the revolutionary transforming activities of the working class and all working people by various groups of political intriguers which are trying to edge their way into the workers' and national liberation movement. They sap the strength of revolution and also exploit the successes of the revolutionary struggle of the masses, the failure in revolutionary battles and the defeats of the workers' and liberation movement. They include the various kinds of ultra-Leftist revolutionism and adventurist extremism, including Maoism, Trotskyism, etc.

Performing their historic duty and role as the vanguard, the Communist Parties are locked in an all-out and unwavering struggle with Right and "Left" revisionism, Maoism and Trotskyism in order to uphold proletarian class principles in the anti-monopolist battle, a consistent revolutionary line, the purity of Marxism-Leninism and its creative development. They are defending the principles proclaimed by Lenin, who repeatedly stressed that "opportunism is no chance occurrence, sin, slip, or treachery on the part of individuals, but a social product of an entire period of history".*

The Communist Parties analyse the social, historical, gnosiological and political origins, causes and sources of the appearance, activation and diffusion of contemporary opportunism as a whole and its separate tendencies. They also scientifically determine the ways, forms and methods for eliminating their influence among the working people.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union contributes greatly to the struggle for the purity and creative development of Marxism-Leninism and for the pursuance of a consistent proletarian line in the revolutionary move-

* V. I. Lenin, "The Collapse of the Second International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 247.

ment. The CPSU is an equal among equals, but, owing to its accumulated experience, theoretical achievements and the historic role being played by the Soviet people under its guidance, it bears the greatest responsibility for the cause of peace, democracy and national independence, for the victory of revolution and socialism and for the future of the peoples and human civilisation. The CPSU continues to struggle relentlessly against all revisionist and opportunist tendencies in the working-class and communist movement by creatively developing Marxism-Leninism and remaining true to the principles of proletarian internationalism.

I. MODERN TROTSKYISM — A WEAPON OF ANTI-COMMUNISM

The powerful and violent whirlpool of social events sees the appearance and disappearance of many different political trends which in one way or another reflect the complex process whereby all democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist forces become steadily more active.

Trotskyism is one of the specific political phenomena of contemporary social life.

It is well known that the principled stand of the CPSU and the whole international communist movement caused Trotskyism as a political force to suffer a crushing ideological and political defeat. It was ousted from the workers' as well as the communist movement. Trotskyism, in fact, became a political corpse, and Trotskyist organisations were reduced to being collections of people constantly squabbling among themselves.

Since the mid-sixties, however, Trotskyism has shown some signs of making a come-back. Trotskyist organisations have stirred and are becoming active in the field. An increase in their activity has been observed in France, Britain, Belgium, the USA, the Federal Republic of Germany and Latin America. There has been a resurgence of the activities of the Fourth International, although it is in some disarray. The quantity of material published by Trotskyists has recently increased significantly. The Trotskyists have launched a loud and noisy campaign to put their views across. A political trend known as "modern Trotskyism" has made its appearance.

Basically, modern Trotskyists continue to support and propagate the ideas of Trotsky, so that it is fully justifiable to say that modern Trotskyism is a latter-day continuation of Trotskyist activity. However, it is very difficult and sometimes impossible to apply Trotsky's propositions fully in the new historical situation. That is why Trotsky's views as expressed in the works of modern Trotskyists have undergone considerable modification. In some instances it even occurs to one that the modern Trotskyists hold views on a number of issues that are completely at variance with those of Trotsky. What is more, some Fourth International theoreticians state that in some respects Trotsky's views have aged and are in need of revision. Such attempts to revise Trotsky's opinions are indeed being made, but only from a Trotskyist standpoint. As a result, the non-initiated may form the impression that they are dealing with a new, renovated ideological and political trend. The term "neo-Trotskyism" sometimes used in the press may have done something to encourage such mistaken notions.

In fact, in its social origins, methodology and, above all, its political orientation and role in the workers' movement modern Trotskyism is a continuation of the theory, tactics and policies of traditional Trotskyism. Today's Trotskyists are the ideological heirs of Trotsky. The changes that have taken place in the policies and tactics of the modern Trotskyists are merely attempts to adapt Trotsky's ideas to new circumstances in order to achieve the aims that Trotsky once set himself. It follows that there is no such thing as a "new stage" in the evolution of Trotskyism.

Trotskyism is outside the communist movement, but through its ultra-Leftist revolutionism it tries to influence the policies of Communist Parties. A scientific analysis of the social roots and ideological sources of Trotskyism is of paramount importance in the present-day political and ideological struggle, in work with the masses and in shaping the correct political line for democratic organisations.

The recent Trotskyist revival should be viewed as the outcome of the many complex and sometimes contradicto-

ry tendencies that determine the course of history. It would be wrong to look for any single cause for the resurgence of Trotskyist activities. Modern Trotskyism has been brought back to life in the context of the drastically intensifying contradictions of the capitalist mode of production and the deepening of the crisis of the economic, social, political, ideological and moral bases. This crisis is causing the most varied social strata to hate the system of exploitation more and more. It prompts them towards political activity and in many cases drives them to disorganised rioting.

The monopoly bourgeoisie is well aware of the danger that is latent in the constantly growing indignation of ever wider sections of the working people. It is trying to assemble a self-preservation mechanism from a vast range of political, economic, social and ideological measures.

The main self-preservation device consists of social and economic juggling and rhetoric. The monopoly bourgeoisie is striving to perfect its social and economic system, hoping to maintain its economic and political position on the one hand, while making some concessions to the working class and all the working people on the other. Bourgeois politicians and economists are busy adopting measures to camouflage and tone down the worst features of capitalism. Capitalism seeks to adapt to present circumstances and answer the three great challenges posed by the world of today: the socialist mode of production, which embodies a historically progressive trend in social development; the scientific and technological revolution, which marks a progressive, revolutionary stage in the development of productive forces; and the working class, which personifies the revolutionary line of social development, the line that will eventually lead to the overthrow of capitalism.

It is rightly pointed out in Marxist publications that all the attempts by the monopolists to deal with these challenges ultimately only deepen the contradictions in capitalism. However, over the last quarter of a century the monopoly bourgeoisie of the developed capitalist countries has employed very involved and subtle social, political

and ideological tactics and has managed to find a temporary way out of its difficulties. It has delayed the resolution of the contradictions, which can only ultimately be brought about by revolutionary means. The monopolists have been able to hang on to their domination and their economic position, ensure the growth of production and profits and forestall the onslaught of the forces of revolution. Bourgeois ideologists endeavour to present capitalism to the masses as a renewed, improved and reformed social phenomenon.

Nevertheless, the monopolists' economic manoeuvres, political concessions and brainwashing of the masses are of little help to them in their drive to maintain their position. In the mid-sixties the tendency towards crisis point in imperialist contradictions and a rise in revolutionary activity became clearly apparent. Recent years have seen a wave of strikes in Italy, a bitter national conflict between the working people of France and their ruling élite (May-June 1968), the strikes of 1968 in Japan, increasing strike action in Britain, the FRG and the Scandinavian countries, and the growing acuteness of the social, racial and political conflict in the USA. All these symptoms point to capitalism's growing internal instability. The documents of many Communist Parties indicate that a clear outline of a future revolutionary upsurge is beginning to emerge.

In this situation the question of the masses is of crucial importance. An intensive campaign is under way in the capitalist countries to enlist the support of the masses. The rising level of class antagonism testifies to the growing difficulty that the monopoly bourgeoisie is having in keeping the masses under its ideological influence. The tendency for the masses to switch to a revolutionary position is becoming more and more pronounced. The monopoly bourgeoisie is forced to look round for fresh ways and means of preventing the onward march of the masses towards revolution.

For many years the Social-Democratic Right wing was the main political force that helped the monopoly bourgeoisie to hold broad sections of the working people in check. Social-reformism still remains an important con-

tingency reserve for the monopoly bourgeoisie. But at the modern stage social-reformist illusions are totally inadequate. Hatred for the fundamentals of capitalist society and revolutionary sentiments are inspiring more and more working people—the middle strata, the intelligentsia, the student body and the peasantry. Pseudo-revolutionaries provide an effective means of halting the growth of the danger of revolution and preventing a revolutionary explosion. Various Left-wing extremist groups—Maoists, anarchists and Trotskyists—were a real windfall for the bourgeoisie. The monopoly bourgeoisie has made use of the revolutionary phrases of Left-wing extremists in order to divert the revolutionary potential of the working people on to a false track. By simply juggling with revolutionary phrases and slogans, the leaders of these groupings hardly pose any threat at all to the fundamentals of the capitalist mode of production. The social function and historical role of the Left-wing extremists are to mouth calls for revolution, while actually hindering its development.

Yet this does not mean, as some investigators maintain, that the monopoly bourgeoisie artificially creates ultra-revolutionary tendencies. Leftist revolutionism arose spontaneously, within the democratic, national liberation and even workers' movements. Its social, political and gnosiological origins are varied and highly contradictory. It is engendered by the difficulties of developing the revolutionary process and by the complexity of preparing and carrying out socialist revolution.

Pseudo-revolutionism arises independently of the monopoly bourgeoisie. But the monopoly bourgeoisie uses and even incites pseudo-revolutionary organisations to action. Thus, the flood of Trotskyist publications in the capitalist countries is so vast and so unrelated to the actual membership of Trotskyist organisations and their material resources that one is led to suppose that the Trotskyists are in some way assisted to disseminate their views. Numerous works by Trotsky and his followers are in fact printed today in various bourgeois, liberal and semi-liberal newspapers, magazines and publishing houses.

The Trotskyists to a certain extent reflect spontaneous, subconscious rebellious feelings and views in the urban middle strata, the intelligentsia and, especially, the student body. Since spontaneous protest against the fundamentals of the capitalist system is not a topic that many politically inexperienced fighters usually have a good theoretical grasp of, Trotskyists try to impose on them their distorted ideological and political notions. At the same time Trotskyism both feeds on this spontaneous petty-bourgeois revolutionism and strengthens it by its political acts and appeals.

The revival of modern Trotskyism should also be seen against the background of the unevenness in the ripening of the objective and subjective conditions for revolution, and the difficulties in which the world revolutionary process is developing. In a situation in which spontaneous revolutionary feeling is growing rapidly, while the revolutionary movement in the main capitalist countries is making relatively slow headway, the politically unstable strata of the population wish to speed up events artificially. Trotskyists reflect this revolutionary impatience, reinforce it and endeavour to push certain social strata into adventurist acts. They offer far-fetched recipes for an accelerated development of revolution and various methods for artificially spurring on the revolutionary process. They call for immediate "revolutionary" action. In the enormous mass of non-proletarians among the working people engaged in direct political activity there are some who respond to these Trotskyist appeals.

The Trotskyist revival must also be considered in the light of the crisis that a number of Left-radical organisations are undergoing. It is well known, for example, that "new Left" political organisations flourished in the early sixties. However, as the political struggle developed, the inadequacy of the Lefts' theoretical position started to become apparent, as well as its lack of positive objectives, its preoccupation with destructive acts, its lack of confidence in the future and profound pessimism.

There was disenchantment among the intelligentsia and students with the various theories and political conceptions of many Left-wing groups. The ideas of such

“new Left” ideologists as Marcuse no longer enjoy the popularity which once created the illusion that they would become the ideological banner of the Left-extremist movement. The “new Left” organisations are going through a grave crisis. Other radical Left-wing trends and groups have displayed signs of crisis too.

The scope of the non-proletarian workers’ movement, their political immaturity and the enormous burden of their private ownership ideology and psychology make it difficult to spread genuinely revolutionary and scientifically substantiated ideas among them. To combine the democratic movement with Marxism-Leninism is a very difficult and complex process, requiring vast effort and a long period of time.

The Trotskyists try to make use of the crisis in the other Left-radical trends and the difficulties involved in bringing broad strata of the working people to adopt the cause of the working class. They take every opportunity of displaying their ideological wares in vast abundance and in suitably lurid ultra-revolutionary wrapping, claiming that they are the most effective weapons in the struggle with the bourgeoisie. Trotskyists live on mistaken notions about the aims, forms and methods of struggle that are appropriate to the non-proletarian strata of the working people.

The Trotskyist revival was greatly assisted by the divisive activity within the international communist movement perpetrated by the leadership of the Communist Party of China (CPC) under Mao Tse-tung. As is generally known, the Maoists set out to establish their ideological and political hegemony in the early sixties. In some countries they did serious damage to communist organisations. The Maoists managed to establish their influence over several Communist Parties, a split was caused in some and ultra-Leftist sentiments were strengthened in other parties. Maoist organisations sprang up in almost every capitalist country. Maoist publications spread throughout Belgium, Switzerland and Italy. All this was directed at weakening the fighting capacity of the Communists. Welcoming the divisive action of the CPC, Trotskyists sought to amass political capital from the

difficulties that resulted in the communist movement. Following principled criticism of the ideological and political conceptions of Maoism by Communist Parties and thanks to consistent struggle against the divisive activities of the CPC, the Maoist groups and organisations that were operating in many countries were faced by crisis. The Trotskyists hastened to make use of the crisis to extend their influence and position.

The harm that Trotskyists inflict on the workers' and national liberation movement and the need for increased work among and for the masses give rise to the necessity of intensifying the ideological and political struggle against Trotskyism.

Naturally, it would be wrong to exaggerate the danger of Trotskyism. Careful study of the theory and practice of Trotskyism and an analysis of the attitude towards it of various strata of the working people lead one to conclude that the revival of Trotskyism is only temporary and that the tendency is being torn apart by internal contradictions and cannot survive.

Above all, Trotskyism has no lasting and stable social support. Trotskyists persist in imagining themselves as the political organisation of the working class and are making an all-out effort to worm their way into the worker's world. But the working class of not a single country has accepted the Trotskyists as their political representatives. Nowhere have the Trotskyists succeeded in attracting even a small section of the working class. They are feverishly seeking support among the student body, the radical sections of the intelligentsia and the impoverished urban middle strata. Here and there they manage to sink their roots for a time, but even in these strata Trotskyism has been unable to attract a following of any significant proportions. Very often people who have allowed themselves to be carried away by Trotskyist rhetoric become disenchanted and then begin to see the truth.

An important indication of the weakness of Trotskyism is its inability to put together a coherent ideological and political platform. The Trotskyist trend is relatively limited in numbers and influence and comprises numerous

groups that constantly accuse one another of dogmatism, revisionism, betrayal and so on.

Hand in hand with the ideological and political crisis goes the organisational disarray both in the Fourth International itself and in the national Trotskyist organisations. In fact, as a single international organisation the Fourth International hardly exists. It broke up during the fifties and sixties. At least four organisations are active at present, all claiming to represent the Fourth International: the International Committee of the Fourth International, based in London, the International Secretariat of the Fourth International in Paris, the Joint Secretariat of the Fourth International, or the Marxist-Leninist tendency in the Fourth International (the group favours a more flexible and subtle updating of Trotsky's views) and the Latin American Secretariat of the Fourth International, in which the majority of Latin America's Trotskyists and a number of Trotskyist groups in Europe are represented.

In recent years the appeal has been repeatedly voiced to end the organisational split between the Trotskyist organisations and to create a renewed Fourth International. Several attempts were made to amalgamate the international Trotskyist groups, but they only produced further dissension and deepened the division between the different groups.

Ideological and political discord has also gripped the national organisations. In a single country there are usually from four to six Trotskyist organisations and groups, all warring with one another. Trotskyist organisations form and fall apart or unite and then split up again. They are in a state of organisational chaos.

Trotskyism's cosmopolitan nature contributes heavily to its weakness. The Trotskyists have been unable to attach themselves to a single national contingent of the working class. This suits the bourgeois politicians admirably. Noisy revolutionaries who lack national roots and the support of a real national working class are always powerless. For a certain time their national rootlessness allowed the Trotskyists to juggle with appeals for world revolution, and this militant revolutionism tempted some

individuals. With time, however, and under pressure from the harsh laws of the class struggle, the cosmopolitan emptiness of these noisy calls became apparent. It was clear that the Trotskyists were isolated from real revolutionary forces, which always appear, mature and struggle within national frameworks.

Other facts can also be adduced to show that Trotskyism is politically weak and historically foredoomed. Nevertheless, Communists cannot just sit back and wait for its ideology and policies to collapse. Trotskyism will not leave the historical stage voluntarily. As experience has shown, any underestimation of the ideological battle with Trotskyism and, even more so, any weakening of the struggle are signals to the Trotskyists to step up their subversive campaign. Communists in the USA and some other countries considered at one time that Trotskyism was less dangerous than other Left-radical trends. They concentrated on the struggle against these Left-extremist groupings. Their successes on a number of occasions were used by the Trotskyists. Bad tactics also produced unfortunate results. Communists and other representatives of Left forces would retire from organisations that had been infiltrated by Trotskyists, whereupon the latter would seize control of these organisations and use them as a cover for their subversive activities.

The need for action is also shown by the fact that modern Trotskyism reflects and expresses, albeit in a distorted form, the views and prejudices of those social strata which, though not acknowledging socialism that actually exists, nevertheless reject the policies of the monopoly bourgeoisie and long to overthrow the monopolies. By exploiting the spontaneous revolutionary spirit of these strata and their inability to fight independently, the Trotskyists are hindering them from undertaking conscious revolutionary action. Trotskyists worm their way into the confidence of these strata, flirt with them and try to impose themselves on them as guides and leaders.

The Trotskyists are most active in the youth movement. More and more young people, including the students, are coming to recognise the futility of the capitalist mode of

production, the acuteness of its contradictions, the incorrigibility of its vices and the necessity of destroying it. These young people are ready for battle. They imagine that revolutionary enthusiasm alone is sufficient to overthrow the rule of the monopolies. The Trotskyists endeavour to take advantage of these feelings. They call upon the young people to take up arms immediately, fight on the barricades and storm government offices. In a number of countries some young people succumbed and organised a few large-scale demonstrations. But they were no more than effusive outbursts. The revolutionary energy, not buttressed by revolutionary awareness, was quickly spent. A period of disenchantment, uncertainty and apathy set in, and these sections of the young people virtually abandoned revolutionary activity.

These defeats were said by the Trotskyists to be due not to an unfavourable correlation of forces and their own miscalculations but to a "communist betrayal" and "the apathy of integrated workers". In a number of instances the Trotskyists managed to amass political capital out of this. Trotskyist influence is still strong among the young people and in youth organisations. The Trotskyists are relying on young people, who remain their principal political card.

All these facts combine to show that the struggle for peace, democracy, revolution and socialism and the task of winning over the masses require an intensified anti-Trotskyist campaign with no slackening of effort. Only the correct political line of the Communist Parties, the masses' own experience and the scientifically substantiated exposure of the flimsiness of the Trotskyists' ideological and political conceptions will enable their parasitical hold over some strata of the working people to be broken and condemn these Leftist adventurers to complete disintegration. Symptoms of this can already be seen.

In order to comprehend the tenacity of Trotskyism and to devise more effective measures against those who propagate it, it is also necessary to be familiar with their political activity, tactics and the forms and methods of their penetration into mass organisations.

Modern Trotskyism is an example of unscrupulousness, dishonest political demagogy and provocative action. Duplicity, revolutionary phrases but anti-revolutionary deeds, loud calls for struggle against imperialism and subversion of the struggle of the masses from within—this is the essence of Trotskyist conduct and tactics.

Modern Trotskyism is the complete opposite of Leninism. It is the bitterest opponent of Leninist theory and practice. Trotskyism is hostile to Leninism owing to its theoretical, political and methodological fundamentals. However, the Trotskyists conceal their anti-Leninist nature through persistent hypocritical protestations of loyalty to Lenin. Trotskyists do not simply revise Lenin, as some writers maintain, but fill Lenin's propositions with a Trotskyist content or, worse still, attribute some of Trotsky's statements to Lenin. Trotsky is declared to be Lenin's comrade-in-arms, his faithful disciple and even the only continuer of his cause. Trotskyists consign to oblivion the whole of Lenin's long, principled and resolute struggle against Trotsky, his theoretical views and subversive activity. On the other hand, the Trotskyists highlight those passages in Lenin's works where he expresses his efforts to involve Trotsky in the general cause of the revolution when the latter declared himself to be in agreement with Bolshevism and joined the Party in 1917. Trotskyists direct a good deal of verbiage against revisionists. All this is done in order to depict Trotskyism as a development of Leninist thought.

The modern Trotskyists are monstrously violating history and the facts on the assumption that most members of the anti-imperialist movement, especially the younger ones, are unacquainted with the details of the ideological and political battles that were fought to establish and consolidate the Communist Party in the USSR. They also assume that these people do not know who stood in the way of the formation and welding of Bolshevism and how Trotsky disfigured the cause of Leninism after the death of its founder. Together with bourgeois ideologists, modern Trotskyists try to represent Trotsky as a fighter for revolution who fell victim to the cult of the personality. Aided by the bourgeoisie's

vast propaganda set-up, they have managed to spread this impression throughout the capitalist world.

Trotskyists are doing all they can to enshrine Trotsky as a revolutionary and portray themselves as real (indeed, the only) masters of modern revolution. Everywhere they proclaim revolutionary slogans and call irresponsibly for direct action and armed risings without bothering to see whether the objective and subjective conditions for them exist. They are adept at exploiting the burning problems of the age. In some countries they have slithered into strike campaigns. Here and there they were active at meetings in support of Vietnam. They have tried to take over the peasant movement in some countries, while in others they are attempting to organise various kinds of armed revolt.

This current Trotskyist activity has a very definite purpose. In order to undermine and divide the forces of the anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly movement, the Trotskyists are trying to give the exploited the impression that only they are defending the interests of the working people and thinking in terms of revolution. They are endeavouring to pressure the inexperienced, young and wavering sections of the liberation movement into believing that one can be a genuine revolutionary without being a Communist.

An indissoluble link has always existed between the concepts of Communist and revolutionary. This unity was given its supreme embodiment in the victorious battles of the Great October Socialist Revolution and in subsequent revolutionary battles. It contains a powerful explosive force directed against capitalism. Modern Trotskyists are making strenuous efforts to dissipate this unity. They wish to be revolutionaries and anti-Communists at the same time.

All the supporters of the capitalist system and all the conservative, liberal, reformist and divisive forces have welcomed this stand and are doing everything possible to bolster and spread it. They know full well that a revolutionary spirit without communism is futile, doomed and insubstantial and poses no threat to the fundamentals of capitalist society.

II. THE CONCEPT OF BETRAYAL OF THE REVOLUTION

Trotskyism with its kernel—the theory of permanent revolution—arose as a political trend hostile to Marxism and the cause of revolution at the beginning of the 20th century. That was the time when the most important features of its policies, theory and tactics took shape. As a collection of theoretical views and political concepts that were hostile to Leninism, Trotskyism was at its height during the period of the October Revolution, the Civil War and the years of socialist construction.

The following are typical of Trotskyism: the subjective and idealistic basis of its theory and practice, adventurism and voluntarism in politics, double-dealing and cynicism, unscrupulousness and Machiavellianism, betrayals and overnight defections. All this is considered to be the norm in political conduct. In 1914 Lenin commented: "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, and desert one side for the other."*

As a political tendency, Trotskyism has always been hostile to Leninism. It adopted opposite positions on all the major questions of revolutionary struggle and socialist construction. But in order to appreciate the cunning and cynicism of both Trotsky and his present-day followers,

* V. I. Lenin, "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, pp. 447-48.

one must bear in mind that the forms taken by the struggle constantly changed and are still changing owing to the need to adapt to changing historical circumstances.

At the beginning of the 20th century, when Trotsky was aiming to become the leader of the workers' movement in Russia, he engaged in an open and spiteful struggle against Lenin and Leninism, was constantly busy with intrigue and created various anti-Bolshevik blocs. Trotsky declared that the struggle against Leninism formed the backbone of his political activities, yet strove to conceal his hostile attitude to Lenin and Leninism by means of various theoretical arguments. He asserted that Lenin's theory of revolution, especially his propositions concerning the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, merely held back the proletariat and hindered its struggle for power. In 1910 Trotsky promised a "great fight" against Lenin and claimed that Lenin would "perish" in it. In 1913 Trotsky maliciously and cynically declared in a letter to Chkheidze that the whole Leninist edifice was then founded on lies and falsification and contained within itself the venomous beginnings of its own decay. Similar facts, and there are many of them, unmask the assertions of bourgeois writers and modern Trotskyists to the effect that Trotsky was one of the founder-members of the Bolshevik Party and that his disagreements with Lenin were of a private nature.

Certain traits of Trotsky's political character were clearly revealed at that time, e.g., his predilection for camouflaging Right-wing opportunist positions with Left-sounding phrases. Lenin observed more than once that Trotsky was a man of Left-wing phrases and Right-wing alliances. In 1917 he wrote of Trotsky: "Always true to himself = twists, swindles, poses as a Left, *helps* the Right, so long as he can..."*

Subsequently double-dealing and hypocrisy, revolutionary clamour and reactionary deeds became the main features of Trotsky's activities.

* V. I. Lenin, "Letter to Inessa Armand, February 19, 1917", *Collected Works*, Vol. 35, p. 288.

Prior to the October Revolution and even more so when it was actually taking place, Trotsky's attitude towards Bolshevism underwent a sudden change—outwardly, at least. In fact, though, Trotsky was simply changing his tactics in the struggle against Leninism. For some time after his return from exile he tried to maintain his position in the hope of becoming one of the leaders of the workers' movement in Russia. When the "United Social-Democrats" (Trotsky's group) were invited in May 1917 to take part in preparing the forthcoming Party congress and to outline revolutionary measures that would promote amalgamation, Trotsky had the arrogance to reply that the Bolsheviks had ceased to be Bolsheviks and he was unable to call himself a Bolshevik.

Trotsky continued to dream of having his own, independent organisation. The tremendous growth of the Bolsheviks' influence among the proletarian masses, the soldiers and working peasants showed, though, that his ambitious schemes were bound to be fruitless.

Under pressure from historical necessity and the many members of his own group who had adopted a genuinely revolutionary position and had recognised that Leninism was the true course, Trotsky joined the Bolshevik Party in July 1917. But, as history was to show, he entered the Leninist Party not in order to collaborate sincerely and honourably, but simply for the purpose of carrying on the struggle inside the Party and imposing his own views on it. This is the origin of the strategy of "entrism", to which modern Trotskyists still cling tenaciously. From that time onwards Trotsky continued to propagate his views, but camouflaged them in general phrases on Leninism and declarations of loyalty to Leninism.

The essence of Trotsky's political sabotage was soon discovered. During the difficult years when Soviet rule was being established he organised a number of discussions that were very burdensome to the Party. Trotsky attempted to foist on to the Party his Left-adventurist way of tackling the main domestic and foreign policy issues. Trotsky's anti-Leninist campaign reached its peak during Lenin's illness and after his death.

During the discussions Trotsky tried to humiliate Lenin and to represent his own theories as being the only correct ones. He asserted that Lenin's experience and intuition were those of a revolutionary; he denied the originality of Lenin's contribution to Marxist thought and would not accept Leninism as a revolutionary theory. In his pamphlet *A New Course* Trotsky defined Leninism as a system of revolutionary action that presupposed a feeling for revolution nurtured by reflection and experience, which in the social sphere meant the same as muscular sensation in physical labour.

At the same time Trotsky started to maintain that there were two forms of Leninism: an "old", "impracticable", "pre-war" Leninism and a new, post-war Leninism. This post-war Leninism had resulted, in Trotsky's view, from a rejection of the fundamental tenets of Bolshevism and an ideological re-equipment on the basis of Trotskyism, especially the acceptance of the theory of permanent revolution. He states quite bluntly in one of his articles that under Lenin's guidance (and not without internal dissension) Bolshevism underwent an ideological re-equipment in this vital respect during the spring of 1917, i.e., before the seizure of power.

Trotsky's supporters started to claim that his so-called American letters and Lenin's *April Theses* were identical in content and that in the *April Theses* Lenin was simply voicing Trotsky's idea of permanent revolution. Distorting Leninism, history and the facts, they declared that Lenin's strategy for the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution was in fact a summary of the theory of permanent revolution. By replacing Leninism with Trotskyism the Trotskyists attempted to become co-authors of Lenin's theory of revolution.

In order to understand Trotsky's views and modern Trotskyist ideas and to make a more informed criticism of them, one must have some grasp of the theory of permanent revolution.

The Trotskyists borrowed the term "permanent revolution" from Marx, but then proceeded to debase his brilliant idea and to distort it.

Marx's idea of uninterrupted revolution is an outstanding product of scientific thinking. In a Central Committee Address to the Communist League in 1850 Marx wrote: "While the democratic petty bourgeois wish to bring the revolution to a conclusion as quickly as possible, and with the achievement, at most, of the above demands, 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, and the association of proletarians, not only in one country but in all the dominant countries of the world, has advanced so far that competition among the proletarians of these countries has ceased and that at least the decisive productive forces are concentrated in the hands of the proletarians. For us the issue cannot be the alteration of private property but only its annihilation, not the smoothing over of class antagonisms but the abolition of classes, not the improvement of existing society but the foundation of a new one."*

Marx originated the idea of uninterrupted revolution while he was opposing the petty-bourgeois democrats who imagined they could make certain democratic advances through a revolutionary struggle but wished to pursue matters no further. As distinct from the petty-bourgeois democrats, Marx showed that the constant growth and deepening of the revolutionary movement was objectively possible, historically necessary and in the interests of the proletariat. He proved that, once the democratic revolution had been accomplished, the proletariat should not rest content with that state of affairs: it was the historic duty and political task of the proletariat to persistently deepen the revolution and, as it gained in strength and numbers, to topple one faction of the bourgeoisie after another. Eventually it would be able to seize power on a national scale. Triumphant in one country, the proletariat would then use its gains to foster revolution internationally. These ideas of Marx, enriched and developed by Lenin so as to be applicable to the new stage of the

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1973, pp. 178-79.

class struggle, form the theoretical basis for dealing with the main questions of policy, strategy and tactics of Communist Parties in modern conditions.

The opponents of Marxism attempt to reinterpret and distort Marx's concept of uninterrupted revolution. The anarchists were the first to debase and distort the idea. In his article "The Bakuninists at Work" Engels quotes a declaration made by some members of the anarchist alliance who, seeing the first symptoms of the growth of revolutionary feeling in Spain in 1873, stated: "Nothing has yet happened in Barcelona, but there is permanent revolution in the squares and public places!"* Commenting on this exaggerated cry of triumph and ridiculing this debasement of the idea of permanent revolution, Engels wrote that this was the revolution "which consists in endlessly beating kettle-drums and which for precisely that reason stands 'permanently' on the 'spot'."**

Marx's seminal idea of uninterrupted revolution was developed in the works of Lenin, who constantly enriched it, drawing on the most recent experience and trends in the revolutionary struggle in the age of imperialism. In his book "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution", written on the eve of the first Russian revolution, Lenin showed that in the age of imperialism and in a country which possessed a minimum of capitalist development, such as Russia was then, the democratic revolution came close to the socialist revolution. At the same time the political line of the working class and its political vanguard should consciously aim to promote the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution, i.e., uninterrupted revolution. 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".***

* Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 18, S. 482.

** *Ibid.*

*** V. I. Lenin, "Social-Democracy's Attitude Towards the Peasant Movement", *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, pp. 236-37.

Such is the genuine, Marxist and Leninist concept of uninterrupted revolution, which has been embodied in all successful revolutions in Europe, Asia and Cuba.

Trotsky and his followers have deprived the term "permanent revolution" of its Marxist meaning. The Trotskyist theory of permanent revolution differs radically from the Marxist concept of uninterrupted revolution. As soon as Trotsky began to voice his opinions on permanent revolution, Lenin launched a principled ideological and theoretical attack on them. In many of his works Lenin said that the theory was essentially half-Menshevik: from the Bolsheviks it borrowed the call to the proletariat to rise up in decisive revolutionary struggle and seize political power, and from the Mensheviks the denial of the role of the peasantry. Henceforth the Trotskyists stiffened the reactionary tenor of their views.

It should be pointed out that Trotsky was not the originator of the corrupt interpretation of permanent revolution. He borrowed the most important propositions from Parvus, who was for a long time a member of the German Social-Democratic Party, then turned up somewhere in the Left wing of the Russian Mensheviks and ended up as an ordinary renegade.

During the first Russian revolution, when the Mensheviks began to show their true colours through their declarations that the bourgeois-democratic revolution was the affair of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat ought not to become involved, Parvus wished to somehow dispel the unfavourable impression created by the Menshevik idea of proletarian self-restraint. He sought to find the revolutionary words that would divert the workers' movement along the Menshevik channel. It was Parvus who coined the slogan "no tsar and a workers' government", which simultaneously expressed both an attempt to heed the revolutionary feeling of the workers, albeit in the form of empty Leftist phrases, and disbelief in the hegemony of the working class and its allies, and the secret hope that the Mensheviks might be able to capitalise on a distorted interpretation of Lenin's thesis of the growing over of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution. Parvus also peddled the adventurist

concept of bypassing the stage of the democratic revolution.

Trotsky seized on Parvus' views, added some verbiage of his own and declared the whole eclectic hotch-potch of revolutionary phrases and Menshevik capitulationism to be the theory of "permanent revolution".

The Trotskyist concept of permanent revolution has the following unscientific and anti-Leninist features:

—denial of the objective laws of the maturing and preparation of revolution and the stages in its development; denial of the necessity of the democratic revolution, and subjectivist calls for an immediate socialist coup regardless of the circumstances—in other words, irresponsible leap-frogging over historically necessary stages in the struggle;

—denial of the hegemony of the working class; denial of the revolutionary capabilities of the working peasantry; the concept of the revolutionary isolation of the proletariat, which, in the Trotskyist view, comes inevitably into conflict with a naturally conservative peasantry and all the non-proletarian strata of the working people; all this negates the idea of union between the working class and the peasantry;

—scepticism towards the revolutionary capabilities of a victorious proletariat; denial of the possibility of building socialism in one country—in other words, the historical futility and senselessness of revolution in a national framework, which is condemned to defeat either at the hands of international reactionary forces or under the blows of an internal conservative opposition;

—an adventurist policy of exporting revolution; calls for a victorious proletariat to stir up revolutionary wars and world revolution as its sole historical mission;

—the idea that the revolutionary power of a proletariat that has triumphed in a single country will inevitably degenerate unless state assistance from the working class of other countries and world revolution appear on the scene;

—a voluntarist revolutionism which denies the role and importance of the masses in the revolutionary struggle as well as the need for training the motive forces of revo-

lution for the decisive class battles; an exaggerated assessment of the part to be played by various revolutionary detachments, groups and individuals in effecting the revolutionary overthrow;

—denial of the wealth and variety of forms and methods of revolutionary struggle, and the absolutisation of just one form—armed struggle—which Trotskyists believe can be initiated by separate small detachments of fighters with the aim of swaying the working masses and pushing them artificially into revolutionary action;

—a predilection for spontaneity in the working-class movement, lack of appreciation and even disregard for the organising role of the revolutionary vanguard and a scornful attitude towards the activities of the Communist Party.

These are the main features of the Trotskyist theory of permanent revolution, which, in effect, condemns the working class of any country to sit still and wait for an abstract world revolutionary conflagration which, as has been demonstrated by both theory and practice, cannot possibly flare up in all parts of the world at the same time.

It is perfectly obvious that all these propositions are reactionary in nature and are anti-Leninist from start to finish.

Trotsky's permanent revolution runs counter to Marxist-Leninist teaching on socialist revolution in all vital respects: in the assessment of the nature and stages of development of a revolution and its motive forces in the age of imperialism; in the appraisal of the working class's policies, strategy and tactics at various stages in the revolution; in the denial of the variety of ways in which revolutionary tasks can be accomplished and of the prospects for a revolution in a particular country; in the interpretation of the interrelationship between national revolutions and world revolution; in assessing the feasibility of building socialism; and so on.

Through a profound analysis of the social processes engendered by the development of capitalism into its imperialist phase Lenin gave added meaning to Marx's propositions on the maturing of a revolution, the objective and subjective prerequisites for revolutionary upheaval

and the increasing drawing together of the struggle for democracy with the struggle for socialism. Lenin made a brilliant summary of the prospects for the revolution that was maturing in Russia, and cornered the Mensheviks, who maintained that, since the bourgeois revolution had yet to occur in Russia, it would be the bourgeoisie that would guide it and for a long time after the revolution Russia would develop within the framework of capitalist relations. Lenin showed that Russia, which had a medium level of capitalism, was already ripe for far-reaching revolutionary transformations and for a more or less rapid development of the democratic revolution into the socialist revolution. Since Russia still possessed many vestiges of feudalism, it was inevitable that the imminent revolution would be a bourgeois revolution. But, as Lenin scientifically predicted, it would be no ordinary bourgeois revolution. The specificity of the first stage of the revolution that was simmering in Russia lay, as Lenin saw it, in the fact that it would be a great democratic revolution of the people and that it would be guided by the proletariat in alliance with the peasantry. They would be its principal motive force. Once it had assumed the leadership of all the working people and had carried through the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the working class would not be content with the democratic stage of the struggle but, as the revolutionary forces gathered strength, would effect the transition to the next, socialist stage.

Trotsky did not deny the existence of the bourgeois-democratic tasks that faced the Russian proletariat at the outset. But he did deny the need for the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. He considered it possible and necessary to bypass the stage of the democratic revolution and move straight on to the socialist revolution. Trotsky held that the proletariat was always ready for revolution; it just had to be roused, prompted and called upon, and then it alone, without allies, could stand up to the landowners, tsarism and the bourgeoisie, could overcome the resistance of the whole peasantry and could immediately establish its rule. The notorious call of "no tsar and a workers' government" amounted to a denial

of the peasants' role in the revolution and an adventurist appeal to simultaneously accomplish democratic tasks and establish the rule of the proletariat.

Thus, the Trotskyist concept of permanent revolution differs drastically from the Leninist theory of the growing over of the democratic revolution into the socialist revolution in that it ignores the objective laws of social development and the stages through which a revolution passes, calls irresponsibly for bypassing necessary stages and denies the possibility of an alliance between the working class and the peasantry and the revolutionary hegemony of the proletariat.

The Trotskyists outrightly deny the need for stages of development in any revolution and fail to recognise the vital importance of combining the struggle for democracy with the struggle for socialism. In the Trotskyist view, a revolution should develop and be carried through as if it were a socialist revolution irrespective of the conditions. In his book *The Permanent Revolution*, published in 1930, Trotsky upholds the concept of struggling directly for the dictatorship of the proletariat even in the case of backward countries where feudal and semi-feudal relations prevail, where the working class is just being formed and where democratic tasks have yet to be tackled.

Lenin formulated and substantiated the idea of the hegemony of the working class in the democratic revolution: the alliance of the working class and the peasantry under the leadership of the working class. He showed that all the exploited classes, especially the peasantry, have enormous revolutionary potential and are the natural allies of the working class against the autocratic-landlord system in order to secure democratic transformations. The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry is the political expression and consolidation of the revolutionary struggle of the working class and peasantry against the remnants of feudalism and the power of the serf-owners. Lenin stressed that this dictatorship, set up after the victorious democratic revolution, would not, historically, be an organisation of order but an organisation of revolutionary war.

In the Leninist concept of uninterrupted revolution the bourgeois-democratic and socialist revolutions are two links, two stages in a single revolutionary process; a revolution in Russia during the age of imperialism could not be confined to a bourgeois revolution.

Lenin's idea of the growing over of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution provided the theoretical basis on which the Bolshevik Party was able to devise a political line, strategy and tactics during the preparation and waging of the great revolutionary battles in Russia. The victory of the October Revolution was a spectacular practical confirmation of the correctness of Lenin's theory of revolution and the idea that the bourgeois-democratic revolution would grow over into the socialist revolution. It revealed the profound class meaning of the Marxist-Leninist concept of uninterrupted revolution: ensuring the hegemony of the working class in the democratic revolution, forging an alliance between the working class and the peasantry and establishing their dictatorship during the first stage, furthering the development of the democratic revolution into the socialist one and crowning the revolutionary struggle with the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and an international alliance between the victorious proletariat of Russia and the proletariat of Europe in order to promote revolution in the West.

In his book *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* Lenin made the point: "Things have turned out just as we said they would. 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. To attempt to raise an artificial Chinese Wall between the first and second, to separate them *by anything else* than the degree of preparedness of the proletariat and the degree of its unity with the poor peasants, means to distort Marx-

ism dreadfully, to vulgarise it, to substitute liberalism in its place.”*

Trotsky denied the revolutionary possibilities of the peasantry, which he viewed as a conservative and sometimes even reactionary force. He considered that the revolutionary rule established after the victorious bourgeois-democratic revolution would have to contend with the peasantry as well as the bourgeoisie. Consequently, the policy of an alliance with the peasantry was doomed to failure. The theory of permanent revolution suggests that the peasantry must be regarded as a potential enemy. As the Trotskyists imagine the situation, a victorious proletariat would find itself in isolation and would be crushed by bourgeois and peasant reaction. On the one hand, Trotsky's theory tells us, the proletariat cannot count on the support or neutral sympathy of the working masses and must seize power on its own, while, on the other hand, any proletarian rule in Russia is premature, has no chance of attaining socialism and is inevitably foredoomed to defeat, unless it receives support from outside. The sole function of the proletariat's revolutionary struggle is to export revolution to other countries and so “speed up” world revolution.

From his analysis of the features of capitalism in the age of imperialism and, in particular, the law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalist countries Lenin concluded that it was possible to break the chain of imperialism in just one country and to successfully carry through the socialist revolution and establish the dictatorship of the working class in Russia.

The theory of permanent revolution rejects the possibility of a victorious revolution within the national framework of any country and especially one like Russia. Trotsky maintains that the working class of a single country may begin a revolution, achieve the first successes and even, with luck, impose their own rule, but ultimate victory is only possible if the revolution is continued on an international scale, if the revolution in one country inaugurates the age of “permanent” world revolution and if

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

it is the spark that causes a world revolutionary conflagration. Trotsky puts it quite bluntly: "A Russian revolution can only triumph and set the Russian people free if it touches off revolution in all countries. If capital continues to hold sway in Germany, if the stock exchange controls New York and if British imperialism remains firm in England, then we shall pay dearly indeed, for they are stronger than us, they are richer than us, at present they are more educated than us, their war machines are more powerful than ours and they will stifle us. What is the solution? We must hold out and endure until such time as revolution breaks out in all European countries."

Trotsky elevated his rejection of the possibility of a successful socialist revolution in one country into a law of history. In his book *The Permanent Revolution* he asserts that "the accomplishment of a socialist revolution within a national framework is unthinkable.... A socialist revolution starts in the national arena, develops in the international arena and culminates in the world arena.... Thus ... a socialist revolution is not complete until the new society finally triumphs throughout the world."

The thesis concerning the possibility of building socialism in a single country is a vital element in Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution. He showed that the proletariat could do more than just accomplish a revolution in one country: it could also construct socialism there. While criticising the Trotskyist slogan of the "United States of Europe", which was seen by Trotskyists as a preliminary condition for a victorious proletarian revolution, Lenin commented in 1915 that the slogan might be taken to mean that the victory of socialism in a single country was impossible. He added: "Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible first in several or even in one capitalist country alone."*

In 1916 Lenin wrote even more pointedly in his article "The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution": "socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously *in all* countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several

* V. I. Lenin, "On the Slogan for a United States of Europe", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 342.

countries, while the others will for some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois".* Moreover, Lenin emphasised that Russia had all that it took to build a complete socialist society.

These statements by Lenin were wholly directed at Trotsky's concept of permanent revolution and his rejection of the possibility of building socialism in a single country.

After the victory of the October Revolution Lenin formulated specific ways, forms and methods of building socialism in Russia.

Trotsky said: "We are counting on revolutionary developments in Europe. The New Economic Policy is simply an adaptation to the pace of those developments.... If the capitalist world survives for a few decades more, that spells out a death sentence for socialist Russia: she will have to either pass through the stage of bourgeois democracy or decay 'in other forms'."

Trotsky and his followers considered that, since it was impossible to build socialism in Russia, there was no need to embark on peaceful economic construction and proposed recklessly that all the enthusiasm of the Soviet people should be channelled into fomenting world revolution, into exporting revolution.

Lenin's most important contribution to the theory of the socialist revolution lies in his substantiation of the connection between socialist revolutions in a national framework and world revolution and in his scientific determination of the international obligations of the victorious proletariat. Lenin expected proletarian revolutions to develop in the West, and he pointed out that, if the reactionary régime in Russia could only be overthrown, it might be possible to spread the fire of revolution to Europe. "...Then," he wrote, "the revolutionary conflagration will spread to Europe; the European worker, languishing under bourgeois reaction, will rise in his turn and show us 'how it is done'; then the revolutionary upsurge in Europe will have a repercussive effect upon Russia and will convert an epoch of a few revolutionary years

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 79.

into an era of several revolutionary decades.”* Lenin thought it essential that a revolution in Russia should produce total victory over the landlords and the bourgeoisie and that it should aid the development of revolution in Europe.

Lenin did not rule out the possibility that a proletariat which had triumphed in one country might, in certain conditions, lend assistance to the working class of other countries in their revolutionary struggle. But he was referring to help for a proletariat that had already risen in revolt. He was firmly against any attempts to export revolution and condemned adventurist calls for fomenting revolutionary wars and artificially sparking off revolutions in other countries when the conditions were not yet mature.

Lenin made it clear that a victorious socialist revolution was only possible if the conditions for it had ripened within the particular country, if the country was in the grip of a political crisis, if the ruling classes were unable to govern as before, if the working class and all the working people did not wish to live as before and if the working class was organisationally, ideologically and politically prepared for revolutionary battle and was fully determined to bring about a revolutionary coup. Lenin declared that these conditions were fundamental to any revolution.

All attempts to export revolution, push it on or meddle in other countries' affairs only have the effect of delaying the revolution. Lenin wrote: “Such a ‘theory’ would be completely at variance with Marxism, for Marxism has always been opposed to ‘pushing’ revolutions, which develop with the growing acuteness of the class antagonisms that engender revolutions.”**

Lenin gave the sole correct description of the possible effect that a victorious proletariat in Russia might have on the development of world proletarian revolution. He considered that the defeat of revolution in the West was

* V. I. Lenin, “Social-Democracy and the Provisional Revolutionary Government”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, pp. 287-88.

** V. I. Lenin, “Strange and Monstrous”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 71-72.

only temporary and looked to a fresh revolutionary upsurge, while recognising, however, that it might be a long time in coming.

Lenin observed that even at the initial stage the working class of Russia had received considerable support from the international proletariat in the form of a powerful campaign to defend Russia and fierce class battles in the West which slackened the imperialist grip on Russia.

In the new historical conditions Lenin set before the victorious working class of Russia the following crucial international revolutionary task: to maintain and strengthen the Soviet Republic as the political, moral and material bulwark of world proletarian revolution. Lenin proved that the further development of this revolution called for vast economic socialist construction. In Lenin's view, the successes of the Soviet people in the struggle for socialism would be the main and decisive contribution of the working class of Soviet Russia to world revolution. As he put it, "We are now exercising our main influence on the international revolution through our economic policy.... The struggle in this field has now become global. Once we solve this problem, we shall have certainly and finally won on an international scale."*

This is the genuinely Leninist understanding of the question of the relationship between the national and international tasks of the working class of Soviet Russia.

All the above goes to show that Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution is completely opposed to Lenin's theory of socialist revolution. In fact, it negates it.

Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution is extremely radical in word, but in fact it is permeated by disbelief in the revolutionary possibilities of the working class, in the victory of socialism and in the glowing future that the people has before it. This theory combines a clamorous revolutionism with deep pessimism, appeals for world revolution with Menshevik capitulationism, and Leftist phrases with Right-wing tactics. The theory disarms the masses both theoretically and practically and condemns the working class to inevitable defeat.

* V. I. Lenin, "Tenth All-Russia Conference of the R.C.P.(B.)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 437.

III. TROTSKYISTS IN PERMANENT STRUGGLE AGAINST REVOLUTION

All the basic tenets of modern Trotskyism derive from the views of Trotsky. Trotskyists continue and intensify his subversive, reactionary activities in the revolutionary movement and adopt violently anti-communist positions.

The following is a general definition worked out by myself and other authors of modern Trotskyism, its theoretical premises and political role.

Modern Trotskyism is petty-bourgeois, Leftist-extremist revolutionism which amounts, in the final analysis, to Right-wing capitulationism. It is a set of policies and an ideology that feed on the growing anti-capitalist revolutionary feelings of the non-proletarian strata of the working people, mainly the urban intelligentsia and the student body. It substitutes cosmopolitanism for proletarian internationalism and from this standpoint rejects the possibility of victorious socialist revolutions within national boundaries. Its pessimistic scepticism towards the victory of revolution and socialism is concealed behind vociferous appeals for world revolution. It is militant anti-Leninism, seeking to emasculate Lenin's teaching and replace it with the views of Trotsky. It is viciously anti-communist, while juggling with communist ideas.*

All modern Trotskyist groups have certain methodological devices in common. Essentially, they all boil down

* See *Rabochy klass i sovremennyy mir* (The Working Class and the Modern World) No. 1, 1972.

to attempts to replace Marxist-Leninist dialectics with subjectivist sophistry and idle metaphysics.

Modern Trotskyists deny the objective laws of social development and try to oust them in favour of a subjective-idealist interpretation of the historical process. They exaggerate or even make absolute the role of the subjective factor.

When examining and explaining social phenomena, Trotskyists reject the Marxist-Leninist method (dialectical analysis of all aspects of objective reality in their interaction and motion in order to reveal the leading, historically progressive tendencies and the prospects for their development) and proceed instead to compare the separate aspects in a purely mechanical way. They break the dialectical link between the general, the separate and the single and between the international and the national. On the one hand, they deny the variety and specific nature of concrete historical processes and of their development stages and reduce everything to abstract metaphysical patterns and arguments. On the other hand, they fallaciously seize upon disconnected facts, turn them into absolutes and then subjectively and idealistically attribute to them an all-embracing character.

It is on this fallacious foundation that theoretical conclusions are drawn, political concepts are devised, universal strategic slogans for all countries and peoples are formulated and essentially adventurist forms of struggle and tactics are selected.

All Trotskyist groups discard Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution. Despite the revolutionary experience that the world has accumulated, they take Trotsky's theory of "permanent revolution" as the starting point for their political concepts, strategy, tactics and action.

Occasionally, with demagogic objectives, modern Trotskyists talk about the need to renew the theory of "permanent revolution". An editorial in the journal *Quatrième Internationale* says that the theory of "permanent revolution" produced by Lev Trotsky 60 years ago, at the time of the first Russian revolution, "is inadequate to cover a set of phenomena which cannot be compared with those that are taking place in other continents that like Africa

had been colonised, but where the development level of the societies and the productive forces is completely different".*

In an attempt to adapt the theory of "permanent revolution" to modern conditions, the Trotskyists have begun to flirt with the national liberation movement, seeking to infiltrate it and make use of the upsurge in the liberation struggle of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America for the purpose of consolidating and extending their own political position.

Recently the Trotskyists have quietly dropped their view of the peasantry as a reactionary force. Modern Trotskyists are prepared to acknowledge the revolutionary possibilities of the peasants, especially in the former colonies and semi-colonies. Some Trotskyists have even started to look to the peasants politically, seeking their support, as it would appear. A number of Trotskyist documents speak of the need to establish unions of the working class and the peasantry and other strata of the working people.

All this patching up of Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution, duly accompanied by shrill revolutionary phrases, is part of the casting around for ideological arguments that will expand the Trotskyist movement's social base, even if it means outwardly rejecting several old doctrines. But the fundamental reactionary and capitulationist traits of the theory have not only remained unshaken but have taken on an even more anti-revolutionary, anti-communist and anti-Soviet colouring.

The modern Trotskyists have supplemented their doctrine of the impossibility of a victorious socialist revolution in one country with the assertion that it cannot be achieved in a group of capitalist countries at the present time either. They say that a socialist revolution can only be successful and victorious if it develops uninterruptedly as a world revolution and embraces all countries at once. A socialist revolution in one country must inevitably become "permanent" and grow into a world revolution. As for Europe, the Trotskyists have polished up Trotsky's

* *Quatrième Internationale* No. 27, Paris, February 1966, pp. 3-4.

ideas and now offer a "United Socialist States of Europe". Moreover, they state hypocritically that this propaganda slogan does not presuppose that the working class would be unable to overthrow capitalist domination in one country first of all. On the contrary, as a spokesman for the Fourth International has declared, Trotskyists urge all leading fighters to prepare themselves and to imbue the masses with the idea that they must use every favourable opportunity, like the one that existed in France in May 1968, to accomplish a victorious socialist revolution in their own country. But, as is typical of the Trotskyists' Jesuitical logic, reservations follow which in effect reduce this statement to the "theory of permanent revolution". It emerges that:

- 1) such a victory would quickly turn into a trial of strength between capital and labour in a number of European countries;

- 2) it would be irresponsible to promise the workers and students of Europe that they would be allowed to build their socialist society in peace without interference from American imperialism or Soviet bureaucracy;

- 3) it would be even more irresponsible to favour a policy of "non-interference" in the affairs of other countries in order to buy "peace" at the expense of the world's exploited and oppressed peoples. That is how the idea of exporting revolution is now conveyed! And, finally, even within Europe a proletariat would be unable to bring about a successful socialist revolution—a typically Trotskyist touch! The alternative to a socialist Europe, we are told, would be not evolution and peaceful coexistence, but a triumph for reaction. Furthermore, it would, apparently, be impossible to build a United Socialist States of Europe without spreading world-wide the struggle to achieve the same ends as the working masses were already beginning to accomplish in Europe.

Thus, while calling "decisively" in words for revolution in one country, the Trotskyists are saying, as in the past, that such a revolution must either "permanently" develop into a world revolution or suffer defeat.

In spite of Leninism and real socialist practice, modern Trotskyists claim that it is impossible to build socialism

not only in one country, but also in a group of countries, even though they may have attained a high level of economic and political development. Socialism, they maintain, can only be built on a world scale.

Similarly, Trotskyists deny the need for a democratic, liberation, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal stage in revolution and challenge the peoples of the developing countries to carry out socialist transformations straightaway. But, if this is to be done, revolution must first be borne into the world arena, including the major capitalist countries.

Modern Trotskyists intensify the reactionary and adventurist substance of the theory of permanent revolution still more when they say that the trigger of world revolution is the exporting of revolution by the armed forces of the Soviet Union and other "workers' states" (as they put it) to the capitalist world even at the cost of nuclear warfare. Furthermore, Trotskyists consider it unnecessary and socially pointless to develop the peaceful constructive efforts of the working people in the socialist countries. Rejecting Lenin's teaching on the variety of forms of revolution, a proposition that has been tested in all revolutions and all class battles, they recognise only the actions of armed groups as being revolutionary; they turn into an absolute and consider effective only the armed form of struggle, which they exalt everywhere, irrespective of the historical conditions, objective necessity and the degree of readiness and determination of the masses.

Modern Trotskyists reject the revolutionary transforming role of the USSR and other fraternal countries in the world revolutionary process. They adopt a violently anti-Soviet posture, slander the Soviet Union, the CPSU and its domestic and foreign policies and accuse it of conniving with the imperialists and forgetting about revolution.

Trotskyists falsely accuse Communist Parties of degeneration, revisionism and neo-reformism and urge the destruction of this international revolutionary vanguard. They claim that Communists are holding back revolution in capitalist countries and are afraid of engaging in battle. The Trotskyists' aim is to oust the Communist Parties and replace communism by Trotskyism.

All these anti-Leninist and Leftist-adventurist features of the theory of permanent revolution find their logical conclusion and concentrated reactionary expression in the modern general concept of uninterrupted world revolution. According to modern Trotskyists, a world socialist revolution must simultaneously include the following processes: political revolution in the USSR and the other socialist countries aimed at destroying their existing social and state structure; proletarian revolutions in the capitalist countries (these revolutions will have to quickly emerge from their national framework and enter the world arena); and national liberation revolutions, which must be started immediately, by force of arms, and which must at the same time be directed towards the transition to socialist development and the accomplishment of the tasks of world revolution.

These, in brief, are the main points of the modern Trotskyists' concept of permanent revolution, which they hail as the last word in the science of revolution and have the effrontery to call a real contribution to Leninism.

In fact, it is not a concept of uninterrupted revolution, but an irrational theory of permanent struggle against any revolution and waged under clamorous revolutionary slogans.

Theoretically speaking, it is unscientific and flimsy from start to finish and is riddled with contradictions. Politically, it is at first sight unrealistic and utopian, but a closer inspection shows it to be profoundly reactionary. It is a weapon that is being used against today's principal class and political revolutionary forces—the peoples of the socialist countries, the working class and its allies, and the Communist Parties.

The reactionary kernel of the concept of permanent revolution consists in the denial of the historical sense and possibility of carrying through a socialist revolution in a national framework without world revolution. The possibility of building socialism in a single country or group of countries before a world revolutionary upheaval takes place is also rejected.

As a Fourth International source puts it, "Socialism cannot be constructed in a single country. This is one

of the impossibilities of history. There is no country which alone has the economic and material means to construct socialism. There is not a single country which can construct socialism whilst capitalism is the spectator of this.”*

A leader of the Fourth International, J. Posadas, wrote that the general historico-world concept of permanent revolution consisted in the impossibility of building socialism in just one country. He added that ever since the formation of the Soviet Union right up to the present day there has been no socialist state and as yet no socialist society.

Carrying this thesis a stage further, the Posadas group declared: “The historical conditions are such that no people in the world can build socialism by itself. No revolution can triumph and develop towards socialism unless it develops on a world scale.”**

Pierre Frank, the leader of yet another Trotskyist group, stated that it was the theory of building socialism in one country that broke up the unity of the international communist movement.

All this is written at a time when real socialism actually exists and a world socialist system has been created. Under the guidance of the CPSU, a real socialist society has been built up in the USSR. Its distinctive features are the abolition of private ownership of the means of production and their socialisation, the abolition of the exploitation of man by man and the elimination of exploiting classes, the establishment of the power of the people, the creation of social, political and national equality, a continuous rise in the people's well-being through the high level of development of productive forces, the effecting of a cultural revolution and the bringing of culture to the masses, and the development of democracy. Having achieved all this, the Soviet people set up a state of the whole people and created a developed socialist society, which it is perfecting and consolidating. The decisions of

* J. Posadas, “The Crisis in China and Cuba”, see *European Marxist Review* No. 1, London, May 1968, p. 23.

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

the Twenty-Fourth CPSU Congress outline a programme for further consolidating the position of socialism and building the material and technological base of communism.

As is generally appreciated, the victory of the revolution in a number of countries in Europe and Asia has radically changed the international situation. Once the rule of the people had been established in these countries and the world system of socialism had been formed, it became clear to everyone that one-third of humanity had embarked on a new path of historical development.

The world socialist system has demonstrated its complete superiority over the capitalist system in all aspects of social life. Its qualitative historical advantages can be seen in everything: social relations, political structure, the rate at which productive forces grow, the cultural development of the masses and the moral climate. Socialism now operates on a global scale. It has shown its irresistible vitality. The world socialist system indicates the future of all peoples, exerts a powerful revolutionising influence on historical development and helps to deepen the world revolutionary process.

The international working class is aware of socialism's complete superiority over capitalism. The fact is also recognised by progressive circles among the intelligentsia and the middle strata of all working people in the capitalist countries. Even many bourgeois ideologists acknowledge that socialism is progressive.

Trotskyists cannot directly deny the enormous social, economic and political achievements of the Soviet Union and the successes of the whole socialist system. But they continue to discuss the social nature and historical content of these achievements in a defamatory vein.

Modern Trotskyists, true to Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution and full of hatred for the CPSU and Soviet society, assert that there is no socialism in the USSR.

In the Trotskyist view, notwithstanding any amount of effort and success in changing and transforming, a victorious working class within the confines of a single country can construct not socialism, but only a "transi-

tion-period society" or "transitional society". Any state set up after a revolution, irrespective of whether or not it has attained the stage of the dictatorship of the working class or whether a state of the whole people already exists, is termed a "workers' state" by the Trotskyists. The concept carries a full load of pejorative and discriminatory overtones. A "workers' state" as they understand it, is an inferior sort of state, not socialist and, once again, transitional.

For Trotskyists a transitional society by virtue of its socio-economic content fulfils tasks which belong historically to the capitalist phase of social development (agrarian reforms and industrialisation) but which are being accomplished by socialist methods (expropriation of private property in the main sectors of the economy, introduction of universal planning, etc.).

Trotskyists admit that there is social ownership of the means of production in the socialist countries, but consider that distribution and appropriation are of a bourgeois type.

According to the highly contradictory and muddled pronouncements made by various Trotskyists, a "transition-period society" is an essentially indefinite period in human history when there is no longer any capitalism, since it has already been destroyed. But there is no socialism yet either: it has not been built and cannot be built within the framework of separate countries before the world revolution. It would appear that such a society can exist for a long time—decades or even centuries.

The concept of the transition-period society and the "workers' state" occupies an important and, in a sense, crucial position in the modern Trotskyists' theory of permanent revolution and in their case as a whole. This is the direction followed by the further deepening of the theory's reactionary content. This concept provides the basis for the most reactionary conclusions about the world revolutionary process, its motive forces and prospects.

In the first place, modern Trotskyists draw two anti-Soviet and anti-socialist conclusions:

1. If a victorious working class is incapable of building socialism and if transitional "non-capitalist and non-

socialist" societies can last for decades or even centuries, then what are the prospects for social and historical progress in these countries? None—is the Trotskyist answer.

Trotskyists consider that, if world revolution does not intervene, a transitional society is doomed to suffer deformation, restoration processes and the strengthening of capitalist tendencies. In fact, this is illogical: in the Trotskyist view, a "transitional society" inherently possesses capitalist elements and cannot rid itself of them. The only salvation from the bogey of "deformation" is thought to lie in exporting revolution, starting a revolutionary war against the capitalist countries and igniting the conflagration of world revolution.

2. In modern conditions the working class of a single country may, if conditions are favourable, overthrow the exploiters and establish their rule for a time. But within the boundaries of one country it cannot withstand the pressure of world imperialism, its own internal forces and the traditions of a bourgeois society. It is unable to construct a viable socialist state. At best, it is capable of creating the rather limited and socially and democratically defective "workers' state". It can only to some extent bring about a dictatorship of the proletariat during the initial stages.

It can, however, extend and strengthen its political domination by transferring revolution to other countries and using its power to effect uninterrupted world revolution. If a victorious working class fails to export revolution, then the further diminution of the proletariat's sphere of political domination and the weakening of its power will inevitably follow. In that case degeneration of proletarian rule is unavoidable.

According to Trotskyist ideas, the modern "workers' states" are simply degenerate states of the dictatorship of the working class.

Trotsky invented the word "bureaucratism" and made wide use of it in his political feud with the Bolshevik Party and Leninism.

Trotsky himself, of course, was the staunchest supporter of administrative and bureaucratic methods for running society. In his struggle with the Communist Party,

however, Trotsky tried to attribute his own sins to the Bolsheviks and accused them of degeneracy and bureaucratism.

The modern Trotskyists have latched on to this term, increased its counter-revolutionary weighting and now use it as an important means of justifying anti-Soviet and anti-communist policies. It is noteworthy that the term has been seized on by the Maoists, Right-wing revisionists and all other enemies of Leninism and the communist movement.

In fact, the CPSU and the Soviet Government, faithful to Lenin's behests, have always engaged in unswerving struggle with any manifestations of bureaucracy and have eliminated its causes. The Soviet people decisively and uncompromisingly eradicates any occurrences of bureaucracy.

In recent years new measures have been taken in the USSR to reinforce the real power of the people. The extended rights of Soviets and trade unions, the organisation of a far-reaching and effective system of people's control, increased responsiveness to letters from the working people, the further development of criticism and self-criticism, the heightened role of the press and the new forms of economic management all guarantee the participation of millions of working people in the management of society and in deciding state matters both in the centre and the regions. They are dealing crushing blows at the last vestiges of bureaucracy. The development and improvement of socialist democracy and the heightening of the working people's political and social activity ultimately ensure the elimination of all manifestations of bureaucracy.

But the Trotskyists have never been interested in the real drive to eliminate the vestiges of administrative bureaucracy. In Trotskyist vocabulary the term "bureaucratism" merely expresses their slanderous thesis of the degeneracy of Soviet society, the Soviet state and the Party. They seek the destruction of the USSR's existing political system and a struggle against the CPSU and the Communist Parties of the fraternal countries. It amounts to a drive to wipe out the socialism that actually exists.

Thus, the Trotskyist term "bureaucratism" acts as the ideological basis for a counter-revolutionary policy whose objective is to dissipate the tremendous gains of the Soviet people.

It is not surprising that bourgeois propagandists have seized on this thesis and that it is put to all manner of uses by renegades who have betrayed the cause of Leninism and socialism. Right and "Left" revisionists often make provocative use of it.

Consequently, it should be pointed out that the uncritical use of such a term by some journalists with a Marxist bent is fundamentally incorrect and can only damage the cause of the communist movement.

The fallacious character of the theory and practice of permanent revolution was also clearly shown by the position adopted by the Trotskyists towards the Cuban revolution.

When the revolution had taken place in Cuba, the Trotskyists tried furiously to use it for the benefit of their theoretical and political notions. They tried to push the leaders of the Cuban revolution into adventurist acts, claiming that the purpose of the revolution was not to build a new life, but to export revolutionary struggle. According to the Trotskyists, Cuba should become the springboard for permanent revolution in Latin America and then throughout the world.

The Cuban people and its revolutionary leaders were quick to see through the Trotskyists' cunning designs. Needless to say, acceptance of the Trotskyists' ultra-Leftist appeals could not have accelerated the development of revolution in Latin America; instead it would have caused the Island of Freedom to perish and the reactionary forces on the Latin American mainland to grow stronger. In his speech at the close of the tri-continental conference Fidel Castro sharply condemned the Trotskyists' subversive activities, showing that in practice the Trotskyists were objectively helping the imperialists to resist revolution, the masses and the vanguard of revolutionary forces—the Communist Parties.

When the Cuban people, guided by their Communist Party, spurned the pretensions of the Trotskyists and set

out to build a new way of life, the Trotskyists condemned the revolution in Cuba.

The political fallaciousness, theoretical poverty and provocative essence of the Trotskyist concept of permanent revolution and its internal contradictoriness are blatantly exposed whenever modern Trotskyists endeavour to apply it in order to determine the working class's political line, the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle in the developed capitalist countries.

Trotskyists rely mainly on the export of revolution by the forces of the socialist ("workers'" in their terminology) states. Yet at the same time they do their utmost to dislocate and split the principal driving forces of revolution—the proletariat of the capitalist countries and the socialist peoples led by the working class.

On the one hand, the Trotskyists call on the socialist states to employ all their power to finish imperialism off, while, on the other, they condemn the constructive work through which their might is increased, urge the overthrow of the socialist countries' present state system and claim that it is primarily in these countries that a political revolution needs to take place.

As adventurist as everything else is the Trotskyist policy of denying the regularities through which a revolution and its various stages ripen. Trotskyists reject the need for combining the struggle for democracy with the struggle for socialism, as well as the necessity of democratic reforms, and demand immediate socialist transformations. The American Trotskyists, for example, are foisting upon the anti-imperialist and Negro movement a programme for "seizing state power" and "setting up a workers' government". French Trotskyists reject the independent significance of the general democratic and anti-imperialist struggle at its present stage and accuse the French Communist Party of renouncing the struggle for socialism and betraying the cause of the working class. The Trotskyist weekly *Rouge* declares: "The programme (of the FCP) is no longer socialist. It does not interest first and foremost the working class, but all the supposedly anti-monopolist strata and the democrats. The true claims of the working people as voiced by the FCP do not form the backbone of

its programme, which would allow us to understand why it is necessary to fight for socialism; they simply appear as a special aspect of the programme for advanced democracy.”*

In opposition to the Communists' scientifically based programme for the stage-by-stage accomplishment of revolutionary tasks the French Trotskyists advance the concept of a purely “workers' revolution”, to be carried through simultaneously in all the countries of Europe, and link it with world-wide economic crises.

Trotskyists also deny the need for the working class to strengthen its ties with the non-proletarian strata of the working people. They condemn the policy of creating anti-monopolist alliances and broad unions of the Left.

The Trotskyists preach autonomy and independence for the most varied currents of the democratic movement, sometimes dividing up its members in accordance with some highly dubious, non-class criteria. In the USA, for example, they distinguish between a working-class, Negro, Mexican, Indian and women's movement among others, which ultimately has the effect of fragmenting the revolutionary forces.

Verbally the Trotskyists exalt the role of the masses, declaring that it is necessary to look to the masses and rouse them to revolutionary struggle. But in fact they confuse the masses and prevent them from setting out along the genuinely revolutionary path, preferring to replace the masses by a bellicose élite in the form of Trotskyist organisations, leaders and so on.

In short, by endlessly postponing the real revolution, the Trotskyists replace genuine preparation of the working class and all working people for the decisive revolutionary battles by Leftist phraseology and also occasionally by scattered adventurist armed actions which simply damage the class struggle.

The Trotskyist scheme of permanent revolution, proceeding as it does from the need for a global armed clash between world revolution and world capitalism, denies

* *Rouge* No. 67, June 8, 1970, Paris, p. 5.

the necessity of peaceful coexistence and a policy for international peace and security. According to their calculations, war will provide the impetus for the development of "workers' states", and after the war even the peoples now living under the tribal system will be able to blossom in communes and Soviets. Hence the slogan of the Posadas group which says that, in order to speed the advent of communism, it is necessary to seize the initiative from imperialism and begin a nuclear world war with a "pre-emptive strike".

In keeping with their inhuman proposition that communist awareness will suffice to build a society on radioactive ruins, the Trotskyists call for fresh local wars on the Vietnamese pattern and for a revolutionary war in the name of world revolution. Moreover, the war is to be started by the Soviet Union they hate so much. Joseph Hansen, one of the leaders of the "Socialist Workers' Party", stated at the 22nd National Convention that the Soviet Union was capable of putting an end to capitalism in a matter of days and that it would not be difficult to inflict a military defeat on US imperialism in the first phase of an Asian war.

The modern Trotskyists are rabid anti-Communists. All their activities are concentrated against the vanguard of the contemporary revolutionary movement—the Communist Parties.

The Trotskyists find allies for this fight among all the dissenters, renegades and Right and "Left" revisionists. They were delighted with the divisive activities in the communist movement of the leadership of the Communist Party of China, especially their attacks on the CPSU. They hope to use the Maoists to weaken the Communist Parties. Posadas has called on his Chinese comrades to have no fear of conflict with the "communist masses". Undoubtedly, there will be a period of conflict with them, he maintains, since they are for the moment being led by the Communist Parties; if the Chinese summon the masses of the whole world to rise up, then they will be able to exert a direct influence over them.

Posadas even considers that, if 90 per cent of today's Communists abandon the communist movement as a result

of the Maoists' subversive efforts, that is a step in the right direction. It is a highly mercenary calculation, but is quite clear: Posadas reckons that the Trotskyists stand to gain from such a blow to the communist movement.

The leaders of the Fourth International looked favourably on the so-called general line for the world communist movement formulated in 25 points by the CPC leadership. They were not slow to point out that the "general line" basically echoed Trotskyist propositions.

Posadas has informed the Maoists that all the aims that the Chinese are setting themselves have been set before and that the struggle to achieve them has been going on for many years. That is the *raison d'être* of the Fourth International. The Chinese have in fact discovered nothing new.

The Trotskyists do not acknowledge the theoretical authority of Mao Tse-tung and offer Trotsky (a knowledge of whose works is deemed vital to an understanding of modern revolution) as an alternative.

It is well known that the Maoist groups in the working-class movement are facing a crisis. Despite the conflicting assessments of the Chinese "cultural revolution" by Maoist groups in Western Europe and Latin America, it has had the effect of further diminishing the influence of the Maoist groups' divisive activities. The recent foreign policy moves by the Chinese Government and their flirtation with imperialism have worsened the plight of the Maoist groupings in the capitalist world.

The modern Trotskyists decided to cash in on the circumstances and reinforce and extend their own position. Some Trotskyists would like to take over the Maoist organisations and use them for their own selfish ends. Many Trotskyist centres have recently condemned the CPC leadership. The London international committee of the Fourth International even came out with a call to overthrow the Maoist bureaucrats. The Latin American Secretariat headed by Posadas has also recently condemned the Maoists. But this does not mean that the struggle between Maoists and Trotskyists involves conflicting principles. In fact, over the main issues in world politics, the revolutionary struggle and the national liberation

movement they present a common anti-Marxist, anti-Soviet and anti-democratic platform.

Thus, the theory and practice of contemporary Trotskyism are directed against democracy, national freedom, revolution and socialism, against the cause of international peace and security and against the current and fundamental interests of the workers, the intelligentsia, the peasantry, women and the young people. Trotskyists are the bitterest enemies of the progressive development of mankind.

All the evidence suggests that the revival of modern Trotskyism is purely temporary. Its reactionary and pessimistic policies and Leftist-adventurist tactics ultimately expose and discredit it more and more in the eyes of those whom it has managed to deceive at one time or another. However, in view of the inevitable increase in the numbers of those involved in revolutionary battles and the inclusion in them of new social strata, one must bear in mind that Trotskyist organisations and concepts may once again rise to the surface of the spontaneous revolutionary waves.

This compels us to intensify the ideological onslaught on the theory and policies of Trotskyism, the enemy of revolution and socialism.

World historical experience shows that the only theoretical basis of the struggle for the triumph of revolution and socialism is the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism.