FROM TROTSKYISM TO SOCIAL-IMPERIALISM

Michael A. Miller

League for Proletarian Revolution

FROM TROTSKYISM TO SOCIAL-IMPERIALISM

BY MICHAEL A. MILLER

Published by the League for Proletarian Revolution

League for Proletarian Revolution
P.O. Box 19114
Laurel Station
Oakland, California
94619

Typeset by Archetype
First Printing
Berkeley, 1973

Printed by Bay Print Shop

This paper is based on a lecture given at a forum of the Anti-Imperialist Coalition in Berkeley, August 1972. It was then, and still is, my main purpose to advance the grasp of Marxism-Leninism among communists, by means of its application to the problem of Trotskyism. Such a strictly ideological account, so to speak, was probably a left error for an anti-imperialist forum. However, a certain zeal in the audience (for and against), combined with requests for publication, made it apparent that there is definitely a need and a proper place for this type of theoretical work. It has been considerably expanded and footnoted, but it is still aimed primarily at those revolutionary workers who are bent on building a revolutionary communist party. For those whose greatest hope is that their practice will result in such an organization, there is no escape from theoretical questions concerning history and international strategy. It is also my hope that among the revolutionary or internationalist-minded intellectuals, this will serve the purpose of bringing them closer to the developing communist party.

The followers of Leon Trotsky strike a grand pose as the only true and genuine continuation of Marxism after Lenin. Of course, when they are retreating and on the defensive, they make more modest claims, like, "we are just a trend of thought within Marxism, within the revolutionary movement, within the working class movement, etc." In either case, they are wrong. There are many examples of bourgeois intellectuals who think themselves great revolutionary theorists but who actually serve the exploiting classes. There are also examples of intellectuals who may even make a contribution to the revolution for a time, only to turn renegade because of their own corruption, demoralization, fear, or infatuation with their own shortcomings and simultaneously with their own "genius". They continue to speak with a Marxist vocabulary, but their objective effect is counter-revolutionary. Their overall line, their "Marxist" theories, would guide the movement away from revolution and socialism, and toward defeat. For a time, only temporarily, we might say such an individual has "good intentions, but a mistaken theory". But in the long run there is a unity between theory and practice, and between intention (subjective) and effect (objective). In other words, persistence in a counter-revolutionary line means that their intention is precisely to carry out a counter-revolutionary line. In the course of making history, the masses eventually judge these people as hidden traitors, scabs, and renegades. In the case of Trotsky there is no good evidence that he or his most loyal followers were ever consistent Marxists. Trotsky didn't *turn into* an opportunist; rather, an examination of his history shows that *he turned out to be* an opportunist the whole time.

ON SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM

Before Marxism, socialism existed as an idea—a religious idea, a moral, ethical, sentimental idea, in short, only as a conception of a utopia. Marx and Engels proved theoretically that socialism is a definite social system arising out of the contradictions in the mode of production, i.e., in the economic structure, of capitalism. Marx and Engels established the philosophy of dialectical materialism, a method of thinking and analysis which enabled them to reveal the general outline of thousands of years of human history and the causes of historical progress. How were they able to do this? Mao Tsetung explains in "On Practice" that

> it was not until the modern proletariat emerged along with the immense forces of production (large scale industry) that man was able to acquire a comprehensive, historical understanding of the development of society and turn this knowledge into a science, the science of Marxism.[1]

From that time forward, socialism has existed not only as a definite social system coming into being, but also as an ideology, a system of theories, policies, etc., which move masses of people from any particular set of concrete conditions toward revolution and eventually to communism. Although it was in many respects the epoch of the bourgeoisie, Marx and Engels, based on their investigations and analyses, already declared that the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie inevitably leads to the victory of the proletariat, a period of proletarian dictatorship over the bourgeoisie, and that this period was itself a transition to the abolition of classes altogether.

During Marx and Engels' lifetime, their theories were known only in the most advanced capitalist countries, and could achieve a popular following only in those countries where the proletariat was most literate. At that time the view commonly held among socialists was that the revolution

1. Mao Tsetung, "On Practice", *Four Essays On Philosophy,* Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1966. p. 3.

2. Frederick Engels' Introduction to *The Civil War In France,* FLP, Peking, 1969.

would occur first in those countries that were economically prepared for *social* ownership of *already socialized* productive forces. But Marx never took any vows to this view. France was not an industrially advanced country, but when the workers dispersed parliament in Paris and established an armed commune, Marx and Engels supported it wholeheartedly right to its end, which came only a few months later. They supported it and called it the model of the dictatorship of the proletariat despite the fact that they did not believe it could succeed, and despite the fact that the leaders of the commune were not, with a possible few exceptions, followers of Marx and Engels.[2]

It was also the generally accepted view among socialists at that time that colonial oppression would be resolved by revolution in the mother country. But Marx and Engels weren't religious about that view either. Marx changed his mind on this question when it came to a concrete application to the relation between Ireland and England:

> For a long time I believed that it would be possible to overthrow the Irish regime [meaning colonial government—MM] by English working-class ascendancy. I always expressed this point of view in the *New York Tribune.* Deeper study has now convinced me of the opposite. The English working-class will *never accomplish anything* until it has got rid of Ireland. The lever must be applied in Ireland.[3] [emphasis in original]

Many articles by Engels in his later life refer to the connection between England's colonial monopoly and a bourgeoisified stratum in the English working class.[4] The reason we find this development of thought in Marx and Engels is that they considered themselves scientists and not prophets, serving the cause of proletarian revolution and not their own images. Thus they had a great respect for historical experience.

3. Marx and Engels, *Selected Correspondence,* Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1953, pp. 277, 279-80. (written in 1869)

4. These references are quoted by Lenin in "Imperialism And The Split In Socialism", Vol. 23, esp. pp. 111-20. Unless otherwise noted, all references to Lenin are from *Collected Works* (CW) recently published by Moscow.

THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION

Lenin summed up the dialectical method: "concrete analysis of concrete conditions."[5] Lenin applied Marxism correctly to the conditions of his time and place. Lenin's theories on strategy and tactics, on philosophy, on the state, and on organization, guided the political party of the Russian workers which led the October revolution and established the Soviet state. Lenin's theory of imperialism, especially its effect on the world revolution and on the proletariat of the imperialist country, has since guided the revolutionary wing of the working class movement.

At the beginning of the struggle, however, many Russian revolutionaries sought to by-pass Marxism. They believed the peasantry could form communes and that this would be the basis of socialism. Lenin showed that capitalism already existed in Russia, the Russian proletariat was growing and that Marxism would apply to Russian conditions. Lenin also fought a protracted struggle against a mechanical application of Marxism, a revisionist trend which believed that a country like Russia, which had an autocracy—complete with Czar and landed nobility—would have to go through a bourgeois revolution, and a long period of capitalism (in order to build up the productive forces) before launching a struggle for socialism. Lenin didn't deny that the revolution had to proceed in two stages—first, overthrow of the autocracy; second, overthrow of the bourgeoisie—but he concentrated his attention on the building up of an independent force; a party of proletarian revolutionaries who were ideologically, politically, and organizationally independent of the bourgeoisie. The first stage of the revolution—overthrow of the autocracy—was undoubtedly bourgeois in character; but as to how long an interval between the bourgeois and socialist

5. Lenin, Vol. 31, p. 166.

6. Lenin, "Social-Democracy's Attitude Towards The Peasant Movement", Vol. 9, pp. 236-37.

revolutions, Lenin did not say. The revolution would move forward to its socialist tasks "just in accordance with our strength",[6] that is, the strength of the socialist program among the masses of people and their readiness to fight for it. Lenin's theory prepared the party for the possibility of a long or a short interval and that was the Bolshevik line. He left this question open because he was no prophet; yet the poor fellow was beside a "prophet" all along and didn't even know it. For all the fourteen years prior to the October revolution, from 1903-1917, Lenin was opposed by this "prophet", and his name was Leon Trotsky.

Trotsky's theory was that the revolution would *have to be* a socialist revolution; it would *necessarily* be pushed forward to socialist tasks with no line dividing the stages; it would then come into hostile collision with the private ownership interests of the peasantry, but would be saved because the revolution would sound the bell for revolution in the advanced capitalist countries and the whole world would go socialist. This came to be known as the theory of "permanent revolution".[7]

7. Trotsky's theory can be found in *What Is The Permanent Revolution?*, published by Sparticist, N.Y., 1970. Trotsky's formulation of the theory changed slightly over the years and this is his last (1940) and supposedly best. Like all the earlier writings, this too is filled with "inevitables." Marx's theory of permanent revolution, to which the Chinese Communist Party has adhered very closely, is a theory of *continued revolution by stages.* The essence of Trotsky's theory is that it *negates stages;* it is a theory of simultaneous and universal revolution, which is a theory of no revolution at all. The opposite side of the same coin is the universal feature of revisionism, which is to negate all conceptions of continuous, uninterrupted revolution and to see the struggle as an infinite accumulation of *quantitative stages;* this is also a theory of no revolution at all. "The movement is everything, the ultimate aim nothing" said Bernstein, with the modern revisionists following in his footsteps. To this the good dogmatist is bound to reply: The ultimate aim is everything and the movement nothing—even worse than nothing, a *hindrance* to the final aim. An excellent summary of this theory and the historical struggles which centered around it is "Conscientiously Study Chairman Mao's Theory Of Continuing The Revolution Under The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat" by Chao Yang, *Peking Review* No. 5, 1970.

Lenin thought this was a fantasy which admitted of no other possibility than a revolution without the peasants; that it was no more than *playing with revolution* behind an absurdly "left" slogan.[8] Although Trotsky had this peculiarly "left" theory, he never in fourteen years left the side of the Mensheviks, those who held the view that Russia would have to go through a long period of capitalism, and who tied themselves to the liberal bourgeoisie in order to accomplish this purpose. The theory of "permanent revolution" coincided with the Menshevik line, since, in Trotsky's view, it was the advanced productive forces of Europe which would carry the revolution forward to socialism. Failing the European socialist revolution, there was no alternative for Russia but a long period of capitalism. This is why, despite Trotsky's desire to disassociate himself from the Mensheviks, he always stuck with them and against Lenin. The clearest illustration of this was on the question of the party organization.

What kind of an organization does the proletariat need to accomplish the task of revolution, to carry the revolution successfully through its necessary stages all the way to communism? Lenin wanted the party to be made up primarily of professional revolutionaries from the proletariat, highly skilled and trained in all the necessary functions of revolutionary work, and highly dedicated and disciplined to the party program. The Mensheviks didn't think it was so important that someone should actually have to agree with the party program in order to *proclaim themselves* a party member. Trotsky sided with the Mensheviks. What Trotsky wanted was a loose organization of varying groups representing different shades of opinion. He wanted the ideologists representing contradictory classes to contend equally in the party. Trotsky understood Bolshevism as "barracks discipline", saw Lenin as the "dictator" and "leader of the reactionary wing of the party", and predicted

8. Lenin, Vol. 20, pp. 346-47, Vol. 21, p. 419, and "Two Tactics Of Social-Democracy In The Democratic Revolution", Vol. 9.

doom for the party:

> The party organization will replace the party, the Central Committee will replace the party organization, and finally the dictator will replace the Central Committee. . . .[9] s

Trotsky set out in 1903 to draw together all the anti-Leninist elements from both the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. In 1917 he was exactly where he started—with a small group of anti-Bolshevik and anti-Menshevik intellectuals. He and his whole little group were literally swept up by the tide of revolution and all of them joined the Bolsheviks a few months before October.

Now the Trotskyists, beginning with Trotsky himself, have built up a myth concerning this struggle and its outcome. They say, "well Lenin was right about the party, but Trotsky was right about the strategy. After all, the bourgeois revolution *was* pushed forward to the socialist revolution immediately." From Trotsky's point of view a miracle happened at this propitious moment in history. The revolution joined Trotsky. Trotsky didn't really join the Bolsheviks. They joined him! 40,000 Bolshevik workers joined Trotsky since he had foreseen everything![10]

What's wrong with this theory? In the first place, the main reason why the workers were able to go forward at once toward socialist revolution was because the Bolshevik Party

9. Leon Trotsky, from *Our Political Tasks* (1904), as quoted by M. J. Olgin, *Trotskyism—Counter Revolution In Disguise*, Workers' Library Publishers, N.Y., 1935, pp. 68-69. See also Lenin, *CW*, Vol. 7, pp. 271-275 in "One Step Forward, Two Steps Back".

10. Isaac Deutscher, *The Prophet Armed*, Oxford University Press, London, 1954. Deutscher conveys this impression by stressing how the two "came together," each supposedly adopting the position of the other on crucial questions. "The roads of Lenin and Trotsky, so long divergent, had now met." "Trotsky had foreseen." "Lenin had refused to see. . . .", etc. 255-59. See also Trotsky's egotistical reminiscences in *My Life*, Pathfinder Press, N.Y., 1970, pp. 329-33. Just recently the Spartacist newspaper *Workers' Vanguard* (April 1972), says Trotsky was right about strategy but had to give up his left-Menshevik views on party organization.

had been built to an organization of revolutionaries with 40,000 worker-members.[11] Lenin's theory took both eventualities into account (a long or a short interval of bourgeois rule) and he had said that the second stage would be achieved as quickly as the measure of their strength would allow. By the time the autocracy was overthrown, the bourgeoisie itself was entangled in a network of agreements with the imperialist bourgeoisie of other countries and couldn't get out of the imperialist war. The Bolsheviks had turned the war to the advantage of revolution, initiated a break with the chauvinist leaders of the international socialist movement (the Second International), and defeated opportunism within its own ranks, including a definitive split from the Mensheviks. Therefore their strength was very great.

The short-lived rule of the bourgeoisie was in fact a "dual power" owing to the fact that the workers and peasants had armed soviets (democratic political councils)[12] Had there been no strong Bolshevik Party, there would not have been the necessary strength, and there would be no October to speak of. If Trotsky, as a "left" Menshevik, had not been defeated, there probably *would* have been a long period of capitalism before the socialist revolution. *The problem with Trotsky's theory is that it requires no party at all.* The event is determined *apriori.* What really determines historical events, according to the Trotskyist method of thinking, is *The Correct Idea,* which is injected into the mass movement by an intellectual genius. By this reasoning the October revolution and all other revolutions since are merely the gradual unfolding of Trotsky's great idea. This method of

11. This is admitted by Tim Wohlforth of the Workers' League: ". . . if their roles had been reversed and Trotsky's methods of building the party had triumphed in the early period there would have been no Bolshevik Party. . . ." And, "The October revolution was actually prepared through Lenin's long struggle to build the Bolshevik Party." (*Bulletin,* April 7, 1969, p. 6).

12. Lenin's writings on "dual power" can be found in Vol. 24, pp. 38-39, 57, 60-62.

reasoning is called rationalism (part of the idealist school of philosophy) and not dialectical materialism. Since the main philosophical error had been pragmatism, Lenin always stressed the role of consciousness. However, when Lenin stressed consciousness he meant that it was possible to build a vanguard organization of workers who were *conscious* of their objective position in society and their historic task, and therefore prepared to lead the mass movement to the overthrow of the autocracy and then the bourgeoisie, *given the necessary objective conditions.* Trotsky's theory of October is that the Bolsheviks, having finally come around to The Correct Idea, were able to lead the revolution despite having an incorrect line for fourteen years prior to the event. Lenin understood clearly that Trotskyism inevitably leads to liquidationism—a theory for liquidating the vanguard party.[13]

But besides this, Trotsky was relying on the advanced European countries and not on the Russian masses. Thus he never could understand that the Russian proletariat could lead the democratic revolution in alliance with the peasantry, and, based on that alliance, could organize socialist production. This reliance on European revolution therefore led him to preclude the possibility of socialism being victorious in a single country.[14] However, Trotsky put these burdens in his cupboard (as Stalin later said) when he joined the Bolshevik Party. It was only later that his old anti-Leninist views again came to light and the continuity of Trotskyism as a petty-bourgeois trend of thought was to be revealed.

13. Lenin, Vol. 20, "Disruption Of Unity Under Cover Of Outcries For Unity". This entire article exposes Trotsky's liquidationism, culminating in a short review of Trotsky's political history for the "benefit [of] the younger generation of workers [who] do not know him." pp. 327-47.

14. Lenin's writings on the possibility of the victory of socialism in a single country can be found in Vol. 23, p. 79, and specifically against Trotsky in "On The Slogan For A United States Of Europe" in Vol. 21, p. 342: ". . . it may be wrongly interpreted to mean that the victory of socialism in a single country is impossible. . . ." And by "victory of socialism", Lenin meant not only the successful overthrow of the bourgeoisie but also the "organization of socialist production".

TROTSKY IN THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY

Peace Negotiations with Germany

The height of Trotsky's career came during his Bolshevik period, especially the first few years. During that time Lenin called Trotsky "comrade" and had high hopes for Trotsky's bolshevization. But in the short space of a few years Trotsky managed twice to bring the party to a crisis and disruption by his oppositionism. The first post given to Trotsky was as head of the Soviet delegation to Brest-Litovsk, the meeting place with representatives of the German government. Trotsky's task was to fulfill both their internationalist duty and their promise to the Russian people by withdrawing from the imperialist war.

The Bolshevik revolution occurred in the midst of World War I. The party had pledged to withdraw from the imperialist war; they had overthrown their own bourgeoisie, published the secret treaties between the imperialist powers, and immediately sought out a fair peace with Germany. Germany was on the offensive on Russian territory, and the Russian army was in retreat and rapidly decomposing. In these conditons the terms were bound to be very harsh, and indeed they were. The Soviet government undoubtedly would have been justified in waging war, a revolutionary war against German occupation. But this was impossible given the actual state of affairs militarily, economically and politically. Lenin insisted that the treaty had to be signed immediately before even worse terms would confront them.

Lenin had to fight every inch against a majority in the party leadership who constituted themselves into a "left" war faction. They argued that the signing of a peace treaty would hamper the German revolution, whereas continuing the war would intensify the crisis in the German government and help bring about the German revolution; this would lead to the European revolution, which would save the Russian revolution, etc., etc. The entire party leadership, including Lenin, believed the German revolution to be imminent. Nevertheless, Lenin was not about to *rely* on that event in making practical policy. In fact, he maintained that the internationalist duty of the Bolsheviks was precisely to

safeguard the Soviet state and not bring about its collapse through speculating on the world revolution. Trotsky sympathized with the "lefts", but he compromised only in order not to openly oppose Lenin's leadership, and put forth his own policy: "neither war nor peace". Trotsky's plan was to stall, to delay for enough time to allow the German revolution to succeed. After long sessions of debating, Lenin had to accede and Trotsky's middle position was adopted.

After negotiations went on for a while, the terms got worse, exactly as Lenin had predicted. Once again the battle raged in the Central Committee. Once again Trotsky prevailed upon Lenin to compromise, to wait a bit longer, and once again, Lenin acceded, warning that it would be the last time. In the course of the internal struggles over the Brest-Litovsk policy, Lenin more than once threatened to resign his position and appeal to the rank and file if the Central Committee didn't agree to sign an immediate peace. Before Trotsky left for Brest-Litovsk to re-open negotiations, Lenin spoke to him personally. He wanted Trotsky's assurance that *if* the Germans were going to begin a new military offensive that he, Trotsky, would sign the treaty. Trotsky gave his assurance. And Trotsky was faced with exactly that situation. But he didn't follow through with his promise. Instead he delivered a very eloquent, very revolutionary (read "r-r-revolutionary") speech to the German General and Foreign Minister declaring to their astonishment that the Russian Army was being demobilized and that the Bolsheviks still would *not* sign the treaty. Trotsky's adoring biographer, Isaac Deutscher, explained that Trotsky "allowed himself to be carried away by his optimism":

> He underrated his enemy and even refused to listen to his warning. Great artist that he was, he was so wrapped up in himself and in his ideal and so fascinated by the formidable appeal of his own work that he lightly overlooked its deficiencies. While Trotsky was still on his way to Petrograd, General Hoffman, backed by Ludendorf, Hindenburg, and the Kaiser, was already issuing marching orders to the German troops.[15]

15. Deutscher, *op. cit.*, pp. 346-404. The scene in which Trotsky's

In the Central Committee discussion which followed Trotsky's return, Lenin became more adamant. The gravity of Lenin's attitude towards the hold-outs can hardly be exaggerated; suffice it to say that he considered them to be delivering the revolution to the enemy. If not for Trotsky, Lenin said, "we could have signed a peace which was not at all dangerous to the revolution." He called the attention of the whole party to Trotsky's "great mistake". Trotsky finally voted for Lenin's proposal, giving up his own formally. But he never gave it up intellectually. At the party congress Trotsky moaned and groaned, actually suggesting that "*we have come before our time,*" and would have to give up government power to the bourgeoisie, withdrawing into the underground.[16] In saying this, of course, Trotsky opened his cupboard and a big "burden" spilled out. To say that the workers could not hold power because history was against them was a direct attack on the morale of the revolutionary workers and a rallying call to all the vacillating intellectuals who fell into despondency at the slightest retreat.[17]

The "Trade Union Question"

Late in 1920 a new struggle broke out in the party leadership, entirely provoked by Trotsky. At that time the civil war was coming to an end and the expeditionary forces of various imperialist powers were defeated. The economy was in chaos. Peasant riots followed the requisitioning of grain and often the entire surplus was burned. Worse, sometimes the peasants didn't plant at all which had an effect two years later. In the cities there were no supplies. Workers were often paid in kind or not at all. Strikes began to spread.

Trotsky, still head of the Red Army,[18] turned his attention to economic affairs. The problem, he decided, was in

speech is depicted is on pp. 379-82. Lenin's talk with Trotsky is described on pp. 375-76. However there is no accompanying primary source documentation.

16. As quoted by Deutscher, ibid. p. 396.

17. Lenin's writings and speeches on the Brest-Litovsk policy are in Vols. 26 and 27.

labor productivity and therefore in the trade unions. The leadership needs a shake-up, he argued; new leaders have to be appointed and in fact the whole trade union apparatus needs to be under state control. Finally,the workers should be organized into labor brigades with military discipline. The workers don't need any independent trade unions anymore, said Trotsky, because since they have a workers' state they couldn't possibly have any interests separate or apart from their own state. This was Trotsky's plan, which he introduced as the only possible way to solve the problem of "labor productivity." This naturally provoked a rightist opposition which turned to trade unionism and the total independence of the unions from the state and party.

Lenin at first took little notice of the dispute until he saw the extreme crisis Trotsky had provoked. At the Tenth Party Congress in early 1921, Lenin severely denounced Trotsky both for his politically erroneous thinking and for his persistent factionalism. He explicitly held Trotsky responsible for provoking a split in the party, and all over the most incredible theoretical blunders on the relation between economics and politics. Trotsky should have known better, Lenin told him, than to try to solve an economic problem without putting politics first. Without the correct political approach, Lenin explained, the class in question can't maintain itself in power and therefore can't solve its production problems. In considering the workers' state, Lenin had to remind Trotsky that this "workers' state" relied heavily on the support of the peasantry, and if this wasn't taken into account, the revolution would not survive. Secondly, and ironically, Lenin pointed out that their workers' state had certain bureaucratic weaknesses which had to be fought and not reinforced by the bureaucratic removal of the heads of mass organizations. Lenin concluded that the workers needed the trade unions and the party had to rely on the methods of persuasion in dealing with their independence.[19]

18. Trotsky's role as head of the Red Army is omitted here. The reader is referred to Bruce Franklin's introduction to *The Essential Stalin,* for a brief description of Trotsky's military role. Doubleday-Anchor, Garden City, N.Y., 1972.

At this Congress, Lenin dealt with the main problem, which was definitely not the "trade union" question, but rather the alliance between the workers and peasants. He put forward the "tax in kind," a kind of incentive system for the peasants which initiated the New Economic Policy (NEP). The "tax-in-kind" was the agricultural aspect of the partial restoration of the open capitalist market, a deliberate policy of temporary retreat which did not alter the proletarian character of the State. Further, Lenin dealt organizationally with the persistent factionalism in the party leadership by personally urging the adoption of a special rule in the party constitution prohibiting factions.[20]

Ebb in the World Revolution

About the time that Trotsky was working out his trade union platform—the statization of the unions and the militarization of labor—Lenin delivered a speech to party activists in which he made specific reference to the world revolution and the relation of the Soviet Union to it. He spoke of the groups affiliated with the Third (Communist) International carrying out independent work in all the imperialist countries. He lauded the change in the slogan of

19. Lenin, Vol. 32, "On the Trade Union Question", "Once Again On The Trade Unions", etc. This theoretical confusion (on the relation between economics and politics) goes back to "What Is To Be Done?" (1902-Vol. 5). Lenin there put the matter quite clearly: ". . . the most essential, the 'decisive' interests of classes can be satisfied *only* by radical political changes in general. In particular the fundamental economic interests of the proletariat can be satisfied only by a political revolution that will replace the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the dictatorship of the proletariat." Today the Soviet social-imperialist philosophers perpetuate more confusion by criticizing the "Maoists" for putting "politics in command". (see M. Altaisky, V. Georgiyev, *The Philosophical Views Of Mao Tsetung – A Critical Analysis*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971, pp. 69-72, 83)

20. *History Of The CPSU (Bolshevik)*, Authorized by the Central Committee of the CPSU (B), International Publishers, N.Y., 1939, p. 255. This is also documented by E.H. Carr, *The Bolshevik Revolution*, Vol. 1, Penguin Books, 1969 (reprint of MacMillan Publication of 1950), p. 207.

proletarian internationalism from "*Workers of the World, Unite!*" to "*Workers and Oppressed Peoples, Unite!*" "The whole world," Lenin said, "is divided into oppressed and oppressor nations." Of the Soviet state he said, "we now stand not only as representatives of the proletarians of all countries but as representatives of the oppressed peoples as well." And of the revolution in the capitalist countries he said,

> . . . the rate, the tempo of development of the revolution in the capitalist countries is far slower than in our country. It was evident that the revolutionary movement would inevitably slow down when the nations secured peace. Therefore, without surmising as to the future, we cannot now rely on this tempo becoming rapid. We have to decide what we are to do at the present time. Every people lives in a state, and every state belongs to a system of states, which are in a certain system of political equilibrium in relation to one another.[21]

Perhaps Trotsky didn't take notice of this speech. But in a few short phrases, Lenin spoke volumes against Trotsky's idea of permanent revolution, the idea that there couldn't be socialism in one country, the idea that the very attempt hinders the opportunities for revolution elsewhere. Lenin was a student of historical experience, whereas Trotsky was a "prophet." Lenin was just as expectant of revolution in Europe as Trotsky, but he never *relied* on it; he did rely on the peoples of the Soviet Union and was therefore willing to turn his attention to the construction of socialism in the U.S.S.R. Of course this was no easy path. History had not provided any previous experience to go by. Of course the Russian masses and the productive forces as a whole were backward and the internal and external pressures towards a restoration of capitalism were great. It is very instructive to compare Lenin's and Trotsky's writings on this situation. Here is how Trotsky described the years following the

21. Lenin, Vol. 31, "Speech to Party Activists", and immediately following, the report to the 8th Congress of Soviets.

revolution, when the advance of the proletariat came to its height and then temporarily receded:

> A revolution is a mighty devourer of human energy, both individual and collective. The nerves give way. Consciousness is shaken and characters are worn out. . . . thus after an unexampled tension of forces, hopes and illusions, there came a long period of weariness, decline and sheer disappointment in the results of the revolution.[22]

And here is Lenin on the same subject:

> Victory creates such a "reserve strength" that it is possible to hold out even in case of an enforced retreat—to hold out materially and morally. Holding out materially means retaining a sufficient superiority of forces to prevent the enemy from smashing us completely. Holding out morally means not allowing ourselves to be demoralized and disorganized, it means retaining a sober estimate of the situation, preserving our courage and firmness of spirit, it means retreating far perhaps, but within measure, and retreating in such a way as to be able to call a halt to the retreat at the proper moment and again assume the offensive.[23]

Trotsky on the Paris Commune, obviously with the Soviet Union in mind:

> it shows us the incapacity of the masses to choose their path, their indecision in the leadership of the movement, their fatal penchant to come to a halt after the first successes, thus permitting the enemy to regain its breath, to reestablish its position.[24]

22. Trotsky, *The Revolution Betrayed,* Pioneer Publishers, N.Y. 1945, pp. 88-89. (written in 1936)

23. quoted in *Strategy And Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution,* International Publishers, N.Y., 1936, pp. 60-61 (written approximately 1921-22)

24. *Leon Trotsky On The Paris Commune,* Pathfinder Press, N.Y., 1970, pp. 52-53

Nothing disgusted Lenin more than the snivelling, the "I told you so," the vacillation and demoralization of the petty-bourgeois ideologists. Lenin expressed his position in metaphor as well as concretely, in "Notes of a Publicist" (1922). He compared the situation of the Bolsheviks with ascending a high mountain. Having come near the summit, the mountain climber finds that

> it is not only difficult and dangerous to proceed in the direction and along the path he has chosen, but positively impossible. He is forced to turn back, descend, seek another path, longer, perhaps, but one that will enable him to reach the summit.

This descent, Lenin continues, proves to be more difficult than the ascent, "and one does not know where this extremely dangerous and painful descent will end." Down below are the righteous critics who warned that it was impossible in the first place. They shake their heads sadly: "It grieves us sorely to see our fears justified."

> Happily, in the circumstances we have described, our imaginary traveller cannot hear the voices of these people who are "true friends" of the idea of ascent; if he did, they would probably nauseate him. And nausea, it is said, does not help one to keep a clear head and a firm step, particularly at high altitudes.[25]

Events did not turn out as Trotsky had thought. From his point of view, from the point of view of the supreme petty-bourgeois egotist, this could not be explained by the incorrectness of his own ideas. And so he invented a theory to correspond to his own practical demoralization. In 1923 he launched an attack on the party leadership insinuating that they may be degenerating like Bernstein and Kautsky, the revisionist leaders of the Second International. Too many decisions are made at the top and too few workers are in the party, Trotsky complained.[26] He complained, yet he knew,

25. Lenin, Vol. 33, pp. 204-205

26. Trotsky, *The New Course,* University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1965

since he was a participant, that the party had already passed a resolution concerning bureaucracy and the recruitment of workers-from-the-bench. When Lenin died in early 1924, some 300,000 workers were enrolled into the party, replacing, as they said, Lenin's leadership with their collective leadership. What did Trotsky think about this? Years later he wrote that this was the "death blow" to the party! After all, all these raw recruits![27] He only realized years later that these hundreds of thousands of workers were dedicated to the construction of socialism in the U.S.S.R. That's why he hated them so.

Stalin Exposed Trotsky

Trotsky desperately tried to distort the history of the revolution in order to launder his unfavorable image. Besides injecting his "Lenin really joined Trotsky" theory, he asserted that the real test of the revolutionary is at the time of the seizure of power. According to Trotsky, since he stood that test, while others vacillated, he believed his stature should be very high in the eyes of the workers.[28] Stalin answered Trotsky right then in 1924. Stalin's speeches to the Central Committee and to Party organizations and congresses remain some of the most perceptive analyses and acute exposures of Leon Trotsky.

> In general I must state that during a victorious uprising, when the enemy is isolated and the rebellion is spreading, it is not difficult to fight well. In such moments even backward people become heroes. However, the struggle of the proletariat is not a solid advance, a solid series of successes. The struggle of the proletariat has also its trials, its reverses. Not he who displays courage in the period of a victorious uprising is a genuine revolutionary, but he who, while being able to fight well during the victorious advance of the revolution, is also able to display courage during the period when the revolution is in retreat, when the proletariat is defeated; who does not lose his head and flinch when the revolution meets with setbacks, when the enemy gains successes; who does not become panic-stricken and seized with despair during the period when the revolution is in retreat. . . . It is an extremely sad but undoubted fact that Comrade Trotsky, who fought well during the October period, lacked the courage during the Brest period, the period when the revolution received temporary setbacks, to show sufficient firmness at that difficult moment. . . . The revolution has not been exhausted by October. October is only the beginning of the proletarian revolution. It is bad enough if flinching is evinced during an uprising in the ascendant. It is still worse when there is flinching after the seizure of power when the revolution is undergoing heavy ordeals. To retain power the day after the revolution is no less important than to seize power.[29]

Stalin summed up the danger of Trotskyism:

> Wherein lies the danger of the new Trotskyism? In that Trotskyism, according to its entire inner content, has every chance of becoming the centre and the rallying point of non-proletarian elements which are trying to weaken, to disintegrate the dictatorship of the proletariat.[30]

Stalin turned out to be exactly right about Trotsky. Within a few years a petty-bourgeois "left" opposition was organized to fight against Stalin's theory of socialism in one country. Trotsky got together with the very people he had correctly accused of wavering on the verge of the October uprising. Defeated in the Central Committee, they brought their ideas to the cells, to all the party organizations. They provoked the party into no less than *three years* of discussions concerning Trotsky's line. And they were resoundingly defeated. The final vote was something like 700,000 to 5,000. How did

27. Trotsky, The Revolution Betrayed, op. cit., pp. 97-98

28. Trotsky, *The Lessons of October*, New Park Publishers, London, 1971. Trotsky wrote (1924): "selecting the leading staff . . . must proceed in the light of *revolutionary action.*" "Failing this criterion, the rest is worthless." p. 62 (italics in original)

29. Joseph Stalin, "Trotskyism or Leninism", in *The October Revolution*, International Publishers, N.Y., 1934, pp. 73-74

30. ibid., p. 94

they explain this? They thought the party must have been stacked against them by Stalin. So they appealed to the masses over the head of the party, in direct violation of the party's discipline. On the tenth anniversary of the revolution, they took to the streets and tried to speak to the people participating in the parades and demonstrations. They were literally swept aside by the workers. They shouted "Long Live Trotsky and Zinoviev!" And they heard in reply from the workers, "*To the dustbin with them!*"[31]

Now the opposition, completely routed, split apart. Some concluded that capitalism was being restored; on the other side, many recanted and begged the party to forgive their error. Trotsky wanted to have it both ways. He wanted to have his opposition and be in the party too. He couldn't understand, after twenty-five years, why the party couldn't allow groupings and factions! Trotsky was finally expelled. The die-hards, especially Trotsky, now set about forming opposition groups elsewhere. These opposition groups were instructed to maintain the view that the Soviet Union remained a workers' state and that the Bolsheviks still represented the October revolution; yet they were to oppose wholeheartedly the line of the Party, to constantly point out the "deformations" in the Soviet state, and to warn of the imminence of capitalist restoration if Stalin's line were pursued. Very soon their message reached the U.S.

31. These quotes, originally written down by one of the participating opposition, are cited in Isaac Deutscher's account of the 10th anniversary rebellion, in *The Prophet Unarmed,* Oxford University Press, London, 1959, pp. 373-76

U.S. TROTSKYISM

The Communist Party U.S.A.

The Communist Party U.S.A. was formed in the early 1920s as a direct result of the international revolutionary wave and especially the victory of the Soviet Union. The ideological leadership of the Bolsheviks, Leninism, drew the most revolutionary elements from the old Socialist Party, from the IWW, from the Socialist Labor Party, and from the politically unorganized workers. It took approximately ten years to finally establish somewhat of a base, and to develop a sufficiently clear two line struggle so as to determine a definite line of action. It was only after this that the party became a significant force in the working class movement. Between 1925 and 1928, the party was dominated by factions and factionalism, the leading force at this time being Jay Lovestone. Lovestone gradually emerged as the spokesman of a rightist tendency which argued the case of "American exceptionalism"—that because things were so different in the U.S. Marxism didn't apply and would have to be altered to fit the case. He believed that the U.S. economy would not be affected by capitalist crisis, even if it affected the rest of the capitalist countries. In short, Lovestone wanted to throw out Marxist principles. Instead, the party threw out Lovestone.[32]

Now all during the 1920s, there was never a struggle in the party having to do with some special Trotskyist line for the U.S. The leading American figure of Trotskyism is James P. Cannon, who was expelled as a Trotskyist in 1928, just before the conclusion of the struggle against Lovestone. Cannon had gone to the 1928 Congress of the Communist International and there was given a copy of Trotsky's critique of the Comintern program. According to Cannon in his historical writings, he was convinced at once. He said nothing

32. An enduring summary of the struggle for the party in the 1920s was provided by William Z. Foster in *History Of The Communist Party of the United States,* International Publishers, N.Y., 1952, pp. 260-275

at the Congress and hurried home to plot the opposition's tactics. Cannon up to this time had never taken any distinct line one could identify with Trotsky or against Stalin. *In fact there was no special or particular line for the U.S. based on Trotskyism.* But Cannon maneuvered around and organized whoever he could find before the whole bunch were expelled. The only program this little clique had was Trotsky's "line." And what was that line? That the construction of socialism in one country stands in antagonistic contradiction to the proletarian revolution in other countries.[33]

While the young Communist Party fought vigorously in defense of the Soviet Union, and against the reformism of "American exceptionalism," it also maintained a relatively good grasp of the peculiar conditions of the U.S. It would not be an exaggeration to say that if there is anything exceptional about American history from the point of view of revolution, it is the "Negro Question." Cannon's writings on the history of American Trotskyism contain not a mention of this question or any particular Trotskyist position or policy or practice on this question. But in 1959, stimulated by the queries of an anti-communist historian, Cannon looked back at the early years with candor:

> A serious analysis of the whole complex process has to begin with recognition that the American communists in the early Twenties, like all other radical organizations of that and earlier times, had nothing to start with on the Negro question but an inadequate *theory,* a false or indifferent *attitude* and the adherence of a few individual Negroes of radical or revolutionary bent.[34]

Cannon goes on to say that there was a "*profound*" difference between the Communist Party and the earlier socialists on this question. Whence the distinction?

> . . . Lenin and the Bolsheviks were distinguished from all other tendencies in the international socialist and labor movements by their concern with the problems of oppressed nations and national minorities, and affirmative support of their struggles for freedom, independence and the right of nations of self-determination.

Slowly throughout the twenties, according to Cannon, the Party adopted this new attitude and theory on the Negro question. And they carried it into practice in earnest in the Thirties.

> It was the Communist Party, and no other, that made the Herndon and Scotsboro cases national and world-wide issues, and put the Dixiecrat legal lynch mobs on the defensive—for the first time since the collapse of Reconstruction. Party activists led the fights and demonstrations to gain fair consideration for unemployed Negroes at the relief offices, and to put the furniture of evicted Negroes back into their empty apartments. It was the Communist Party that demonstratively nominated a Negro for Vice-President in 1932—something no other radical or socialist party had ever thought about doing.

Whatever may be said about the inadequacies of the Party on this question; its frequent failure to go beyond a moral, democratic argument, and its failure to consolidate this policy over a period of time, the fact remains, and Cannon knows it, that the Party represented a revolutionary step forward compared to the old radical and socialist forces. Now it would also seem to be an obvious fact that the party, in adopting this new attitude and theory and in carrying it into practice, was applying Leninism and was *directly influenced by Stalin's thinking.* Yet Cannon cannot admit this part of the story. He attributes the progress on this question to "the influence of Lenin and the Russian Revolution, even debased and distorted as it later was by Stalin." But in order to deny Stalin's role, Cannon finally has to contradict himself by asserting that the upholding of self-determination, which was

33. James P. Cannon, *History Of American Trotskyism,* Pioneer Publishers, N.Y., 1944, p. 93, also 89-91, 95, 49-52. See also Tim Wohlforth, *The Struggle For Marxism In The U.S.,* Labor Publications, N.Y., 1971, pp. 30-32.

34. James P. Cannon, *The First Ten Years Of American Communism,* Lyle Stuart Inc., N.Y., 1962, Part II, "The Russian Revolution and the American Negro Movement", pp. 229-43.

the essence of the new attitude and theory, was incidental, secondary, or even a hindrance.

> The expansion of communist influence in the Negro movement in the Thirties happened despite the fact that *one* of the new slogans imposed on the party by the Comintern [was] the slogan of "self-determination" . . . .

Needless to say that while the Communist Party was doing all this remarkable work, Cannon and the Trotskyites had nothing but hatred for them and could find nothing good to say about them.

During those years, when the C.P. was experiencing a sudden and tremendous increase in its size and influence, while the workers and oppressed peoples everywhere looked to the Soviet Union and to the Communist Parties affiliated to the Third International, this little band of Trotskyites went into "hermetically sealed isolation", in Cannon's words. While millions of people were moved to struggle against capitalist crisis, the Trotskyites were too busy having their own hard times. According to Cannon, intense factional struggle consumed the group for months on end. Sometimes for long periods recruitment just stopped. Then they recruited some oddballs, anti-Soviet "experts", etc. They were rejected by workers' organizations, unemployed organizations, thrown out as counter-revolutionaries. Cannon admits that the Trotskyite movement at that time was "walled off from the vanguard represented by the Communist movement and without contact with the living mass movement of the workers."[35]

The Center and Rallying Point

That was only the beginning of their troubles. As time went on they grew more and more desperate. Eventually they found their way back to the mass movement—*via anti-com-alliances.* They did exactly as Stalin predicted. First they allied themselves with A. J. Muste, the pacifist preacher. Did it matter that Muste was not a Marxist, that he was against

35. Cannon, History of American Trotskyism, *op. cit.* p. 93

the dictatorship of the proletariat? No this didn't matter. Did it matter that Muste's opposition was from the right and not from the "left"? No this didn't matter. What mattered were two things: 1) The Trotskyites failed to recruit from the Communist Party, which they had thought was comprised of the most advanced workers. And the C.P. *was* comprised of the most advanced workers; that's why the opposition couldn't win them over. 2) Muste led a real-life political party (American Workers Party) with some real-life contact with the masses. That's what mattered. Immediately after joining A. J. Muste, they began a factional fight inside the organization, demanding a merger with the Socialist Party, the party of Norman Thomas. Did it matter that the SP and Norman Thomas were outspoken opponents of the Soviet system, that they had been denounced by the world communist movement for the previous twenty years? No. Trotsky himself initiated this policy.

Of course all these maneuvers didn't run smoothly, since even Trotsky's followers knew the difference between the Second International as a right-opportunist organization, and the Communist Third International, the organization built by Lenin. Trotsky's line was a bit difficult to swallow. Leave the Third International from the left, then join the party of the right-wing Second International in order to build a solidly left-oppositionist Fourth International! In order to join Muste's party Cannon led a fight against an internal opposition who were finally expelled. Then, inside the new "Workers Party", they went through a year's struggle all over the question of joining the Socialist Party. Two years after joining they themselves were expelled, but not before they made use of the S.P. for a Trotsky Defense Committee to defend Trotsky's "good name" from insult. Thus the inauspicious beginnings of the "Socialist Workers Party", a center of attraction of all the non-proletarian elements trying to disintegrate the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union by splitting the advanced workers and wrecking the unity between them and the Soviet state.

Later, Trotsky tried to get the SWP leaders to support Earl Browder, the CP's candidate, for President. Cannon and the other leaders objected strongly, but Trotsky wasn't impressed. He even speculated on the possibility of rejoining the

CP, reminding them of the struggle against the opponents of joining the SP.

> Could we enter as we did the SP? I see no reason why not—theoretically. Physically it would be impossible but not in principle. After entrance into the SP there is nothing that would prevent our entrance into the CP. But that is excluded. We can't enter. They won't let us.[36]

While the CP was leading workers' struggles against capitalism, and while the Trotskyites were struggling against the CP, Trotsky was finding an appreciative audience in the literary circles of the bourgeoisie. Over cocktails they discussed whether Stalin poisoned Lenin, and what dark secrets lay hidden in the walls of the Kremlin. In the fascist countries, where communist literature was *verboten,* Trotsky's latest diatribe on the Soviet Union was easily available.[37] Late in the thirties he wrote an article on the coming U.S. revolution especially for his bourgeois fans, stressing how "without compulsion", a socialist economy would be built in the U.S.

> It is the task of your Communist statesmen to make the system deliver the concrete goods which the average man desires: his food, cigars, amusements, his freedom to choose his own neckties, his own house, and his own automobile. It will be easy to give him these comforts in Soviet America.[38]

His article affords an interesting comparison with Earl Browder's revisionism; however, while Trotsky was good-naturedly teasing the bourgeoisie about a revolution, Browder also played an active and positive role in mobilizing

36. Wohlforth, *op cit.*, pp. 65-69

37. James Klugman, *From Trotsky to Tito,* Lawrence and Wishart, London 1951, pp. 81-82

38. Isaac Deutscher, Ed., *The Age Of Permanent Revolution: A Trotsky Anthology,* Dell Publishers, N.Y., 1964, pp. 212-22.

masses of people in struggle against U.S. capitalism and against fascism, before his revisionist line developed.

American Trotskyism and the Soviet State

Trotsky personally played a big role in all the ideological struggles in the U.S. over the question of the Soviet state. And it was this question, the character of the Soviet state, which was the main determining struggle in the development of American Trotskyism. Trotsky's book *The Revolution Betrayed* had a tremendous impact on the Trotskyist movement. In that book he called attention to every bad point, every weakness, every "deformity", inequality, backwardness, and low productivity he could dredge up or make up about the Soviet Union. He compared the Soviet Union unfavorably with the U.S. and even with German fascism. Carried away by the force of his own argument, Trotsky ventured to predict the approaching downfall of the Soviet government, something the fascists were encouraged to hear.

> Can we, however, expect that the Soviet Union will come out of the coming great war without defeat? To this we answer frankly: if the war should remain only a war, the defeat of the Soviet Union would be inevitable. In a technical, economic and military sense, imperialism is incomparably more strong. If it is not paralyzed by revolution in the West, imperialism will sweep away the regime which issued from the October revolution. [39]

Then he was surprised when large sections of his followers couldn't bring themselves to defend the Soviet Union! They only followed his logic; taking off from Trotsky's own comparisons between fascism and Stalinism, they slowly but surely began to equate the two, until the whole American section of the Trotskyite "International" were embroiled in a factional fight over the nature of the Soviet state.

39. Trotsky, The Revolution Betrayed, *op. cit.*, p. 227. Also pp. 226, 229, 209, etc. On p. 161 he compares Soviet methods to those of Goebbels. On p. 125 he says the wage differential is worse than capitalism. Examples abound throughout the book.

According to Tim Wohlforth of the Workers' League, the opposition to "defense of the Soviet Union" represented almost half the party organization, and probably a majority of the youth.[40] Now they had an opposition's opposition, which invented new theories ("bureaucratic collectivism", "managerial revolution", "state capitalism", etc.) and brought forth new personalities (Max Schactman, James Burnham, and others); gradually they drifted straight to the imperialists, where they occupied the favored position of anti-communist expert.[41]

Faced with the constant emergence of new theories justifying opposition to the Soviet Union, all of which claimed to be applying Trotskyism, Trotsky at last considered the possibility that he was wrong. In his last book *In Defense of Marxism,* he briefly considered the possibility only to perform spectacular mental gymnastics in rejecting the thought. He asked himself: suppose the war (speaking just prior to World War II) doesn't provoke revolution, or suppose the western proletariat overthrows the bourgeoisie only to follow Stalin. "then", Trotsky goes on, "we would be compelled to acknowledge that the reason . . . is rooted,

> not in the backwardness of the country and not in the imperialist environment but in the *congenital incapacity of the proletariat to become a ruling class.* [italics added] . . . if the world proletariat should actually prove incapable of fulfilling the mission placed upon it by the course of development, nothing else would remain except only to recognize that the socialist program, based on the internal contradictions of capitalist society, ended as a utopia.[42]

40. Wohlforth, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-49

41. The Schactman tendency evolved into the "Independent Socialists" and then became the "International Socialists"; they are "independent"—of Marxism-Leninism, and they are "international" in the sense of capitulating to imperialism. Nominally they plague both houses, capitalism and "totalitarian communism". Burnham ended up as advisor to the State Department and then as writer for the right-wing periodical *National Review.*

42. Trotsky, *In Defense of Marxism,* Pathfinder Press, N.Y., 1970, p. 9

which should be read:

> If the world proletariat should actually prove incapable of fulfilling the mission placed upon it by me, Leon Trotsky, nothing else would remain except only to recognize that the Trotskyite program, based on disuniting the workers from the Soviet Union, from the oppressed nations, and from the peasants, ended as a petty-bourgeois dream.

Trotsky's persistent refusal to learn from historical experience brings to mind the story about the man who thought he was dead. The wise doctor thought the man would be convinced by simple logic: "you know, of course, that dead men do not bleed." "Yes, of course dead men do not bleed," answers the man. Whereupon the doctor pricks the man's finger. Gazing astonished at his bleeding finger, the man exclaims, "well, I'll be . . . dead men *do* bleed!"

Trotsky's Anti-Soviet Expertise

There was nothing new in Trotsky's predictions of doom for the Soviet government. The capitalist countries had been anxiously awaiting the day of its downfall ever since the revolution and had been predicting its imminent collapse with regularity over the years. The "left" opposition had predicted the restoration of capitalism based on the rise of the Kulaks (rich farmers) and on the rise of the NEPmen (petty profiteers who took advantage of the New Economic Policy to accumulate capital). Not only did this not materialize but it was Stalin himself who led the party and the Soviet people in the fight against these elements. When Trotsky deferred to German superiority and warned that the "defeat of the Soviet Union would be inevitable" ("*it grieves us sorely to see our fears justified*"), he was not only saying what the fascists wanted to hear, he was saying exactly what they were saying. After the Nazis attacked the Soviet Union, the reactionaries fell all over themselves in assuredly predicting the quick defeat of the Soviet Union. Hitler's Foreign Minister thought it would be eight weeks. The British Chiefs

of Staff thought it would be six to eight weeks. Secretary of War Stimson told Roosevelt that it would be from one to three months. James Burnham, anti-Soviet expert in the leadership of the SWP, wrote that the destruction and parceling out of the Soviet Union by Germany and Japan was not only inevitable but had already begun. The Trotskyites feared that Stalin would be afraid to arm the people, or, if he did, that they would turn the guns around. Nothing of the sort happened. They all proved to be wrong.[43]

But how could they have been *so wrong*? The main reason their estimates were so far off is that they were counting on a "fifth column", an inside force sympathetic to Nazism which would play the same kind of destructive role seen in the other countries invaded by the Nazis; a force which enabled the Nazis to execute a quick take-over. But to their everlasting sorrow there *was no fifth column* in the Soviet Union. The Soviet fifth column existed in the organized opposition which had been convicted in the purge trials a few years back, and whose leaders had been executed shortly afterward. The Soviet Union was the only country which did not have a fifth column.

Wherever there existed an "opposition" (and whatever remained of it after the purge trials) it was used skillfully by the Nazis in preparing for the attack on the Soviet Union. Trotsky had provided an invaluable service to the bourgeoisie by painstakingly informing them of the internal affairs of the Soviet Union and constantly encouraging their military appetite by bolstering their confidence. He was the foremost and greatest "Kremlinologist".

A New Line for the "Fourth International"

Trotsky's predictions about the consequences of the second world war proved to be completely wrong. Not only was the Soviet Union under Stalin not overthrown, but the

43. See Herbert Aptheker, *History and Reality*, Cameron Associates, N.Y., 1955, pp. 167-71; Also D.F. Fleming, *The Cold War And Its Origins*, Vol. 1, Doubleday, N.Y., 1961, pp. 136-38.

influence of Stalin and the Soviet Union spread even more all over the world. Protected by the Red Army, the Eastern European countries set about constructing socialist economies, and the Communist Party of China drove the nationalists off the mainland and raised the red flag, solidly with Stalin, over Peking. How did the Trotskyites react to this?

One section of Trotskyites had already come to openly oppose itself to the communist movement. This wing was connected with Schactman and Burnham, and tended to view the advance of the socialist movement as Soviet imperialism, equating it to U.S. and fascist imperialism. Domestically they saw the U.S. Communist Party as an agent of a foreign power. This line coincided with the liberal social-democratic line, which merged in practice with the State Department. This line was of no use to "real" Trotskyites, who wanted to be opposed to the communist movement, *but from the inside.* The "Fourth International" needed a new line, one which would "support" these new "workers' states", while opposing them.

This was provided by the new theorist of the "Fourth International", Michel Pablo. Pablo became the head of the "International", whose task it was to reconstruct all over again an opposition movement within and connected to the international communist movement. Pablo therefore held that these were all workers' states, deformed just like the Soviet Union, but workers' states all the same. But then he had to explain how it was possible that all these workers' states could arise out of Stalinism. Pablo concluded that Stalinism had taken on a new feature. Now the Stalinists were subject to popular pressure, and this popular pressure could force the Stalinists in a revolutionary direction, push them into a revolution they don't want and are fighting against! Sometime the reader will happen to be looking at one of the "left" Trotskyite papers, and will surely run into rantings and ravings against "Pabloism". This is because Pablo, in an attempt to explain the advent of all these workers' states, came up with a theory which *undermined any necessity for a Trotskyite party.* What need for such a party when they could better play the role of pressuring the Stalinist parties towards revolution. Pablo foresaw "centuries

of deformed workers' states" independent of the will of Trotskyism.[44] But Pablo isn't to be blamed, for Trotsky himself thought the Bolsheviks were swept to power despite having an incorrect line for fourteen years prior to the event. Pablo only remained consistent and true to Trotskyism and carried it to its rightful conclusion—liquidation.

The other infamous leader of the "Fourth International" was Ernest Germain (Mandel), who originally had the view that these "Stalinist" victories were still capitalist states, set up by Soviet agents. This led to a "third camp" position in the Korean War, where the SWP did not even side with the Korean struggle against imperialist aggression.[45]

Lining Up With Khrushchev

In 1956 Khrushchev came on the scene, launching an attack on the dictatorship of the proletariat and spreading petty-bourgeois ideology and culture everywhere. To the SWP this was a long awaited reform. How did they see the deals between the Soviet revisionists and the U.S. imperialists? As "a victory for the forces of peace over the warmongers."[46] From this time forward, the SWP became simply an attachment of modern revisionism, and later social-imperialism, finding plenty of common ground in the attack on Stalin, opposition to the dictatorship of the proletariat, and in general in complete lack of principles. In 1961 one of the SWP leaders was to state at their convention: "The Soviet Union is compelled today, instead of playing a counter-revolutionary role—to place itself on the side of revolution."[47] *In other words, during the period of "Stalinism", when the Soviet Union actually transformed the economic base and constructed socialism, when the Soviet Union led*

44. Wohlforth, *op cit.*, p. 116

45. *ibid.*, p. 117

46. *ibid.*, p. 148

47. *ibid.*, p. 148

the world revolution to the victory over fascism and to revolution in a number of countries, when the imperialist bourgeoisie and the Soviet state were the most implacable enemies, during this whole period the Trotskyites had nothing but hatred for the Soviet Union. Then when revisionism is in command, at the height of Khrushchev's collaboration with U.S. imperialism, then the SWP sees the "progressive role" of the Soviet Union! Such is the history of Trotskyism!

With the leadership becoming an appendage of modern revisionism, naturally a "pro-Mao" wing developed with the support of as much as 15% of the party. This means that after 35 years of propaganda and agitation for Trotskyism, the Trotskyites ended up with the modern revisionists defeating a "Maoist" faction![48] Nothing the Trotskyites said or did concerning the Soviet Union had any significance because it was all based on phoney prophecy and not on historical experience. *The mainstay of the Trotskyite leadership never even realized that the Khrushchev clique was preparing the ideological ground for the restoration of capitalism. But they knew enough to welcome it when it came!*

48. *Ibid.*, pp. 151-52, and a final note on Tim Wohlforth. This man obviously knows a great deal about the history of American Trotskyism, and he has no compunction about exposing it. Yet he chooses this very heritage. Why? Because Tim Wohlforth is not a dialectical materialist; he is a rationalist historian searching for *The Correct Idea.* One can learn a lot about the history of philosophy from Wohlforth (see *Marxism And American Pragmatism,* Labor Publications, N.Y., 1971); especially one can learn about Wohlforth's rationalist philosophy of the party. "At heart, what the party is is its program. It is nothing else. The apparatus, the forces, the people, the equipment, the paper, are all expressions of what? A program. . . . and a program is an idea. So at its heart you could say that the party is an idea." Well, *you could* say it, in fact *you did* say it. (p. 5)

THE CHIEF CHARACTERISTICS OF THE "LEFT" TROTSKYITES

Opposition To The National Liberation Movement

The Trotskyites are always talking about world revolution. Let them begin with "In Memory of Norman Bethune".

> Leninism teaches that the world revolution can only succeed if the proletariat of the capitalist countries supports the struggle for liberation of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples and if the proletariat of the colonies and semi-colonies supports that of the proletariat of the capitalist countries.[49]

The first spearhead of Trotskyite theory and practice is aimed at this very important *principle of Marxism,* as developed by Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung. In attacking this principle, they find ample room for unity with the modern revisionists. The Soviet social-imperialist theoreticians are outraged by the "east wind" slogan, the protracted people's war theory, and they never express the principal contradiction in the world as anything but socialism vs. capitalism. Their critique of "Maoism" is that it is "petty-bourgeois nationalism".[50] The Soviets talk about the world socialist system, but they also oppose any concrete revolutionary plans for getting there. In theory they have liquidated the war of national liberation, the *revolutionary* national liberation movement, and in its place have put the struggle of *already independent states* for a more favorable international

49. Mao Tsetung, "In Memory Of Norman Bethune", 1939

50. P. Fedoseyev, "Ideological And Political Essence of Maoism" in the information Bulletin of the *World Marxist Review,* No. 1-2 1972, and originally published in *Pravda,* December 5, 1971. According to this Russian social-imperialist, "Great Han Chauvinism is the original motive" of the Chinese party's struggle against modern revisionism. "Being bearers of nationalistic ideology and advocates of great-Han chauvinism, the national-bourgeois elements support the nationalistic ideas and actio .s of the Maoists." "The tragedy of the Chinese revolution is that in the struggle between the two courses—the proletarian internationalist and the petty-bourgeois-nationalist—the latter prevailed at a certain stage." pp. 70-78.

(economic and political) position.[51] This struggle does exist and it is often directed against imperialism; but it *is* a *reform movement.* When speaking of national liberation we include this apsect of the struggle against imperialist oppression; but the other aspect, the *war of national liberation,* is the really essential, revolutionary struggle, the *sine qua non* of the movement for national liberation. The social-imperialist theoreticians all agree that the national liberation movement is a reform movement; the Soviet social-imperialists praise it to the skies while the Trotskyite social-imperialists damn it to hell. The one and only case of a Trotskyite organization supporting the peace treaty (*Workers' World*) exactly proves the rule. *WW* argued that the peace treaty—like a union contract!—was the best they could get under the circumstances (of being sold out by the Soviet Union *and China*—of this more later) and so we should support it *as we would a trade union struggle!*[52]

What is the usual Trotskyite rationale for opposing the national liberation movement? They say they are not opponents. They say that support for national liberation should be

51. Examples are easily found in the recent Soviet literature. One of the most important is the "Letter Of The Central Committee of the CPSU To The Central Committee of the CPC" (March 30, 1963) which is included in the pamphlet *A Proposal Concerning The General Line Of The International Communist Movement* (the reply to the Soviet party's letter) Foreign Language Press, Peking, 1963. Of a dozen paragraphs devoted to the national liberation movement, the CPSU uses up ten talking about "the peoples of the former colonies", "the freed peoples", "the countries that have thrown off the colonial yoke", "the young national states", "the struggle of the young sovereign states", "the consolidation of independence" etc. etc.

52. See *Workers' World* on the peace treaty, especially the months of November 1972—February 1973. the "Workers World" (party?) and their mass organization "Youth Against War and Fascism" are an oddity among Trotskyites for they have actually given up on pushing Trotsky. They don't distribute his writings and have replaced them with those of Mao. And isn't is a fact that in direct proportion to their shedding Trotskyism have they made a positive contribution to the anti-imperialist movement. Is this a transition from Trotskyism to Maoism? No. This is more a case of Trotsky waiting in the back room for the appropriate time. *WW* keeps both kinds of goods in stock and finds a use for each.

conditional. And what is that condition? That the movement in question opposes imperialism and doesn't help it? No. The condition imposed by the Trotskyites on the national liberation movement is that they adopt a socialist program and nothing less; that they break up their united front of patriotic classes; that they don't establish fraternal ties with any socialist country—in the end, of course, the Trotskyites wouldn't support it unless it came out for Trotskyism.

The Sparticists and the I.S. say they give *military but not political support*. What does this mean? Does this mean they have been sending arms to the NLF? That would be good news. Unfortunately, they have not been sending arms to the NLF. The way they talk you would think they were the head of the dictatorship of the proletariat in some country which actually had a realistic choice regarding military support. Moreover, we can be sure, when the Chinese give arms it is because they support the movement politically; that's why they only *give arms* and never sell them. Well, since the Spartacists and the I.S. (and the others) are sending no arms and they are sending no resolutions of support, and since they are spreaders of slander, gossip, and gross insult about the leaders of the liberation forces, we have to conclude that they are opponents and not supporters of national liberation.

The other side of the chauvinist coin is the Trotskyite "transitional program" for American workers: 30 for 40. This is how they "connect" socialism with the workers' movement. On the face of it, this program has nothing to do with national liberation; on deeper probe however, we see that it deliberately has nothing to do with (is *unconcerned with*) national liberation. Of course every workers can dig 30 for 40. One need not study Marxism to be for it. The question is, can we get this under capitalism, and if not, is it part of the socialist program? This is a theoretical question, which our Marxist, our vanguard, must be able to answer. Aside from social-liberals and technocracy experts no one believes you can achieve this under imperialism. "But", our Trotskyite theorist might say, "the workers want it, and when they realize it can't be won under imperialism, they'll go over to the revolutionary side." Putting aside certain

questionable reasoning in this tactic, we ask, can this program be carried out by a revolutionary government? Can they really believe this will be carried out as part of the socialist program? Here we are in the biggest imperialist country, the country which has been ripping off the rest of the world, the country which has developed chauvinism right along with the productive forces. As a matter of responsibility to the world revolution, this revolutionary government will have some internationalist duties to fulfill. If there does not exist some millions of workers willing to work over-time in order to help our comrades in other countries, then there will be no proletarian internationalism and no proletarian revolution. The Trotskyite scheme is nothing but social-imperialism and not socialism. In other words, if there is a relatively peaceful transition to "socialism", where destruction of the productive forces is very minimal, and the U.S. continues somehow to live off the poorer countries, then the imperialists would divert the resources for the pleasure of Americans, and a fourth or even a half of the working class would get 30 for 40. As a movement for an economic reform this may attain popularity among the workers, and deserves to be supported. But we should never confuse it or allow others to confuse it with a socialist program or revolutionary tactics.

The Workers League should know better than to try to solve an economic problem without putting politics first. To paraphrase Lenin, without the correct political approach—which in this case is the alliance between the proletariat of the imperialist countries and the national liberation movement—the given class, the proletariat, will not be able to make revolution and therefore will never be able to solve its economic problems. This support for nationally oppressed peoples is a political question; you will find it very difficult to convince workers to wholeheartedly support the NLF because of some soon to be gotten material gain. No, the conviction must be politically motivated, by a grasp of the relation between these forces in defeating imperialism.

The other big advocate of 30 for 40 as a road to socialism is the Progressive Labor Party. Now PL is brand new to Trotskyite type thinking and they apparently never studied

Marxism-Leninism or Mao Tsetung's writings anyway, and so they are to be excused for not knowing about the theoretical relations between economics and politics, or between national liberation and socialism. The very remarkable thing about PL is that they came to "Trotskyism" not from the books—in fact, they don't study Trotsky at all—but *directly via the route of national chauvinism in practice.* This is why, despite PL's adamant denials, all the Marxist-Leninists consider them Trotskyite. We should take PL's rotten history—its denunciation of national aspirations and all national leaders, its super-economism on the job, its rejection of theory—as instructive, as a good negative lesson for us all to learn.

Opposition to Socialist Countries

The second "great historic duty" of Trotskyism is to destroy the unity between the proletariat of the imperialist countries and the proletariat in power in other countries. If the proletariat in an imperialist country should identify with the dictatorship of the proletariat, the real living socialism with all its weaknesses as well as its strengths, wouldn't this be a good thing? Wouldn't this accelerate the world revolution? On the other hand, if the workers are cynical about that socialist country, if they believe it's just as bad there as here, then how can they defend it? Won't they lack the will to resist an imperialist attack on that country? Yet the heart of Trotskyism in its original conception is that these are *deformed* workers' states, states which are an *obstacle* to world revolution. According to the Trotskyites, every advance, every victory and consolidation of a socialist country should be looked on as a blow to the proletarian revolution elsewhere. In reality, such a country is, as the Chinese say, a "reliable base area" for world revolution.

Trotskyism has never understood theoretically and has never learned from practice, that socialism can be constructed in a technologically backward country. They say the movement in such a country must be a socialist movement, but this is only a tactic in order to spur the sluggish revolution in the imperialist countries. If the communists

actually succeed in leading the masses of people to power, independent of socialist revolution in the imperialist countries, the Trotskyites have no other concrete program than to give up power and await the world revolution.

What Trotskyism teaches the American worker is contempt for the effort to build socialism in a country materially less prepared than the U.S. They are too backward, you see. They don't know how like we will. The "real" socialism is yet to come and will show the world, etc., etc. An illustration of this is revealed in the Spartacist publication *From Maoism to Trotskyism.*[53] At the height of the "transformation"—the climactic acceptance of Trotskyism stated in "A Letter to a Maoist"—we find the following gems of Trotskyite wisdom: "need for a revolution among the dominant peoples as a prerequisite for socialism"; and further, "the Europeans will have to rescue Marxism from Asiatic obscurantism". By now, hopefully, the reader will know in whose hands Marxism finds a good home, and in whose hands it is being perverted and in need of rescue.

Trotskyism has never understood in theory and never learned from practice the class character of the Soviet and Chinese states. During the period of Soviet history when the economic base was being transformed from private to social ownership of the means of production, the Trotskyites always stressed the political structure—the superstructure. Then the emphasis was always on "*deformed*" in the characterization "deformed workers' state". Now the emphasis is on "*workers*". Now they base their analysis on the fact that, in the main, the means of production are publically owned, through the state apparatus; This is mechanical materialism, and typical Trotskyite upside-downism. The economic base can never be considered apart from the political structure. In

53. Marvin Treiger, "From Maoism To Trotskyism", published by Sparticist, 1971. The "Letter to a Maoist" was originally sent as a personal letter to this author in March of 1971. Treiger was "fused" into the Spartacist leadership but within a few months found it repulsive. He is now, for time being, politically inactive.

the Soviet Union, the Communist Party, which is the heart of the political structure, was taken over by a clique of bourgeois-type politicans and transformed into a variant of a big bourgeois political party. Now they are busy implementing economic policies which *reverse the socialist economic base,* which restore private ownership, private production for the market, and which reproduce on an enormous scale all the corresponding capitalist social relationships. Now they are busy implementing foreign policies designed to utilize the national liberation movement for their own profit, turning the Soviet Union into a competitive imperialist country. At the same time, while the Trotskyites are upholding Soviet social-imperialism as a workers' state (the *Workers World* even calls it a socialist country) in the face of more than a decade of counter-revolutionary practice, they are forced to take on the repulsive task of elaborating on the "backward", "degenerate" and "bureaucratic" character of the Chinese state, and this after the historic experience of the cultural revolution! Can anyone believe after the experience of the cultural revolution that China is restoring capitalism, that China is run by bureaucrats, that China is subordinating the world revolution to national interests? One would literally have to shut their eyes to the concrete facts in the world in order to believe that the Soviet Union and China are the same types of states.

And that is literally what the Trotskyites do, and that is how they can believe it. As an example we have the crystal clear, anti-bureaucratic *Decision Of The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party Concerning The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution* (adopted on August 8, 1966).[54] In point number 2, "Put Daring Above Everything Else and Boldly Arouse the Masses" we find that a good party leader is one who encourages the masses to "criticize the shortcomings and errors in the work of the persons in charge". The not so good leaders are those who "put fear

54. This is only one tiny example, however important as a document. The real story lies in the thousands of concrete examples from the actual experience of the cultural revolution. In those can be found the essential proletarian character of the events in China.

above everything else, stick to outmoded ways and regulations, and are unwilling to break away from conventional practices and move ahead." Their leadership "lags behind the situation, lags behind the masses." The bad leaders, those who will become an obstacle unless they make serious self-criticism and change their ways, "are even more prone to put fear above everything else, being afraid that the masses will catch them out." (find out about them) Finally, there are those who are genuine misleaders whose fear of being exposed leads them to "seek every possible pretext to suppress the mass movement". These are the "capitalist roaders", who are the immediate target; the success of the revolutionary movement depends on the overthrow of these people. Is there any other way to interpret this than as an appeal from the vanguard to the masses to rise against bureaucracy? We may disagree considerably on exactly what defines a bureaucrat, but on one thing we can agree: *bureaucrats do not appeal to the masses to participate in the class struggle.* How is this to be explained?

> That bureaucratic factions could resort to this, *going against their natural inclinations as bureaucrats,* can be explained only by the intensity of the crisis tearing apart a leadership that is now the oldest in any Communist party, and this, close to twenty years after seizing power.[55] [Italics added]

With the erudition and emptiness of content worthy of the good rationalist, we are told only that it "can be explained" by the "intensity of the crisis". In other words, it is theoretically conceivable since the "class struggle.' is such an unknown that it could conceivably cause anything to happen. Here the "class struggle" itself has been abstracted from concrete reality and turned into a metaphysical demon responsible for all refutation-in-practice of Trotskyist notions about the world. Apparently this is the same demonic "class struggle" which was responsible for the "Stalinist" victories which Trotsky said would be impossible. And then they

55. "The Meaning Of The Shanghai Events" by Pierre Frank, in *Behind China's "Great Cultural Revolution"*, Merit Publishers, N.Y., 1967, pp. 37-38.

wonder why we don't want to argue with them, why our policy is to isolate them, and to discourage people from taking them seriously (that is, as a serious Marxist-Leninist theory, or as a trend of thought with the revolutionary movement or within the working class movement).

But all that—confusing the distinct character of the Soviet and Chinese states—is only one side of the issue. The other side is sometimes erroneously thought to be a question of semantics: viz; exactly what do we call these societies where the form of state is the dictatorship of the proletariat, a term the Trotskyites have all but abandoned in favor of "Workers' state". We all agree that in China or in other countries where there exists the dictatorship of the proletariat, socialism is not complete, classes and class struggle continue, the dictatorship of the proletariat remains in force and there cannot be talk of entering communism and the withering away of the state. For the moment we leave aside our knowledge that in the Soviet Union the dictatorship of the proletariat has formally and officially been liquidated, and we leave aside as well, our knowledge that the Trotskyites deliberately obscure this fact. We leave this aside. The question remains what do we call this society which is *constructing socialism* as the transitional stage to completely classless, and therefore, stateless communism. We call it socialism. That is, we Marxist-Leninists call it socialism. But if our Trotskyites should hear it called socialism, they will positively gasp. They will sputter and stomp, whine and weep. The veins will bulge in their necks and foreheads. Never will they call this socialism. No, "it is transitional", they say; it is in transition to socialism. We can not allow any escape into semantics: the terminology used by the Trotskyites in describing socialist countries is precisely the same Lenin used to describe imperialist countries. Although Lenin's book was written with an eye to the censor, anyone can figure out what is meant: "Monopoly", says Lenin,

> is the transition from capitalism to a higher system. (p. 150)
>
> is the epoch of transition from capitalism to a higher social and economic system. . . . (p. 151)
>
> is the transition from the capitalist system to a higher social-economic order. (212)[56]

Thus the confusion between the Soviet and Chinese states is only a preliminary, a preparatory step in obscuring the distinction between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the monopoly capitalists. We know that in our country millions of uninformed people don't know the difference between socialism and fascism. But the Trotskyites are not uninformed; they have elevated this uninformed backwardness into a high level theory.

The Correlation Between Trotskyism and Proletarian Revolution

The Trotskyites are still waiting for the return of the Messiah, waiting for the day when the world will say, "Comrade Trotsky, you were right all the time." Meanwhile they will have to be content with the following realistic assessment of their relation to proletarian revolution: *In all those countries where the working class overthrew the bourgeoisie, in every case where the masses of people themselves believe they are following the road of Marxism-Leninism—where the Trotskyites themselves say, "there is a workers' state", in all those cases Trotskyism was completely liquidated along the way. In all those cases where imperialism is the strongest, where opportunism leads the working class and revolution is the weakest, in all those cases the Trotskyites have some following.*

Here the Trotskyites jump to their feet: "This is nothing but an 'if you're so smart why aren't you rich' theory." They don't like to be reminded of their failure. Yes, since they act so smart, people want to know why these pious pundits have nothing to show for all their talk. This expression is nothing but a common recognition that correct ideas come from social practice and the test of their correctness is in social practice. Capitalist theories ought to lead to personal riches; socialist theories ought to lead to socialism.

Another leap to the feet: "How dare you ask why we haven't been successful, when it is you, the Stalinists, who have persecuted us and driven us from the working class

56. "Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism", beginning of Chs. 7, 10.

movement." Now this should truly touch our hearts. Are we to believe that the persecution suffered by the Trotskyites is worse than that suffered by the Chinese Communists under Japanese and Kuomintang rule? Was it so bad as the Vietnamese or Korean conditions? Or perhaps the Czechs or the Poles or the Albanians? Or the others? Persecution is virtually the natural environment of a communist determined to make revolution. But the real communists are persecuted by the bourgeoisie because the real communists are really determined to wage the revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie. The phoney communists, those who help the bourgeoisie under cover of revolutionary rhetoric, isolate themselves from the vanguard, from the revolutionary class, and from the masses. While the communists agitate against capitalism, the Trotskyites agitate against the communists.

Moreover, in blaming the Soviet regime for the failure of the revolutionary movement in the advanced capitalist (imperialist) countries, the Trotskyites deviate conspicuously from the Leninist analysis of imperialism. That analysis stresses opportunism in the working class of the imperialist countries and the enlarged role of the oppressed nations struggling against imperialist domination. The unity between the proletarian revolutionary movement and the national liberation movement is no moral question; it is an essential condition for world revolution. What holds back this unity? Opportunism in the working class of the imperialist country, which has its basis in the upper, bourgeoisified stratum of workers. The principal form of this opportunism has been and continues to be *national chauvinism*—identifying with one's "own" imperialist bourgeoisie in their effort to deny the right of self-determination to oppressed nations. And Trotskyism (in its most "left" expression) is nothing if not an appeal to the "socialist" chauvinism of those workers.

A Final Note

Some ten years ago the world communist movement split into revisionist and Marxist-Leninist wings, into an opportunist and a revolutionary camp. Even since that time it has been the urgent practical task of all communists to break decisively from revisionism and build a new communist party ideologically, organizationally, and politically independent of the bourgeoisie. Since that time, revisionism has grown into social-imperialism, and Trotskyism is its "left" ideological arm. There were those who moved left but who never really let go of revisionism and they were most likely to fall into Trotskyite type of thinking. Those who made the break and are building a new communist party are now finding the struggle against "left" opportunism particularly acute. This critique should be seen in the context of that struggle, and that struggle (against "leftism" generally, and against its main theoretical expression) should be seen in the context of the overall struggle against modern revisionism, against the right-opportunist opponents of revolution. Against the united front *with imperialism*. Those who have studied and grasped the significance of the Soviet-Chinese polemics, those who have really looked into the concrete experience of the cultural revolution, those who adhere closely to the united front against imperialism—all those are best prepared to carry out this struggle successfully.