

The New Stalinist Case:

Role of Trotskyism in the Modern World

By M. Basmanov

A Trotskyist Reply:

Role of Basmanov in the New School of Stalinist Falsification

By George Saunders

Stalin's 'Ideological and Organizational Defeat of Trotsky' * The Eleven Points of the ILO * The 'Non-existent' Soviet Section * Founding of the Fourth International * The 'Popular Front' * 'Mother of Revolution' * Did the USSR Face a Deadly Threat? * The 'Second Front' and the Achievements of Earl Browder * 'Simply Disintegrated' * The 1953-54 Split * Opportunities for Trotskyism * 'An Important Stage of Reconstruction' * 'Majority' and 'Minority' at 'Loggerheads' * 'Several Dozen' Trotskyists * 'Initiative' Groups * Youth 'Infected with Leftism' * 'No Clear Definite Program' * What Is Meant by 'World Socialism'? * 'Deformed Workers States' * Whose House? * M. Basmanov and J. Posadas * The Outcome of a Nuclear War * Why the Closed Doors? * Lenin and the August 1912 Bloc * Trotskyism and Democratic Demands * Case of the Missing Facts * Where Ballot Boxes Come In * A 'Rich Arsenal' of Stalinist Means and Methods * Faith in the Working Class * How a Revolutionary Situation Can Develop * The Tactic of 'Entryism' * 'Constantly Root About Among Teen-agers' * Relative Importance of the Colonial Revolution * 'Appraisal of the Peasantry' * 'Patriotic, Democratic Forces' * Lenin on Guerrilla Struggle * 'The Events in Peru' * Guatemala and Fidel Castro's Speech *

State Department Bars Gisela Mandel

In addition to seeking to restrict the freedom of the press to criticize its policies in Vietnam, the Nixon administration is gunning against the right to travel. It made another move in this respect by barring Gisela Mandel from entering the U.S. to speak at an April 15 antiwar rally at Columbia University.

Gisela Mandel, an early activist in the German student movement and in the European protest movement against the war in Vietnam, had been invited by the Columbia Student Mobilization Committee (SMC) to bring greetings from the European antiwar organizations.

She also happens to be the wife of the internationally known Belgian economist Ernest Mandel, who is a contributing editor of *Intercontinental Press*. He had already been barred from entry. A committee of scholars and civil libertarians has been fighting for the right of American audiences to hear his views.

On April 11 the U.S. embassy in Brussels phoned Gisela Mandel's home to inform her that her visa had been canceled. The caller mentioned Section 212/28 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. This repressive legislation, passed at the height of the McCarthy witch-hunt, gives the Justice Department the right to ban "leftists" as well as several other categories of "undesirable aliens." As the anti-Communist hysteria of the 1950s waned, this act fell into disuse. It has, however, been revived by Nixon.

Gisela Mandel later received a telegram and then a letter confirming the cancellation of her visa. No specific reason for this action was given.

Gisela Mandel toured the U.S. in 1968 on a speaking tour for the Young Socialist Alliance. Her visa was good until August 20, 1972. Thinking that the telephone call and telegram might be a hoax, she tried to board her plane April 13.

The Sabena airline officials told her that the U.S. embassy had instructed them not to allow her on the plane. She asked them if the Belgian state airline was taking orders from the American diplomatic representatives. The Sabena officials denied this but

could offer no valid reason for preventing her from boarding the plane.

On learning that Gisela was not on her scheduled flight, Pat Grogan of the Columbia SMC told a news conference at Kennedy International Airport in New York City: "I don't consider this an isolated incident. It's part of the campaign of the government, in the face of the rising protest and discontent, to quell antiwar opposition in academic circles."

A statement by U.S. academic and literary figures read at the news conference condemned the Nixon government's action as "a grave violation of civil liberties and an infringement on academic freedoms." Signers included the theater critic Eric Bentley; the writer Susan Sontag; Faris Bouhafa of the Executive Committee of the Columbia University Senate; Robert Heil-



GISELA MANDEL

broner, professor of economics, New School for Social Research; Ky Neilson, professor of philosophy, New York University; Alan F. Westin, professor of public law and director of the Center for Research and Education in American Liberties; and twelve Columbia professors.

In This Issue

		FEATURES
M. Basmanov	365	The New Stalinist Case: The Role of Trotskyism in the Modern World
George Saunders	370	A Trotskyist Reply: The Role of Basmanov in the New School of Stalinist Falsification
	372	Notes on Basmanov's Article U. S. A.
	362	State Department Bars Gisela Mandel
		ANTIWAR
Les Evans	✓363	Hundreds of Thousands in U.S. Protest War
		CAMBODIA
	364	Junta Asks Nixon for Arms
		CEYLON
	392	Maoists Make Deal to Back SLFP Candidates
		PHOTOS
	362	Gisela Mandel

Intercontinental Press, Post Office Box 635, Madison Square Station, N. Y. 10010.

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.

MANAGING EDITOR: Les Evans.

TRANSLATIONS: Gerry Foley, George Saunders.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

Published in New York each Monday except last in December and first in January; biweekly in July; not published in August.

Intercontinental Press specializes in political analysis and interpretation of events of particular interest to the labor, socialist, colonial independence, and black liberation movements.

Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of Intercontinental Press. Insofar as it reflects editorial opinion,

unsigned material expresses the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism.

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 95 rue du Faubourg Saint-Martin, Paris 10, France.

TO SUBSCRIBE: For one year send \$15 to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010. Write for rates on first class and airmail. Special rates available for subscriptions to colonial and semicolonial countries.

Subscription correspondence should be addressed to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York 10010. Because of the continuing deterioration of the U.S. postal system, please allow five weeks for change of address. Include your old address as well as your new address, and, if possible, an address label from a recent issue.

Copyright © 1970 by Intercontinental Press.

Hundreds of Thousands in U.S. Protest War

By Les Evans

Hundreds of thousands of people joined demonstrations against the Vietnam war throughout the United States April 15, answering Nixon's latest escalation in Laos and Cambodia with the demand "Bring the Troops Home Now!"

The actions were nearly as large as the mammoth October 15 Moratorium last year despite a virtual press blackout beforehand that matched the deliberately limited coverage afterward. More than 100,000 persons took part in a Boston rally, the largest in the country; 40,000 assembled in Bryant Park in Manhattan, while 150,000 New York students boycotted classes as part of a nationwide campus strike called by the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam [SMC].

About 25,000 people marched down State Street in Chicago; 12,000 rallied in Kennedy Square in Detroit; 20,000 in San Francisco; 5,000 in San Diego; 3,000 in Los Angeles; 4,000 in Washington, D. C.; 4,500 in Berkeley, California; 3,000 in Portland, Oregon; 5,000 in Cleveland, Ohio; 8,000 in Philadelphia, and some 3,000 in Orlando, Florida.

More than 6,000 persons, as estimated by national television news broadcasts, took part in the largest antiwar demonstration ever held in Houston, Texas, on April 12, as part of the week of antiwar actions centering on April 15.

Demonstrators from all parts of New England joined the rally on the Boston Commons. A parade of 25,000 persons came from Cambridge, Massachusetts, while thousands more took part in local campus and community rallies that ended in marches to the Commons.

The Boston rally was organized by a broad coalition of antiwar groups in which the SMC played a prominent part. Speakers included Carol Lipman, SMC's national executive secretary; Mamie Wilson of the Welfare Rights Organization; Representative James Shea, author of a bill recently enacted by the state legislature challenging the

constitutionality of the Vietnam war; Mike Kelly, Socialist Workers party candidate for Massachusetts governor; Abbie Hoffman, one of the defendants in the Chicago "conspiracy" trial; and Ngo Vinh Long, a Vietnamese student.

Carol Lipman called for solidarity with all mass movements of social protest, such as the Black liberation movement, workers' struggles like the recent postal strike, and the antipollution campaign. "They are all complementary," she said, "because their enemy is the same . . . a victory for one of these movements is a victory for all. Each movement has its own dynamic and each must be built. And we are going to build one hell of an antiwar movement against expanding U.S. aggression in 1970."

At the Boston rally, a group of ultraleftist hooligans led by the Maoist Progressive Labor party tried to seize the speakers' platform by force and take over the meeting, but a well-organized contingent of monitors restored order after the microphone was grabbed by one of these "commandos." The Maoists were given time to address the gathering and then the program continued as scheduled. Abbie Hoffman was among those who strongly condemned the attempt by the Maoists to use violence against a sector of the radical movement.

In New York, rallies and marches were held throughout the city, building to the Bryant Park meeting held under the auspices of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee. The Board of Education estimated that 60 percent of all secondary-school students were absent from class.

The New York Peace Parade Committee brought out 3,500 people at the Internal Revenue Service offices to protest the use of tax money for the war.

The Student Mobilization Committee helped to build a number of rallies and feeder marches, including one from Columbia University that began with several hundred and built to several thousand by the time it reached Bryant Park.

Because of differences in approach between the main antiwar organizations, the day's activities were loosely coordinated. They were not led by a central coalition as in past major demonstrations. The Moratorium group, the most conservative of the major antiwar formations, incorporating many individuals with ties to the Democratic party, would not agree to proceeding jointly with the Parade Committee, which in recent months has moved away from the strategy of mass actions against the war toward individual "confrontations."

The SMC took responsibility for several of the feeder marches to Bryant Park but was not part of the leadership of the rally, which was tightly controlled by the Moratorium.

Various ultraleftists, led by the Youth Against War and Fascism [YAWF] and the Progressive Labor party, used physical violence to break up the rally because they disagreed with the views of the speakers. As the meeting began, a group of these "revolutionary" hooligans attacked the marshals on the speakers' platform and took over the sound system.

Because of the ineptness of the Moratorium committee in organizing a sufficient number of marshals or in mobilizing the giant crowd to resist this assault on its right to protest the war in Vietnam, a small number of ultraleftists succeeded in taking over the meeting. Speakers were shouted down or physically prevented from addressing the meeting. The ostensible target of the Maoists and their allies was New York's Mayor Lindsay (who was not present, although he had been listed as a speaker), but their real political aim was made clear by their refusal to allow a representative of the antiwar movement in Japan or a spokesman for the SMC to address the rally.

Facing jeers over the sound system and jostling by the "left-wing" vigilantes, a few speakers were able to be heard. Attorney William Kunstler, who was sentenced to four years in prison for "contempt of court" in the

Chicago "conspiracy" trial, accused Mayor Lindsay of hypocrisy for speaking out against the war in Vietnam and the Chicago trial while remaining silent on the imprisonment of twenty-one Black Panther party members in New York City. At the same time, he deplored the attempts to silence opponents of the Vietnam war by small groups picturing themselves as "militants."

Howard Zinn, professor of government at Boston University, spoke at the New York rally on the need to continue to build massive demonstrations around the demand for immediate withdrawal of U. S. troops from Vietnam. He was frequently interrupted and the microphone was shut off several times during his speech.

A few more speakers struggled with the physical and verbal harassment. Then the "direct actionists" took over, haranguing the by now plainly unsympathetic crowd on the need for confrontations with the police and "revolutionary" deeds.

On departing, these "militants" sought to further kindle the masses by a dramatic action. They stole the sound equipment, forcing the crowd to disperse inasmuch as no one could be heard.

The performance was symptomatic of the desperation resulting from the disintegration of the ultraleftist currents. The contingent—about 200—was smaller than in any previous major antiwar action. They were unable to disrupt any of the rallies or feeder marches organized by the SMC, where they were accorded the democratic right to have their own speakers, carry their own signs, and distribute their literature.

It was significant that the leaders of this adventure were YAWF and the Maoists. The hitherto largest ultraleft tendencies — the Weatherman and Revolutionary Youth Movement factions of SDS [Students for a Democratic Society] have virtually disappeared, marking the decline of this mood among the youth.

Outside of New York and Boston, all the rallies reportedly took place without incident. In the large cities the turnout came close to that of the October Moratorium, although most of the publicity this time consisted of leaflets, posters, and word-of-mouth announcements. Only a handful of the hundreds of bourgeois politicians who

supported the first Moratorium came out for April 15.

The Detroit rally was marked by a higher participation of Blacks and trade unionists than ever before.

In San Francisco, in addition to the rally of 20,000, there was a demonstration of more than 3,000 white-collar workers from the financial district in front of the stock exchange and a student strike that was highly effective. Some 19,000 students stayed away from classes at San Francisco State College out of a total enrollment of 20,000. The strike was well-organized in the city's high schools also.

Escalation in Southeast Asia

Cambodian Junta Asks Nixon for Arms

U. S. State Department spokesman Robert J. McCloskey announced April 16 that the military junta in Cambodia had asked Washington for arms. McCloskey would not say what action had been taken on the request, but the *New York Times* had already reported the previous day that the government sources said privately the weapons would be forthcoming.

Even more ominous, McCloskey left open the possibility that American troops might be used in Cambodia to retaliate for Communist attacks. "Previously," the April 17 *New York Times* said, "the 'protective reaction' of allied forces had been limited to immediate responses when they were fired on from Cambodia."

Large-scale military intervention, in Cambodia, involving South Vietnamese troops directed by Americans, is already under way. James P. Sterba, writing from Saigon in the April 16 *New York Times*, said that these South Vietnamese military operations in Cambodia, "like most of those carried out by South Vietnamese troops in combat areas, are advised, supplied and supported by the American military command."

This further escalation of U. S. involvement in Cambodia is linked with a genocidal campaign against the 600,000 ethnic Vietnamese who are citizens of that country. The generals are using the guns they now have to murder

Police used tear gas and clubs to disperse a march of 2,000 students at the Reserve Officers' Training Corps [ROTC] building on the University of California campus at Berkeley.

At nearby Stanford University in Palo Alto, California, some 8,000 people took part in an antiwar demonstration.

About 1,000 people took part in a rally in Newark, New Jersey; while in Des Moines, Iowa, an estimated 700 protesters threw a box of tea into the river, recalling the Boston Tea Party, as a demonstration against taxes being used to finance the war in Vietnam.

men, women, and children on the theory—not so far from the truth—that *all* Vietnamese not tied in with the Saigon regime sympathize with the National Liberation Front.

At least eighty-nine Vietnamese civilians were shot to death in the Cambodian village of Prasot April 9. Steve Bell, a correspondent of the American Broadcasting Company, was told by survivors that the killers were Cambodian government troops.

On April 15 hundreds of Vietnamese bodies were seen floating down the Mekong River in southeast Cambodia. According to an Associated Press dispatch from Neak Leung, many of the victims had their hands tied behind their backs.

"A police official at the Neak Leung ferry crossing 36 miles southeast of Pnompenh," AP reported, ". . . said he had counted 400 bodies this morning. But still they came, and more could be seen for a mile up the river, until they disappeared around a bend."

The American-backed regime is seeking to provoke a bloodbath by inciting the traditional animosity between Khmers and the Vietnamese, historically known as Annamites. The AP dispatch said, ". . . Government planes dropped leaflets in Pnompenh Saturday [April 11] reminding the people of a historic massacre when 'the Khmers once rose up and killed all Annamites on Cambodian territory in one night.'"

The Role of Trotskyism in the Modern World

By M. Basmanov

[The following article is reprinted from the March 1970 issue of *Political Affairs*, the "theoretical organ of the Communist Party, U. S. A.," as it describes itself. The article is translated from the Russian—although for some reason the editors of *Political Affairs* do not mention that fact, preferring to run it with no comment whatsoever, not even identifying the translator. It first appeared in 1969 in issue No. 7 of *Kommunist*, the "theoretical and political organ" of the Soviet Communist party's Central Committee (pages 98-108).

[The version published by *Political Affairs* is mostly true to the Russian original. Certain departures from the *Kommunist* "master copy" are indicated in brackets, our translation being followed by the transliterated Russian.

[The title of the article in the original Russian is "On Contemporary Trotskyism and Its Subversive Activities" (*O sovremennom trotskizme i ego podryvnoi deiatelnosti*). The editors of *Political Affairs* changed this to "The Role of Trotskyism in the Modern World." This departure from both the wording and the spirit of the original is no doubt ascribable to the awareness of the editors that the original title aptly fits recent attacks from the most reactionary sources in the United States against Trotskyism.

[A reply, "On Basmanov's Anti-Trotskyism," has been supplied by George Saunders. This is in the form of some comments plus a series of extensive notes on specific points. For reader reference, the points have been numbered and correlated as footnotes to Basmanov's essay.

[The subheadings in Basmanov's article are versions by *Political Affairs* of the ones that appeared in Russian.]

* * *

The activities of the Trotskyites in the capitalist countries never seems [sic] to flag. Their efforts to influence the youth of France and Japan, their constant intrigues in the Latin American countries, are doing serious damage to the revolutionary struggle. In addition, they proliferate fabricated propaganda materials, which the bourgeois press then quickly accepts and publicizes.

Just what does contemporary Trotskyism stand for?

Flotsam of a Wrecked Ship

Rodney Arismendi, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uruguay, describes the groups that sometimes call themselves Trotskyite parties as the flotsam of a long-wrecked ship. The simile fits rather aptly. For Trotsky's whole apparatus was so totally wrecked four decades ago that the organizations of its followers are indeed like the fragments of a sunken ship.

The ideological and organizational defeat of Trotsky himself in our country has gone down in the history of the Communist movement as a remarkable example of principled, uncompromising struggle against opportunism.

Our Leninist Party not only preserved the purity of its ranks, it enriched Communism the world over with its invaluable experience of exposing ultra-Leftism and its essentially capitulationist nature. Since then, true to Lenin's behests, other Communist parties have suppressed the Trotskyites' attempts to disrupt and destroy the international working-class movement from within.¹

Expelled in the nineteen-twenties and thirties from Communist and Workers' Parties, the Trotskyites soon began making strenuous efforts to find new forms of anti-Communist struggle. In some countries they formed small groups which, being outside the organized working-class movement, continued their subversive activities from without, smuggling their concepts and views into the workers' parties.

With the political adventurism typical of him, Trotsky decided to knock together an international organization out of these fragments. This he hoped to oppose to the Communist International. A handful of his followers from several European countries, gathering in Paris in 1930, declared themselves to be "the international Left-wing opposition." Somewhat later, this "opposition" announced eleven conditions for admission to its ranks. These included a denial of the very possibility of victory of socialism in a single country, denunciation [sic] of the economic policy of the USSR, and recognition of the "theory of permanent revolution."²

Soon the Trotskyites found out, however, that it was much easier to work out conditions for admission than to extend their ranks, even insignificantly. When they faced worker audiences, they met with sharp rebuffs. At the same time, the internal dissensions tearing their organizations apart grew from bad to worse.

It was on such shaky foundations that Trotsky nonetheless decided to build his "International." What's more, before it even began to be formed, he already started acting, in 1934-37, on behalf of a non-existent "Soviet section" of the non-existent "International."³

In 1938, Trotsky was finally able to gather a group of his followers for a "constituent conference" in Paris. This conference, attended by only twenty-one participants, stated that both the "international Left-wing opposition" and its bureau "have in the past shown an inability to act." Nevertheless it decided on the founding of the "Fourth International."⁴

The slogans advanced at the time by Trotskyism further exposed it as a political trend hostile to the working class. Its program was based on a negative attitude toward everything that Communists and the international working-class movement as a whole fought for. The Trotskyites fiercely attacked the very idea and practice of establishing a united anti-fascist front.⁵ They also denied the necessity for a struggle for peace, since, they alleged, war was the mother of revolution.⁶ The hypocrisy of their

pseudo-revolutionary theories was already clear from their whole policy [whole capitulationist (*kapitulanskaya*) policy] of that period. From dark predictions about the destruction of the Soviet Union in case of imperialist aggression (Trotsky wrote: ". . . The defeat of the Soviet Union is inevitable. From the technical, economic and military points of view, imperialism is incomparably stronger. Unless it is paralyzed by revolution in the West, imperialism will sweep out of existence the system born of the October Revolution.")⁷ the Trotskyites passed in the years of World War II to openly subversive activity in the anti-fascist movement.

Measuring with the same yardstick the policy of the fascist bloc countries and the countries subjected to aggression, they denied the liberating nature of the struggle waged by the forces opposed to fascism, and even after Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, declared, as late as the end of 1941, that "the very concept of anti-fascist struggle" was "a Communist fraud and invention." The Trotskyites broadcast their fabrications about the creation of the anti-Hitler coalition being an act hostile to the interests of both the Russian and the world revolution. They also called for preventing the opening of the Second Front which, they said, "would delay the revolutionary struggle in Europe,"⁸ thus showing themselves up in their true colors—enemies of socialism and allies of the forces of reaction and fascism. They discredited themselves so thoroughly that by the end of the war their groupings in a number of countries simply disintegrated.⁹

With the strengthening of socialism's position in the post-war period, internecine strife and disagreements in the Trotskyite camp became even more widespread, and differences began to appear between its two main groupings, each of which defended its own platform of anti-Communist activities. One of these, out of tactical consideration, advocated certain departures from the old Trotskyite formulations as well as revisions of some of Trotsky's own views. The other, on the contrary, demanded that all the old principles be kept intact. In 1953, the "Fourth International" split into the so-called "International Committee" and the "International Secretariat." Later on, still another grouping—the "Latin American Bureau"—branched out separately. Even the Trotskyites themselves were compelled to admit at the time that their already feeble "International" was going through such a serious crisis it could hardly hope to find a way out.¹⁰

Since the beginning of the nineteen-sixties, the Trotskyite groups and groupings, with their one foot in the grave, have again been trying to raise their heads. Seeing in Mao Tse-tung's policy a fresh opportunity to revive anti-Communist activity, they hastened to snatch at it, at the same time shouting about the "vitality" and "correctness" of their ideas. The Trotskyite congress held in 1961 stated in a special resolution that the differences that had arisen in the Communist movement "open up before Trotskyism such opportunities for action as have never existed before."¹¹

The attempt to overcome the split was made by the American Trotskyites, who, in their message circulated in 1968 [1963], declared that the position of the Mao Tse-tung group "determines an important stage of reconstruction" of the "Fourth International."¹² The message, which called for unity in the name of struggle against the Com-

munist parties, was the core of the debate at the so-called unity congress held in the summer of 1963.

In actual fact, however, no unification was achieved. The "Latin American Bureau" and part of the British, French, and Japanese Trotskyites refused to take part in the congress. The remaining few participants divided into a "majority" and a "minority," which to this day remain at loggerheads.¹³

Present-day, just as prewar, Trotskyism represents a medley of groups and groupings to be found in some West European countries (Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, and Holland), the United States, a number of Latin American countries (Chile, Bolivia, Guatemala, Peru, Argentina, and Brazil), in Japan, Ceylon, and in Australia. The number of members in each of these groups does not as a rule exceed several dozen.¹⁴ In some cases they constitute microscopic "initiative" groups¹⁵ which however, each publish a paper or even a magazine.

How, then, do the Trotskyite groups manage to keep their heads above water? What do they hope to accomplish? First of all, they capitalize on the fact that considerable social strata tending toward the ultra-Left have in recent years been drawn into the anti-imperialist movement and the struggle against the monopolies. They bank on the petty bourgeois, who is being ruined and is suffering privations and who, as Lenin indicated, "easily goes to revolutionary extremes but is incapable of perseverance, organization, discipline, or steadfastness." [(*Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* ["Complete Works"], Vol. 41, page 14.)]

Intellectuals and students are sometimes also infected with Leftism. Representatives of these strata are often inclined to deny the leading role of the working class in the anti-monopolist struggle. They even try to subordinate the working-class movement to themselves, to infect it with petty-bourgeois illusions.

Trotskyism does possess a certain tenacity because its ultra-Left views accord with the sentiments of sections of petty-bourgeois intellectuals, of declassed elements, and various adventurers. Trotskyism does adapt itself to such sentiments. Besides, the experience of class struggle shows that Leftism often comes as a reaction to the "original sin" of Right-wing social democracy, rejecting revolutionary forms of class struggle. The leaders of Trotskyism themselves do not conceal the fact that they hope to find their support among the extremist petty-bourgeois elements. And the latter, who as a rule are ready to denounce capitalism in words, are at the same time inclined to reduce all forms and methods of struggle against capitalism to adventurism alone.¹⁶

Here and there the Trotskyites operate in the same environment as the groupings of Mao Tse-tung's supporters. During last year's student actions in France, for instance, the Trotskyites and the Maoists actively helped each other, inciting the youth with equal zeal to rashness and violence. The Trotskyites' alliance with pro-Maoist organizations is also to be observed in some of the Latin American countries.

The "body of theory" of contemporary Trotskyism shows up its complete ideological impotence, its inability to offer positive solutions to the major problems of revolutionary struggle. The fact that it produced no clear, definite program after the war speaks for itself. The numerous statements made by the various "congresses" cannot even be

called a substitute for such a program, for they are full of contradictory, hastily proposed and as hastily rejected theories.¹⁷ Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution, long since discredited, remains the fig leaf hiding the ideological nakedness of his followers.

World Socialist System The Main Target

One of the most characteristic features of Trotskyism has always been the negation of the gains of the international working class and indiscriminate denunciation of the results of revolutionary struggle. While prewar Trotskyites concentrated on a slander campaign against the country that triumphantly accomplished the first socialist revolution, on negating the Soviet Union's role in the [sic] world revolutionary process, today they not only maintain and magnify their hatred of the USSR but breed malice against the socialist system as a whole.

An element of their slander against socialist realities is contained in their very understanding of the prospects of social progress. The reconstruction of society along socialist principles after the proletariat has gained power in individual countries, the Trotskyites claim, is possible only in the very distant future, and only with the victory of socialist revolutions throughout the world or, at the very least, in an absolute majority of countries. The "Fourth International" repeats almost word for word the old Trotskyite arguments of the nineteen-twenties about the impossibility of successfully building socialism in one or even in several countries [sic]. The difference is that at the time such assertions showed only a lack of faith in the ability of the working class of the Soviet state to build socialism; today they represent an unsubstantiated negation of the achievements of world socialism.¹⁸

The Trotskyites have always distorted reality to suit their own far-fetched, lifeless schemes. Naturally, they have no answers to what is the nature of the socialist states. On the one hand, they cannot help but admit the actual fact of progressive social changes within these states; on the other, they would rather bite off their tongue than call the countries socialist. In trying to find a way out of their impasse, they have invented the thesis of "distorted workers' states," ["deformed (*deformirovavshiesia*) workers' states"] and have thus found themselves in the company of the Right-wing socialist reformers [social-reformists (*sotsial-reformisty*)].¹⁹

The canards about the "deformation" and "bureaucratization" of the socialist countries are intended to discredit the historically justified methods of socialist construction. Asserting that the experience of the socialist countries, the Soviet Union first of all, should be disregarded, the Trotskyites act as henchmen for the imperialist forces which try to disunite today's revolutionary currents.

The same purpose is served by their malicious fabrications about the interests of the world socialist system being in conflict with the interests of the working-class movement in the capitalist states and with the national liberation movement. In the past, Trotsky brazenly accused the Soviet people of building "their isolated socialist house"²⁰ while allegedly ignoring proletarian internationalism. Today Trotskyites hold forth on the subject of "national exclusiveness" and "holding back the progress of world revolution." It is easy to discern in their present orienta-

tion the influence of Trotsky's views on war as the only means of "advancing" or "pushing through" revolutions.

This is proclaimed with extraordinary frankness by the Latin American Trotskyites [sic] whose leader is Posadas. Their assertion is that war is the only possible means of doing away with capitalism and that the socialist countries should start a war immediately "for preventive purposes." Arguing that the people must not fear the sacrifices a thermonuclear war must bring, Posadas says: "Communist society can be built on ruins, too." Incidentally, he claims to have been the first to advance this "theory" and accuses Mao Tse-tung of plagiarism. Similar views are voiced by the British Trotskyites, who believe that only a war between the socialist and the capitalist systems will give the working class "a decisive opportunity for the seizure of power."²¹

True revolutionary humanism has always been alien to Trotskyites. World War II took a toll of millions upon millions of lives. It imposed a heavy burden on the working class. Nevertheless, just as in the thirties, the Trotskyites continue to advocate war, seeing in it an inevitable point of transition on the road to revolution. They do not choose to take into account the fact that a new world war would be the greatest of tragedies for mankind, that while burying imperialism it would also spell horrible damage [would also mean heavy damage (*nanesla by takzhe tiazhely uron*)] for the cause of Communism.²²

Adhering to a proposition which is "more Left than common sense," the Trotskyites fiercely attack the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. Behind their endless accusations about the socialist countries' "desire to reach agreement with imperialism on the preservation of spheres of influence"²³ one clearly sees the same old theory about war being the sole means of settling the historical contest between socialism and capitalism.

Equally pitiful, in our day, are also all their attempts to discredit the role of the socialist system in the world revolutionary process and their formulas for "advancing" the cause of the revolution. These malicious activities are still best described by what Lenin in his day said about Trotskyist organizations. He called them "impotent little groups, angry at their own impotence." [(*Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 25, page 179.)]²⁴ It is just this impotent malice that impels the motley Trotskyite groups to concentrate on finding ways to penetrate the revolutionary movement in the capitalist and the "third world" countries and on carrying on their subversive activities there.

Trying to Impede the Working-Class Struggle in Capitalist Countries

The Trotskyites are fiercely and constantly attacking the Communist parties of the capitalist countries, trying to divert the attention of the revolutionary movement from its main tasks and to cause splits in the ranks of anti-imperialist fighters.

Just as Trotsky himself once championed the concept of leaping over certain stages of the revolution, so today his successors oppose mass demands of a generally democratic nature. They say that to struggle for democracy is not only useless but harmful, for it keeps the working class from concentrating all its efforts on the "revolution-

ary overthrow" of the capitalist system. Trotskyites accuse the Communist parties of "showing a tendency to fragment the struggle in time and space into too many aims." But in what do they see signs of such "fragmentation?" In that the Communists, while consistently paving the way for social revolution, do not at the same time evade the urgent tasks set by life—in that they carry on a struggle to extend democratic rights and freedoms, to improve the living standards of the working people, and to preserve the peace. In other words, the Trotskyites reject the general democratic movement, without which no revolution is ever possible, and which today increasingly draws the masses into vigorous action against monopolies, against capital, preparing them for the socialist revolution.²⁵

To this day the Trotskyites adhere to the pseudo-revolutionary formula, "all or nothing," which has always served them as a justification for sectarianism and revolutionary idleness. Thus one of the groups of British Trotskyites even tries, inveterate adventurers that they are, to break strikes. Its justification here has been to assert that only general political strikes are useful.²⁶ And some of their French colleagues, acting under the slogan, "The Working Peoples' Power Can Be Found in the Streets and Not in Ballot Boxes,"²⁷ are today trying to impress upon the workers the idea of the uselessness of any form of class struggle save only armed struggle. But armed struggle itself they interpret not as the conscious action of the masses but as "a conspiracy of revolutionaries" outside and above "the crowd."

Putch-type [sic] action disassociated from the masses—a denial in fact of the revolutionary role of the masses—is the favored method of Trotskyism [sic] in its pseudo-revolutionary strategy. "A team that does not know its job cannot replace the specialist"—this is the smug, reassuring motto the British Trotskyites use in propagandizing their anti-popular theory. The "team that does not know its job" refers to the masses, and the "specialists" would be a handful of adventurers isolated from the people.

Such theories, adventurist and capitulationist at the same time, glaringly contradict the true needs of revolutionary struggle that find their expression in the strategy and tactics of the [sic] world Communist movement. The Marxist-Leninist program, distinguished for its profound and consistent purposefulness, arms the working people and the oppressed masses in general with a rich arsenal of forms, means and methods for carrying on the struggle. It is a matter of principle for Communists to recognize the necessity of mastering all forms of struggle, including armed class struggle, and to be ready to shift them rapidly and resolutely, depending on concrete conditions, and on the alignment of class forces within any particular country as well as in the international arena. Communists believe that revolutionary struggle in all its forms, whether peaceful or non-peaceful, is the province of the masses themselves, the working class first of all, led toward revolutionary goals by its conscious vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist parties.

No wonder, then, that while trying to don the armor of revolutionaries, the Trotskyites are at the same time making every effort to cast aspersions on the international Communist movement, to slander the true revolutionary force of our day. As has already been said, their preferred method consists first of all of malicious falsifica-

tions; out of a whole complex of strategic and tactical aims of the Communist and Workers' parties, they will pick a single slogan out of context, then begin to shout hysterically about our "one-track mentality," about our "suppressing revolutionary initiative," and so on. As was pointed out by O. Kuusinen in 1964, the Trotskyites do this because, should they present their opponents' views honestly, no one would believe their slander; but by "shamelessly distorting other people's views they can lay their own political sins at someone else's door."

One such characteristic trick is the Trotskyite allegation that the Communist parties advocate only peaceful means of struggle [sic]; moreover, they distort the Marxist-Leninists' very interpretation of the idea of a peaceful way to revolution. When Marxist-Leninists speak of the possibility of peaceful development of the revolution, they refer to the possibility of ensuring for the working class and its allies a decisive superiority of forces, capable of preventing the monopolist bourgeoisie from resorting to armed violence [sic]. Marxist-Leninists believe that even while following the peaceful road of revolution one must be ready for armed struggle should the situation demand it.²⁸

But the Trotskyites care little about the interests of the revolution. They only seek pretexts for launching attacks on the Communists and for attempting to spread their views throughout the working-class movement. While loudly advocating their idea of the revolution by putch [sic], they are basically hostile to the creation of any broad anti-monopoly [sic] front. They declare that the idea of establishing such a front would only lead to class cooperation, that it takes the edge off the class struggle and "delays" the revolution.

The Trotskyites present a distorted general picture of the class struggle in the capitalist countries. They intentionally exaggerate certain objective negative features that inevitably exist in the struggle of the working people (political indifference on the part of sections of the working class or the persistence of Right-wing reformist ideology), and just as intentionally, they shut their eyes to the fact that the masses are taking an increasingly active part in clear-cut actions against monopoly capital, so that social battles more and more often acquire great political significance.

Their lack of faith in the forces of the working class has led the Trotskyites to odd conclusions about the "passivity" of the proletariat in the capitalist countries and its "evasion of historical responsibility,"²⁹ and to the equally ill-grounded idea that only a profound economic crisis can rouse the masses to revolutionary fervor.³⁰ Here they come close to sharing the views of bourgeois ideologists, who assert that the workers have ceased to think about revolution and are reconciled to the capitalist system.

In order to disseminate their views, the Trotskyites openly resort to double-dealing. They use the so-called "penetration" tactic [the tactic of so-called "entryism" (*taktika tak nazyvaemogo "entrizma"*)], that is, the tactic of infiltrating mass organizations in order to recruit new supporters. They pretend that they agree with the progressive aims of such organizations and conceal their continued association with their own groups.³¹ Back in 1960, the leaders of the "Fourth International" called upon Trotskyite groups in capitalist countries to "learn to use un-

derground methods" in order to "avoid stagnation," and not to "allow themselves to be scared off by the bogey of being absorbed in other organizations."

Trotskyites try their best to penetrate first of all into youth organizations, and do this by playing on the political immaturity of some of the youth who, in addition, have only a very vague notion of Trotskyism and its true aims. They adapt themselves to the moods of youth and flatter it, calling it the most "radical wing of the movement." As was pointed out in the theoretical organ of the Communist Party of Great Britain, *Marxism Today*, the Trotskyites constantly root about among teenagers [sic], assuring them that "the revolution is around the corner" and that only they, the Trotskyites, have the true "revolutionary program."

As already mentioned, they carry on intensive subversive work among the youth of France, where they have been able to form small student groups. *L'Humanité*, the organ of the French Communist Party, wrote in this connection on March 20, 1968: "Young people inexperienced in political and social struggle, and even less knowledgeable about the battles of the working class, can obviously be easily caught in a trap of phrases. Those of them who sincerely seek ways to change the social system will certainly change their minds if and when Trotskyism is exposed all the way."

In Japan, the Trotskyites have done considerable harm to the Federation of Japanese Students, where at one time they even managed to work their way into the leadership. At a meeting of active members of the youth movement of a number of Asian and African countries, held in Sofia in August, 1968, the Vice-chairman of the Central Committee of the Union of Democratic Youth of Japan, N. Imai, said of them: "Playing on the sentiments of petty-bourgeois radicalism found among some of the students . . . [the Trotskyites] . . . continue their underground activities while hiding behind the backs of reactionary forces, whose cunning policy is to support them."³²

One of the Trotskyites' notorious subversive methods of work in mass organizations is to distribute anonymous leaflets and pamphlets. At conferences of international democratic organizations their emissaries bend every effort to foist their propaganda materials on delegates. In short, they try to utilize every opportunity to prevent the broad masses of working people in capitalist countries from finding their way to Communism, to the ideas of scientific socialism. Adventurism, so typical of their actions in this area, works on an even larger scale when they turn their efforts at subversion against the peoples that have joined in the national liberation struggles.

Adventurism in the National Liberation Movement

The numerous resolutions and statements issued by the Trotskyites during the nineteen-sixties have paid special attention to questions of the national liberation movement. First of all, they counterpose it to other revolutionary trends of the day. They claim, for instance, that colonial revolutions are the force which today is striking the heaviest blows at imperialism, whereas the rest of the revolutionary movement is in a state of crisis. This thesis was first advanced at one of their congresses in 1957. Then, at the so-called unity congress [reunification congress

(*obyyedinitelny kongress*)] held six years later, it was announced that "the revolutions in colonial countries play the main role in the world revolutionary process" and that "the main center of the revolutionary upsurge has for some time been shifting to the colonial countries." At the end of 1966, the secretariat of the "Fourth International" again stated that colonial revolutions were the "main aspect of the socialist revolution."³³

The question now arises, why should the Trotskyites, who have always ignored national liberation struggles (through their leader Pierre Frank they stated that "the question of national independence does not form any essential part of the theory of permanent revolution"), today see in it "the main aspect" of such revolution? Here Trotskyism clearly shows its characteristic features of time-serving and political gambling. Another of the Trotskyite leaders, Germain, said in 1969 [1960] that his party's "greatest chance" lies in the area of the national liberation movement. This "chance" is seen in the fact that here petty-bourgeois groups often totally lacking in solid political experience are drawn into political struggle. The Trotskyites hope that it will be easier for them to find among such elements allies on whom they can rely to support their policy.

It is in this connection, incidentally, that they have also amended their traditional negative appraisal of the peasantry.³⁴ While remaining contemptuous of the peasants of the capitalist countries, they have nothing but praise for those in the national liberation movement, and call them the leading force of our day, ascribing to them "the decisive radical role," while at the same time belittling in every possible way the revolutionary role of the proletariat and its vanguard, the Communist Parties.

All Trotskyite program statements on questions of the national liberation movement objectively serve to deprive the movement of clarity of aims. They reject the idea of anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution, calling it another "Communist invention." "To move step by step up the stairs," they said in 1961, "quite obviously means to turn away from the revolution." Now, true to itself, Trotskyism advocates leaping over some stages of the revolution; it undermines the unity of patriotic, democratic forces without which neither the abolition of imperialist oppression nor the destruction of the feudal system are possible;³⁵ and the full harm of this policy has already been proven by the Trotskyists themselves as they attempted practical interference in the liberation struggle.

Equally unrealistic are their formulas regarding the forms and means of revolutionary action. In point of fact they propose only one universal means—guerrilla struggle, which they recommend launching even in countries that have recently taken the road of independent political development. And in order somehow to explain away such a policy they slander the young national states, asserting that the "neo-colonialist forces" have won or that "traitors have come to power" everywhere.

At the same time, in contrast to the policy of the Communist parties, which support the guerrilla movement in those countries where favorable conditions for it do exist, the Trotskyites try artificially to isolate the guerrilla movement from all other forms of class struggle and thus to undermine it.

These tactics obviously have nothing in common with

the truly revolutionary views of the guerrilla form of anti-imperialist struggle. Communists, of course, are guided by the ideas of V. I. Lenin who, while noting the political validity of guerrilla struggle as one of the forms of the revolutionary action of the masses, stressed that "the party of the proletariat can never consider guerrilla warfare as the sole, or even the main, method of struggle" (*Collected Works*, Vol. XIV, page 9) [*Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 14, page 9].³⁶ This today is the position of the Communists of Colombia, where revolutionary guerrilla tactics have been carried on under Party leadership for many years. In fact, the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of Colombia clearly stated, in January, 1966, that "to combine all forms of struggle and emphasize those forms which correspond to each concrete situation is the true reflection of Marxist-Leninist ideology and its consistent application to the process of social development in our country."

How dangerous and harmful Trotskyite tactics can be is brought out clearly by the events in Peru. There, under the slogan, "Land or Death," the Trotskyites managed in 1963 to provoke ill-prepared actions by isolated peasant units. These units were quickly defeated by government troops, and hundreds of peasants accused of guerrilla action or of giving aid to guerrillas were thrown into prison. The Trotskyites repeated the same maneuver in 1965-66.³⁷ As Peruvian Communist Carlos Zamora pointed out in his letter published in *L'Humanité* on January 3, 1968, "a few dozen guerrillas, completely isolated from the people, represent no serious threat to the government. But the government seized this opportunity to strike a heavy blow at the entire Left-wing opposition. Hundreds of activists and trade union members not even connected with the guerrillas were arrested."

The Trotskyites are trying to spread their sectarian concepts first of all among the ranks of insurgents in those Latin American countries where armed struggle is in progress. In Guatemala, they tried to wreck the

Organization of Insurgent Armed Forces, representing a military-political alliance in which all groupings supporting the people's armed struggle are taking part. In 1964, they entrenched themselves in the November 13th Movement, which was part of that alliance, and began to issue ultra-Left manifestos calling for "socialist revolution now," for armed action alone, for the "establishment of local communes having the functions of Soviets." The Central Committee of the Guatemalan Party of Labor stressed in a statement issued in August, 1964, that to follow the Trotskyites' advice meant to isolate the armed struggle, to facilitate the defeat of the rebels by the enemy. As subsequent events have shown, the Trotskyites did indeed play into the hands of the anti-revolutionary forces, splitting the November 13th Movement in the process. In his speech at the Conference of Representatives of Three Continents, held in Havana on January 15, 1966, Fidel Castro termed these actions a crime against the revolutionary movement.³⁸

The Trotskyites also keep trying to spread ultra-Left slogans in the trade unions and other mass organizations of working people in the Latin American countries. Wherever they appear, they act as opponents of unity of the revolutionary forces, as the practical helpmates of reaction.

This, then, is the role of Trotskyism today. Banished from the ranks of the organized working-class movements, its followers have not given up. They continue to do everything in their power to undermine the Communist movement and to befuddle at least part of the petty-bourgeois sections of the populations and student movement. That is why the true representatives of the interests of the broad anti-imperialist movement, the Communist and Workers' parties, carry on an acute, irreconcilable struggle against Trotskyism. That is why they continually expose the Trotskyites as enemies of the working-class movement, showing their anti-revolutionary nature and unmasking their methods of fostering subversive activity.

A Trotskyist Reply

The Role of Basmanov in the New School of Stalinist Falsification

By George Saunders

The person who signs himself "M. Basmanov" and who now has appeared in the pages of the American Stalinists' "theoretical" organ will be familiar to long-time readers of *Intercontinental Press*. He is apparently one of the Kremlin's leading "Trotskyologists." His last anti-Trotskyist opus was printed in late 1967. (A translation of that article, with critical notes, was done by *World Outlook*, former name of *Intercontinental Press*, March 22, 1968, page 245.)

Basmanov's latest effort represents an updating of the Soviet bureaucracy's campaign against "contemporary" Trotskyism. This campaign has been waged since 1963,

and we have had frequent occasion to refer to it. In 1968 and 1969 alone, five major books and articles against Trotskyism were publicized in the Soviet press. In 1970 a new twist has been added—a Soviet novel denounces Trotsky as a leader of the "international Zionist conspiracy"!

The American Communist party, responding to the Kremlin's intensification of anti-Trotskyist polemics, has begun a similar campaign in its own press.

Political Affairs, in its issue for September-October 1969, ran an article taking up American Trotskyism in rela-

tion to the CPUSA, written by an old champion of Stalinist policies, Hyman Lumer.

The American CP's newspaper, the *Daily World*, more recently opened up a barrage against the American Trotskyists, primarily because of the increasing influence of the Trotskyist Young Socialist Alliance among radicalizing youth. The Stalinists feel this influence spreading among "their own" youth, hence the intensification of their "educational" efforts on the menace of Trotskyism.

Thus, the January 7 *Daily World* included a distorted account of the YSA convention (see *Intercontinental Press*, January 26, 1970, page 59). The polemic begun in that article was continued in the *Daily World's* issue of February 28, which covered the Student Mobilization Committee conference in Cleveland. It was headlined "Student Mobe hampered by racism of Trotskyist faction." The "racism" involved was the YSA's opposition to Black politicians like Mayor Stokes of Cleveland who serve in the capitalist establishment.

The *Daily World* continued its educational work in the March 11 and 12 issues. The "youth" column featured two articles by Donna Ristorucci, New York Educational Secretary of the "Young Workers Liberation League"—the CP's latest attempt to create a Stalinist youth organization in the United States.

The theme of the articles was perfectly expressed in the two headlines: "Trotskyists as counter-revolutionaries" and "Trotskyist youth spurn programs for the masses" (the "masses" being those in the Democratic party).

Donna Ristorucci writes: "Trotskyists first appeared soon after the Russian Revolution when, under the leadership of Trotsky, they attempted to overthrow the newly established revolution [sic] government because they failed to see the necessity and possibility of consolidating socialism in one country." Obviously she has been studying Basmanov.

There is an odd parallel, worth reflecting on, between anti-Trotskyist lucubrations such as those from the pro-Moscow "Communists" and similar polemics that have come in the recent period from the other two chief world capitals—Peking and Washington.

The official Maoist weekly *Peking Review* of September 19, 1969, ran two articles polemicizing in standard Stalinist terms against the traditional Marxist ideas defended by Trotsky and his cothinkers. (See *Intercontinental Press*, October 20, 1969, pages 930-31.) Worthy of Basmanov himself, the Peking articles defend "socialism in one country"—that profoundly antirevolutionary theory elaborated by Stalin to justify his antirevolutionary practice.

Meanwhile, the Nixon administration, faced by a massive fall offensive against the Vietnam war, inspired a number of articles "exposing" the role of Trotskyists in the antiwar movement. The parallel with some of Basmanov's points on the "subversive activities" of Trotskyism shows once again how little originality is to be found among the witch-hunters however great the differences between the economic systems they defend in their way.

The bourgeois columnists picture Trotskyists as "violence-prone," secretive "masterminds" who use the antiwar movement to promote revolution, with the aim of "destroying the American system of democracy and free enterprise."

Basmanov takes a different tack. He does not of course



THE NEW STALINISM. This recent example of Stalinist art is from the March 25, 1970, issue of the *Daily World*, the New York publication of the Communist party U.S.A. In earlier times the Stalinist artist would have selected as his figure on the right either Hitler, the Mikado, Chamberlain, or Uncle Sam, depending on Stalin's current diplomatic line.

refer, as the bourgeois propagandists do, to Trotskyists as advocates of socialist revolution. That might elicit too favorable a response from his readers, particularly in the Soviet Union. Instead he calls the Trotskyists "henchmen for the imperialist forces" out to slander and destroy the Soviet state and the pro-Moscow Communist parties.

He pictures these devilish "henchmen" as advocates of world war (no mention that they are among the leading antiwar activists in many countries), promoters of universal guerrilla warfare, "putschists," and "adventurers." Moreover, he says, they practice "entryism," that is, they join mass organizations, claiming they agree with the aims of those organizations. But their real purpose, he warns, is to distribute their literature and try to recruit to their subversive ideas.

This charge by Basmanov parallels one made by the reactionary Senator Fannin from Arizona in November 1969. Referring to the Trotskyists' role in the antiwar offensive, Goldwater's cohort intoned: "They sail not under their true colors."

During the May-June 1968 troubles in France—Basmanov complains—the Trotskyists collaborated with *Maoists* in "inciting the youth with equal zeal to rashness and violence."

The Washington journalists Evans and Novak, in their syndicated column of November 12, 1969, preferred linking the Trotskyists to Hanoi, rather than Peking. "Fred Halstead of the Socialist Workers Party," they wrote, "took over planning for a march calculated to end in violent confrontation" (on November 15, the largest antiwar march in U.S. history). Halstead, they said, was also the one who "drafted a friendly reply to Hanoi approved by a majority of the New Mobe's steering committee" after

North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong sent greetings to that mass antiwar organization.

How explain the fact that, despite all their differences, Moscow, Peking, and Washington find common ground in antipathy to Trotskyism?

What they all have in common is a deep-seated fear of the revolutionary mass movement. The imperialists in America fear it, obviously, because they fear expropriation of their property. The bureaucrats of the USSR and China fear it for less profound but still powerful reasons: their desire to hold on to their material privileges in the sphere of consumption and political control.

They all hate the Trotskyists because, far from fearing the revolutionary masses, the Fourth International sees in them the one hope for mankind to abolish capitalism, end all bureaucratic deformations, and move toward a classless, stateless society of abundance and truly free human existence.

Basmanov's new offering does more, however, than repeat old slanders about Trotskyism. It also argues some of the substantive political issues more seriously than before. Not that it is free of the old lies, distortions, and attempts to create prejudice; rather it offers a more sugary coating of rational argument to make the "hate Trotskyism" pill go down easier.

Why is it necessary for the Kremlin's spokesmen to coat the pill with more serious discussion today? With the rise of the world revolution in the sixties, the size and influence of the world Trotskyist movement have grown commensurately. As the Basmanovs so often complain, Trotsky's writings are being published ever more widely, and he is being recognized more and more as a dominant figure of the twentieth century.

In the light of this greater interest in and knowledge of Trotskyism, crude invective and stale lies simply will not work any more with the broader radical public.

Yet the Kremlin cannot sit idly by as the dread specter of Trotskyism grows. It must egg on its supporters internationally to combat the menace and must provide them materials and model articles for the fight. Hence the more sophisticated and elaborate works on this subject coming out of Moscow.

The Soviet bureaucrats feel a special urgency on this matter, because word of the active role of the revolutionary socialists in the anti-imperialist struggle is penetrating into the bloc of workers states—via Czechoslovakia, via Yugoslavia, via Cuba (where *Pensamiento Critico* ran a special issue on the May-June 1968 events in France that included documents of all the tendencies [see *Intercontinental Press*, June 30, 1969, page 647]).

The ideas, program, and organization of the Fourth International threaten to penetrate to the layers of Soviet oppositionists and dissenters themselves. The privileged caste in the Kremlin can send troops to reimpose censorship in Czechoslovakia, but they have not been able to stop the spread of ideas. No power can do that in this era of permanent revolution.

Not to go down without fighting, Brezhnev and company are mustering the pro-Moscow parties to help hold the ideological line. The Communist party of Luxembourg, the first CP in Western Europe to endorse the invasion of Czechoslovakia, was equally quick to reprint lengthy excerpts from Basmanov's opus—in its daily paper *Zeitung*, June 12, 1969.

Now the servile American CP follows suit.

Notes on Basmanov's Article

1. Stalin's 'Ideological and Organizational Defeat of Trotsky'

Basmanov asserts that through a "principled, uncompromising struggle" by what he calls "Our Leninist Party," the Trotskyists were defeated. This "principled" struggle he holds up as a "remarkable example" that "enriched Communism the world over . . ."

Another school has argued that what was involved was a petty factional dispute of the "Old Left" which could not possibly be of interest to the youth of today. Bourgeois enemies of socialism prefer to picture it as a clash of personalities, a struggle between Trotsky and Stalin for the succession to Lenin.

The truth is that great issues *were* involved in that struggle. Basic principles were at stake, and the issues remain crucial to this day.

The chief battle was over the growing bureaucratization of the workers state. Lenin began the fight against that tendency but his death cut short his part in the struggle. Trotsky and the Left Opposition carried on the factional battle initiated by Lenin.

The Stalin faction won primarily because of the general

but temporary ebbing of the tide of revolution both in the USSR and internationally as capitalism gained a partial "stabilization" in the mid-twenties.

Stalin's victory, which Basmanov so extols, had serious consequences for the revolution, both within the Soviet Union and internationally, as history has shown.

Within the Soviet Union, Stalinism in power meant the following things: the destruction of democracy within the party and the Soviets and for the working class as a whole; the destruction of national independence for non-Russian Soviet nationalities; the destruction eventually, in the vast purges, of the party cadres that had come out of the revolution and of the top leadership of the Red Army, in fact of the entire generation that had made the revolution, culminating in the assassination in 1940 of Trotsky himself.

The bureaucratization affected and still affects every area of Soviet life, stifling initiative and limiting creativity: in the economy, in science, in the arts, in education and culture generally, in the family.

Internationally, the victory of the bureaucratic tendency and the crystallization of an uncontrolled caste of privileged parasites meant the abandonment of a revolutionary foreign policy in favor of status quo deals with imperial-

ism ("peaceful coexistence"). The international influence of the Stalinist bureaucracy, especially through the Comintern, contributed in a crucial way to unnecessary defeats in a whole series of countries (China in 1925-27, Germany in 1930-33, Spain in 1936-38). The unnecessary deferment of the overturn of world capitalism was quite costly; it meant in the end the invasion of the USSR itself and the disaster of World War II. And it meant that the death agony of capitalism extended into the nuclear era, carrying with it the threat of World War III—a war that could really end all wars.

Such are the main results of the "principled, uncompromising struggle" by which the bureaucratization of the first workers state became possible.

Not only does Basmanov fail to mention the great issues involved; he also overlooks the counterrevolutionary methods used by the Stalin apparatus in its "principled, uncompromising struggle" against the Left Opposition.

"The struggle of ideas gave place," says Trotsky of the fall 1926 period, "to administrative mechanics: telephone summons of the party bureaucrats to attend the meetings of the workers' locals, an accumulation of automobiles with hooting sirens in front of all the meetings, and a well-organized whistling and booing at the appearance of the oppositionists on the platform." (*My Life*, page 528.)

The "principled" party brass around Stalin could not tolerate the ideas advocated by the Left Opposition. During the discussion period prior to the Fifteenth Congress in late 1927, they banned the key documents of the Left Opposition, labeling its platform an "antiparty" document. (It is available in English under the title *The Real Situation in Russia*.)

The Left Opposition began to circulate its platform in manuscript (like the oppositionists of today in the Soviet Union who circulate "Samizdat"). It set up a small printshop to reproduce the document for unofficial circulation. This shop was raided by the GPU, and several top leaders of the Left Opposition were expelled. One of them, Mrachkovsky, was arrested on a false charge of conspiring with a former White Army officer. Later Menzhinsky, head of the GPU, and Stalin himself acknowledged that this "Wrangel officer" had in fact been a GPU agent who offered to help the Left Opposition get printing equipment.

Thus Stalin in 1927 foreshadowed the technique of deliberately associating left opponents with rightist reactionaries, a technique developed to bloody extremes in the Moscow trials of the thirties.

Despite persecution and harassment, the Left Oppositionists waged a political struggle that reached thousands with the ideas of Bolshevism as taught by Lenin. In response, Stalin's Central Committee called on the "workers" to break up the informal meetings of the Left Oppositionists by force and organized goon squads to rout any open expression of oppositionist views.

Stalin also saw to it that no opposition delegates would be elected to the Fifteenth Congress. Elections were held *before* the official "discussion" even began. Any Communist who made known his sympathy with the Left Opposition was subject to transferral, expulsion, or other harassment. The resulting Congress delegation was a reliable body before which to move the expulsion of dozens of leaders of the October revolution. Surely world Communism was "enriched" by this "invaluable experience."

Of those expelled by the Fifteenth Congress, whoever did not recant and proclaim agreement with Stalin's line and leadership was treated as a criminal and exiled or imprisoned. But Trotsky, exiled to Alma Ata, near the border to China, still acted as a political pole of attraction for thousands of oppositionists, scattered in prisons, camps, and places of exile, who held onto their convictions.

Even the deportation of Trotsky in January 1929 did not destroy the Left Opposition; it took years of prison, persecution, and finally the bloody purges of 1936-38 before that was accomplished. It may even be that the chain of continuity was never completely broken domestically, as of course it was not internationally. The full story of Stalin's prison camps and what their former inmates brought to post-Stalin Soviet society, still being unraveled, will have more light to shed on that question.

2. The Eleven Points of the ILO

The eleven points of the International Left Opposition to which Basmanov refers were listed as follows in the American Trotskyist newspaper *The Militant*, September 30, 1933:

"In accordance with the spirit and the sense of the decisions of the first four world congresses [of the Communist, or Third, International], and in continuation of these decisions, the Left Opposition sets up the following principles, develops them theoretically and carries them through practically:

"1. *The independence of the proletarian party*, always and under all conditions; condemnation of the Kuomintang policy of 1924-1928; condemnation of the policy of the Anglo-Russian Committee; condemnation of Stalin's theory of two-class (worker and peasant) parties and of the whole practice based on this theory; condemnation of the policy of the Amsterdam Congress in which the Communist party was dissolved in the pacifist swamp.

"2. Recognition of the international, and thereby of the *permanent character of the proletarian revolution*; rejection of the theory of socialism in one country as well as of the policy of national Bolshevism which complements it in Germany (platform of 'national liberation').

"3. *Recognition of the Soviet state as a workers state* in spite of the growing degeneration of the bureaucratic regime. Unconditional command that every worker defend the Soviet state against imperialism as well as against internal counterrevolution.

"4. Condemnation of the economic policy of the Stalinist faction both in its stage of *economic opportunism* in 1923 to 1928 (struggle against 'over-industrialization' and staking all on the kulaks), as well as its stage of *economic adventurism* in 1928 to 1932 (overstretched tempo of industrialization; thoroughgoing collectivization; administrative liquidation of the kulaks as a class). Condemnation of the criminal bureaucratic legend that 'the Soviet state has already entered into socialism.' Recognition of the necessity for a return to the realistic economic policies of Leninism.

"5. Recognition of the necessity for systematic Communist work in the proletarian mass organizations, particularly in the reformist trade unions; condemnation of the theory and practice of the Red Trade Union organiza-

tion in Germany and similar constructions in other countries.

"6. Rejection of the formula of the '*democratic dictatorship* of the proletariat and peasantry' as a separate regime distinguished from the *dictatorship of the proletariat* which carries along the peasant and the oppressed masses in general behind it; rejection of the anti-Marxist theory of the peaceful 'growing over' of the democratic dictatorship into the socialist one.

"7. Recognition of the necessity of mobilizing the masses under *transitional slogans* corresponding to the concrete situation in each country, and particularly under *democratic slogans* insofar as it is a question of struggle against feudal relations, national oppression, or different varieties of open imperialistic dictatorship (fascism, Bonapartism, etc.).

"8. Recognition of the necessity of a developed *united front policy* with respect to the mass organizations of the working class, both of trade union and political character, including the social democracy as a party. Condemnation of the ultimatum slogan 'only from below' which in practice means a refusal of the united front and consequently the refusal to create soviets. Condemnation of the opportunistic application of the united front policy, as in the Anglo-Russian Committee (bloc without the masses and against the masses); double condemnation of the policy of the present German Central Committee, which combines the ultimatum slogan 'only from below' with opportunistic practice on the occasion of parliamentary pacts with the leaders of the Social Democracy.

"9. Rejection of the theory of *social-fascism*, and of the whole practice bound up with it, as serving fascism on the one hand and the Social Democracy on the other.

"10. The struggle for the regrouping of the revolutionary forces of the world's working class under the banner of international Communism. Recognition of the necessity for the creation of a genuine Communist International capable of applying the principles enumerated above.

"11. Recognition of *party democracy* not only in words but also in fact; ruthless condemnation of the Stalinist plebiscitary regime (gagging the will and the thought of the party, the rule of the usurpers, deliberate suppression of information from the party, etc.).

"The fundamental principles enumerated above, which are of basic importance for the strategy of the proletariat in the present period, place the Left Opposition in a position of irreconcilable hostility to the Stalinist faction that dominates the USSR and the CI. The recognition of these principles on the basis of the decisions of the first four congresses of the Comintern is an indispensable condition for the acceptance of single organizations, groups and persons into the composition of the International Left Opposition."

3. The 'Non-existent' Soviet Section

The assertion that the Soviet section and the Fourth International were "non-existent" raises two questions:

1. Most of Trotsky's cothinkers in the Soviet Union were in prison camps, and any contact by Soviet citizens with Trotsky or Trotskyist organizations abroad was grounds for execution (as in the cases of Blumkin and

Ignace Reiss). Did the Soviet section therefore not exist? Or Trotsky not speak for it?

2. If neither existed, how does Basmanov explain the fact that in 1936-38 hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of persons were arrested, tried, shot, or condemned to the agony, or death, of concentration camps—most of them on charges, now universally recognized as false and so admitted by former Soviet Premier Khrushchev, of being involved in a Trotskyist-rightist conspiratorial organization?

The Soviet government at that time printed millions of words, in dozens of languages, detailing the alleged foul plots of the Trotskyist "spies, saboteurs, and wreckers." But Basmanov has nothing to say about this bit of history—nothing about the generation of Communists destroyed in the purges. Like the Soviet section, presumably, the purges and their victims were also "non-existent."

The Soviet government, through its secret police arm—then called the GPU—also devoted great effort and expense to hounding and assassinating leaders of the "non-existent" Fourth International. Trotsky's son Leon Sedov, Trotsky's former secretary Rudolf Klement, and finally Trotsky himself in 1940 were the most famous of the many who perished on Stalin's orders.

In Basmanov's world, then, not only the persecution of Left Oppositionists, the Great Purges, the Moscow Trials, the murder of Trotsky, but even the Great Genius who presided over all these marvels, Stalin, are as "non-existent" as the Soviet section supposedly was.

A firsthand account of the actually existing Soviet section in 1934-38—an organized opposition within Stalin's camps, loyal to Trotsky though it had no contact with him—may be found in the summer 1963 *International Socialist Review*. Written by "M. B.," an old Menshevik who came out of the camps after Stalin's death, it first appeared in 1961 in the Russian-language Menshevik journal *Sotsialisticheskii Vestnik*.

M. B. states that in the Pechora district, in the Soviet far north, which included the Vorkuta camp where he was, there were "certainly several thousand" Trotskyists. These people, he says, remained faithful to the leaders and platform of 1927, most having been in the camps since then. They were "the only group of political prisoners who openly criticized the Stalinist 'general line' and offered organized resistance to the jailers.

"Their leaders were Socrates Gevorkian, Vladimir Ivanov, Melne, V. V. Kossior, and Trotsky's ex-secretary Ponsnansky."

When the major frame-up trials began in the fall of 1936, the Trotskyists organized a hunger strike in protest. The Trotskyist Gevorkian gave a speech explaining the strike, which M. B. summarized as follows:

"It is now evident that the group of Stalinist adventurers have completed their counterrevolutionary coup d'etat in our country. All the progressive conquests of our revolution are in mortal danger. Not twilight shadows, but those of deep black night envelop our country. No Cavaignac spilled as much working class blood as Stalin. Physically annihilating all the opposition groups within the party, he aims at total personal dictatorship. The party and the whole people are subjected to surveillance and to summary justice by the police apparatus. The predictions and the direst fears of our opposition are fully confirmed.

"The nation slides irresistibly into the thermidorian

swamp. This is the triumph of the centrist petty-bourgeois forces, of which Stalin is the interpreter, the spokesman, and the apostle. No compromise is possible with the Stalinist traitors and hangmen of the revolution. Remaining proletarian revolutionaries to the very end, we should not entertain any illusion about the fate awaiting us.

"But before destroying us, Stalin will try to humiliate us as much as he can. By throwing political prisoners in with common criminals, he strives to scatter us among the criminals and to incite them against us. We are left with only one means of struggle in this unequal battle: the hunger strike. With a group of comrades, we have already drawn up a list of our demands of which many of you are already informed. Therefore, I now propose that we discuss them together and make a decision."

The hunger strike lasted four months, during which several strikers died, but it ended with the authorities agreeing to the (necessarily limited) demands of the strike. But after the second frame-up trial, in the fall of 1937, the camp administration turned ferocious. In March-May 1938, by groups of thirty or forty at regular intervals, nearly all the Trotskyists were taken out into the tundra and shot.

Since Stalin's death there have been many rehabilitations, mostly posthumous. These have not included members of the Soviet section of the International Left Opposition. Their turn has yet to come in the USSR.

4. Founding of the Fourth International

At the founding congress of the Fourth International there were thirty delegates from eleven countries. Affiliated organizations in some twenty additional countries were unable to send delegates because of war conditions, dictatorial regimes, or other adverse circumstances.

Considering that the founding congress of the Third International, held in Moscow where a workers government was in power, in the midst of a world revolutionary upsurge in 1919, had only fifty-two delegates from thirty countries, the Trotskyists did not do badly.

The key question, after all, as Basmanov the "Leninist" should know, is not the number of delegates but the *program*. With an international perspective based on a Marxist understanding of the actual course of world development, not an illusory or utopian belief in class peace; with a firmly conceived purpose of building revolutionary workers parties in every country, capable of providing the necessary leadership for the overthrow of capitalism—with that program, what was important was not the number of delegates present but that a determined and timely beginning should be made.

There is a curious similarity between Basmanov's version of the founding congress and that given by Isaac Deutscher in *The Prophet Outcast*, pages 419-21. Both mention the figure of "twenty-one" delegates. Deutscher wrote that the "'sections' of the International consisted of a few dozen or, at most, a few hundred members each." (Emphasis added.) In a passage farther on, Basmanov echoes the phrase "a few dozen" in speaking of the Fourth International today, without adding any qualifications such as "or, at most, a few hundred."

Deutscher writes that at the founding congress "Naville delivered the 'progress report,' which was to justify the

organizers' decision to proclaim the foundation of the Fourth International. Unwittingly, however, he revealed that the International was little more than a fiction: none of its so-called Executives and International Bureaus had been able to work in the past few years."

Basmanov introduces something similar—a quote apparently from the proceedings of the gathering, although as usual he cites no sources. The quote alleges that both the International Left Opposition and its bureaus "have in the past shown an inability to act (*nesposobnost k deistviyam*)."

Deutscher goes on: "The conference, however, remained unshaken in its determination to constitute itself a 'foundation congress,' as Trotsky had advised."

Basmanov puts it this way: "Nevertheless it decided on the founding of the 'Fourth International.'"

The unusual closeness of Basmanov's text to Deutscher's words on this point is hardly surprising. Basmanov, we may guess, found himself in agreement with Deutscher as to the ill-advisedness of founding the Fourth International. So he decided to use what sounded to him like telling arguments. But he could not name his source because Deutscher is taboo in the USSR and not to be quoted approvingly by Kremlin hacks.

Another possibility, however, should be borne in mind. Deutscher says in a footnote that his account is based on minutes of the founding congress in the closed section of the Trotsky archives. Perhaps Basmanov has visited Harvard recently, or has a copy of the archives, made available to him by the KGB through their own special methods.

5. The 'Popular Front'

What Basmanov means by "united anti-fascist front" is the Popular Front created by the Communist parties, particularly in Spain and France in 1936-38. In the United States this policy led the Communist party into supporting the Democratic party, a policy it still follows.

Trotsky favored a united front of *working-class* organizations and energetically advocated such a tactic against Hitler in Germany in 1930-33. But the German CP leaders would not adopt this only possible way to defeat Hitler, adhering instead to the Stalin-inspired policy of treating Social-Democratic workers organizations as the "main enemy," deepening the divisions in the working class in face of the Nazis.

Trotsky opposed the Popular Front precisely because it was the reverse of a proletarian united front. The CPs did not form alliances of workers organizations against the capitalist parties, but blocs between workers parties and *liberal bourgeois* parties.

The effect was not to mobilize the workers against fascism and for revolution but to subordinate them to the program of the liberals, within the framework of the capitalist status quo. The Stalinists and Social Democrats headed off any revolutionary initiative by the masses with the argument that the Popular Front had to be preserved. The watchword was to subordinate everything to the fight *against* fascism, but *for* . . . only liberalism.

What the Stalinists did was practice the policy of "peaceful coexistence" with capitalism, and the consequence was

that capitalism still remains strong when it should have given way to socialism decades ago.

For more on the "Popular Front" policy see note No. 8 below.

6. 'Mother of Revolution'

In the Russian master copy, Basmanov states this as a quotation, "war is the mother of revolution," but does not give the source.

It is torn out of context from the "Manifesto on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution," written by Leon Trotsky and adopted at the Emergency Conference of the Fourth International held May 9-16, 1940, in the very early days of World War II.

The document analyzed the world situation as it stood in the opening phase of the war, and projected what could be expected in the subsequent stages. Trotsky's forecast was, in its broad outlines, strikingly borne out by events.

The complete sentence utilized as raw material by Basmanov reads: "In history war has not infrequently been the mother of revolution precisely because it rocks superannuated regimes to their foundation, weakens the ruling class, and hastens the growth of revolutionary indignation among the oppressed classes."

For the text of the manifesto see *Writings of Leon Trotsky* (1939-40), Merit Publishers, 1969, page 31.

7. Did the USSR Face a Deadly Threat?

This is a partial quote from Trotsky's discussion of "The Soviet Union in a War" in *The Revolution Betrayed*. For some reason Basmanov's English translator did not take the standard version available in most public libraries but chose to do something original on the basis of Basmanov's text, which was probably done into Russian from the English. Small matter, since Basmanov tore his version out of context. The following is the full paragraph in which it appears, with the part used by Basmanov indicated in italics:

"Can we, however, expect that the Soviet Union will come out of the coming great war without defeat? To this frankly posed question, we will answer as 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.*" (Page 227.)

This paragraph seems to be a favorite of the Kremlin Trotskyologists. *Pravda* of November 19, 1969, ran an article by a Professor F. Ryzhenko about one of the several new anti-Trotskyist books published in the Soviet Union. (See "New Kremlin Fairy Tale About Trotskyism," *Intercontinental Press*, December 8, 1969, page 1104.)

Here is Ryzhenko's variation on the theme: "Not long before the attack by Hitler Germany on the Soviet Union, Trotsky wrote: 'Can we, however, expect that the Soviet Union will come out of the coming great war without defeat? To this frankly posed question we will answer as frankly: If the war remains only a war, the defeat of the

Soviet Union is inevitable.' But this counterrevolutionary prognosis was not fated to come to pass. Fascism, it turned out, was beaten roundly, and socialism achieved a victory of world-historical significance over it."

This is a crude attempt to make Trotsky appear an *advocate* of Soviet defeat because he warned that the *wrong* policy would invite defeat—that is, he warned that purely military measures, without revolutionary developments or policies, would be inadequate.

Anyone even remotely familiar with Trotsky's record and writings knows he was never a defeatist on the question of the workers state. Far from it. He was the staunchest advocate, throughout his struggle against Stalinism, of the unconditional defense of the USSR against imperialism. This was so much a part of Trotsky's program that on the eve of the Nazi invasion, Stalin, who rejected every warning that Hitler was about to attack, had many people shot as "Trotskyists" because they advocated preparing for war with the Nazis.

Ryzhenko is right, of course, that in the end a victory of world-historical importance was gained over fascism. But that was because the war did not remain "only a war."

Let us quote another of Trotsky's observations, from the same part of *The Revolution Betrayed*, on "The Soviet Union in a War."

"The henchmen of the Soviet bureaucracy say that we 'underestimate' the inner forces of the Soviet Union, the Red Army, etc., just as they have said that we 'deny' the possibility of socialist construction in a single state. These arguments stand on such a low level that they do not even permit a fruitful exchange of opinions. Without the Red Army the Soviet Union would be crushed and dismembered like China. *Only [its] stubborn and heroic resistance to the future capitalist enemy can create favorable conditions for the development of the class struggle in the imperialist camp. The Red Army is thus a factor of immense significance.* But this does not mean that it is the sole historic factor. Sufficient that it can give a mighty impulse to the revolution. Only the revolution can fulfill the chief task; to that the Red Army alone is unequal." (Emphasis added.)

The second world war did not remain "only a war"; parallel with the stubborn and heroic resistance of the Red Army, mass resistance movements arose throughout Europe, especially in 1943 and 1944 after Stalingrad; a mass uprising in Italy overthrew Mussolini; armed partisans in both Italy and France had enormous possibilities in a revolutionary direction; similar resistance established workers power in Yugoslavia; civil war broke out in Greece, as capitalism generally collapsed throughout Eastern Europe. And in the old European and Japanese empires the war brought with it an immense rise in the colonial revolution. After all, it was in the wake of this war—that-was-not-only-war that the Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese revolutions came to power.

On the question of the relative strength of the USSR and the imperialist camp in 1935-36 (when Trotsky wrote these lines), he was unquestionably correct because he was referring to imperialism as a whole, not just to the German or continental European sector. This was written while Germany was still rearming and while the Allies were weighing whether Hitler might be utilized as an agent of

capitalism as a whole in settling accounts with the workers state to the east. Hitler had not yet compelled them to reconsider this alternative by his conquest of Western Europe and his bid for hegemony in the imperialist camp. In 1935-36 the main danger to the Soviet Union from abroad was still that the imperialist powers might combine against their common enemy, the only workers state, just as they had in 1918-20 (militarist Germans and Japanese together with "democratic" Americans, British, and French). Even as late as the Finnish war in 1939 there was still a threat that the *united* power of world imperialism might be thrown against the Soviet Union. The Trotskyists were in the forefront of those combating this possibility.

Trotsky's point, however, was not to stress the real relative weakness on the technical side but to insist that the strength of the Soviet state lay in its connection with the world revolution as much as in its technical military capacities. The Soviet leadership under Stalin, by abandoning the lever of international revolution, was mortally endangering Soviet power itself, because on the technical level alone it could not hope to win against a united imperialism.

As events turned out, "the regime which issued from the October revolution" was almost swept away by the forces of only *one section* of world imperialism. The disaster that the Left Opposition warned against—that the Stalinists, unable to conduct a revolutionary defense, would bring about a Soviet defeat—was barely averted. It was only at the cost of millions of lives and enormous sacrifices such as the mass mobilization of proletarian auxiliaries in vast battles at Leningrad, Moscow, and Stalingrad, that the Red Army managed to stop the onslaught of the Nazi troops—virtually in spite of Stalin's remarkable disorganizing activities.

Let it never be forgotten that in 1935-36 when Trotsky was warning against the danger of imperialist military power, Stalin was soon to make his contribution by having the top cadres of the Soviet army shot!

So colossal was the bungling by the Kremlin, so great the disaster of the first period of the war, that many in the Soviet Union expected Stalin to be ousted. Stalin himself apparently was surprised to survive the war still at the head of the state.

In a May 24, 1945, victory toast "to the Russian people" Stalin said: "Our government made not a few errors, we experienced at moments a desperate situation in 1941-42, when our army was retreating, because there was no other way out. A different people could have said to the government: 'You have failed to justify our expectations. Go away. We shall install another government which will conclude peace with Germany. . . .' The Russian people, however, did not take this path. . . . Thanks to it, to the Russian people, for this confidence." (J. Stalin, *War Speeches*, page 139.)

If the Left Opposition, or even the Red Army, had not been decapitated by Stalin, ever shrewd when it came to looking after his own interests if not those of the revolution, they might very well have "installed another government"—but to fight far more effectively against the invasion, not to make peace with imperialism.

By raising the question of the Soviet experience in World War II, Basmanov is touching on a very sore subject. There is much evidence in fact that a strong undercurrent

has persisted despite all repression from the days of those early disasters, demanding a settling of accounts and punishment of those who failed to prepare the defense of the country.

This sentiment was reflected most dramatically in Khrushchev's "secret speech" in 1956 at the Twentieth Congress—which was followed by the appearance of a body of literature "raising the edge of the curtain" on this subject. But the bureaucracy as a whole finds the subject too dangerous, with implications threatening its privileged position. Under Brezhnev, Stalin's role in World War II is being rehabilitated, even to the point of justifying the Stalin-Hitler pact. Still Soviet citizens continue, despite harassment, expulsion from the party, and even arrest, to denounce Stalin's crimes and those who cover up for them.

For samples of Soviet anti-Stalinist views on this question, see "Stalin and the Nazi Aggression Against the Soviet Union [Minutes of a discussion between Soviet historians and army representatives]," *World Outlook* (former name of *Intercontinental Press*), November 11, 1966, page 26; and "Why Hitler Was Able to Overrun the USSR," by former Major General Pyotr Grigorenko, *Intercontinental Press*, November 10, 1969, page 1004.

8. The 'Second Front' and the Achievements of Earl Browder

Basmanov claims that the Trotskyists applied "the same yardstick" to the policies both of the fascist bloc and of the countries "subjected to aggression," that is, countries like France, Britain, China, the Soviet Union, etc.

What actually was the Trotskyist view of the second world war? Far from applying the same yardstick, the Trotskyists considered it a complex and contradictory phenomenon in which the different elements had to be sorted out carefully to determine what the correct policies would be for promoting a revolutionary outcome.

Basically there were three wars in one: a war between an imperialist state and a workers state (the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union); a war between an imperialist state and a colonialized country seeking to free itself (the Sino-Japanese war); and a war between two blocs of imperialist countries for redivision of the world (here Germany, Italy, and Japan were ranged against the United States, Britain, and their lesser capitalist allies).

For the Stalinists—and Basmanov is just rehashing the Stalinist arguments of 1941-47—the war was only one thing: a fight to defend the Soviet Union against a fascist attack. There is no analysis on Basmanov's part of the elements that went to make up the "anti-Hitler coalition." For the Stalinists the aims and interests of Roosevelt and Churchill were not to be questioned. It was enough that they were at war with Germany.

As the Trotskyists saw it, the aims and interests of the British and U. S. imperialists had to be analyzed as distinct from the interests, say, of the USSR and China. Theirs was not a "liberating" struggle to free the world from fascism (an updated variant of Wilson's hypocritical "war to end wars and save the world for democracy"). Theirs was a struggle for a greater share of the world

market as against their imperialist rivals, or any other forces.

One did not have to wait and see how the Anglo-American imperialists would act in the war to know this. A standard Marxist analysis, a plain yardstick if you will, was all that was needed. As the editors of *Fourth International* (now the *International Socialist Review*) put it in February 1941, before the United States had entered the war:

"In the first place the United States is being converted into an arsenal to crush all the competitors of American imperialism and to conquer the world for our monied masters. This policy involves war against Germany, Italy, and Japan, the subjugation of colonial peoples in South America and elsewhere, the smothering of every revolutionary movement, and eventually the erasing of the Soviet Union." (Page 37.)

Those aims, and the policies of American imperialism, have not changed to this day. Any revolutionary could perceive them unless blinded by the concept of a "united anti-fascist front" with "good, liberal, democratic" capitalists.

"The prosecution of this ambitious program of world conquest requires above all a docile working class at home," the *Fourth International* went on. The policy Marxists should follow, then, was *revolutionary defeatism* toward their own imperialists, so as to deny them a docile working class.

(Similarly today, the revolutionary socialists, in the vanguard of the struggle to hamper imperialist aggression in Southeast Asia, practice *revolutionary defeatism* in the imperialist center by mobilizing protest and maintaining the class struggle at home.)

Now the fact that Roosevelt and Churchill made an alliance with the Soviet Union against Hitler modified but did not basically alter the policy of revolutionary defeatism by American and British workers toward their own rulers. What was different was *how defeatism was to be applied*, not that defeatism should be abandoned and every war measure of Roosevelt and Churchill uncritically supported. The abandonment of defeatism, in fact, was the policy Stalin advocated for the world Communist movement in relation to Anglo-American imperialism. This was most graphically demonstrated by his dissolving the Communist International in 1943.

What the Trotskyists opposed was not military aid to the USSR by Churchill and Roosevelt. What they opposed was having this called an "anti-Hitler coalition" to justify any and all *imperialist* policies Britain or the U. S. might engage in in other theaters of war.

Let us look more closely at the question of how revolutionary defeatism was to be applied in the context of this peculiar "anti-Hitler coalition": a workers state, plus an imperialist bloc, plus a colonized nation (China) struggling to be free (of Japan).

In the case of China it is rather clear that U. S. imperialism was not interested in helping the Chinese people win national independence. What it was interested in was denying Japan exclusive sway over China. The policy of the Open Door—for the dollar! Eventually, in order to gain full national independence, the Chinese people had to drive out the U. S.-backed Chiang regime, take the road of socialist revolution, and become involved in a

protracted struggle with that "good" member of the anti-Hitler coalition, U. S. imperialism.

The Trotskyist policy toward China was to support the struggle for independence from Japan, even if it was temporarily led by Chiang; but at the same time to oppose Roosevelt's, and later Truman's, aim of establishing a foothold in China for U. S. imperialism. If America gave aid to the Chinese struggling to free themselves from Japanese imperialism, fine. But the Chinese fighters should use that aid and any resources available to free themselves not just from "fascist" but from *all* imperialism, including the "democratic" variety. They could never place confidence in the "liberating nature of the struggle" waged by the Roosevelt forces, even though they seemed "opposed to fascism." For at the next stage their benefactor of the moment was sure to try to enslave them—as U. S. policy in Vietnam today so clearly demonstrates.

Likewise in the Nazi-Soviet conflict, the policy of defeatism vis-à-vis the Roosevelt-Churchill part of the coalition had to be applied in a flexible way, in terms of the concrete acts or policies of the capitalist governments. Above all, it was necessary to see their aims clearly and have no illusions about them.

Trotsky discussed this type of situation in 1938, a year before the European war broke out. He posed the hypothetical possibility that the workers might take power in Belgium and be attacked by Hitler. "In order to cover its own flank, the French bourgeois government might find itself compelled to help the Belgian workers' government with arms. The Belgian soviets of course reach for these arms with both hands. . . . The French bourgeoisie could send arms to proletarian Belgium only out of fear of the greatest military danger and only in expectation of later crushing the proletarian revolution with their own weapons. To the French workers, on the contrary, proletarian Belgium is the greatest support in the struggle against their own bourgeoisie." (*Writings of Leon Trotsky, 1938-39, Merit, 1969, page 5.*)

Trotsky took up this hypothetical case to explain how to apply revolutionary defeatism in a dialectical way. "Actuated by the principle of defeatism, perhaps the French workers ought to block their bourgeoisie from shipping arms to proletarian Belgium? Only direct traitors or out-and-out idiots can reason thus."

This analysis helps explain how revolutionary Marxists approached the question of Anglo-American aid to the proletarian USSR. First of all, the American and British bourgeoisie sent military aid only out of fear of the greatest military danger. If Hitler had crushed the Soviet Union, he would have straddled Eurasia, threatening to link up with the Japanese to crush China, then pointing toward the Middle East, India, and Africa. It was fear of that eventuality, not the desire to "liberate" anyone, that drove Churchill and Roosevelt to send material aid to the Red Army.

Still the Soviet fighters properly reached for Anglo-American arms with both hands. And obviously any worker who tried to block such shipments would have been a traitor or idiot. The Trotskyists did everything they could to facilitate and speed the shipment of arms to the USSR.

But did the shipping of such arms mean that revolutionists in the Anglo-American world should abandon the struggle against their own bourgeoisie? Not at all. In fact, the Red Army's victories inspired the workers interna-

tionally to step up the struggle against their own masters. And the American and British revolutionaries' job was to aid in that class struggle, not subordinate it to the war needs of imperialism.

The Trotskyists, according to Basmanov, "broadcast their fabrications about the creation of the anti-Hitler coalition being an act hostile to the interests of both the Russian and the world revolution." Aid to the Red Army was not hostile to revolutionary interests and no Trotskyist called it that. However—and it is this aspect that the Basmanovs avoid—to the extent that the "anti-Hitler coalition" theory served to disguise the imperialist interests of Britain and the United States, it was definitely harmful to revolutionary interests, and we still broadcast that unfabricated truth.

To what extent did the alliance aid the Red Army and to what extent did it further Anglo-American imperialist interests?

The question can be clarified in part by a discussion of the "second front." Basmanov asserts that the Trotskyists opposed the establishment of a second front on the grounds that it would hold back the European revolution.

What were the actual facts concerning the second front? The following passage from the March 14, 1942, *Militant*, sheds useful light on the matter:

"The slogan for the 'second front' was first raised by the Stalinists at the height of the Nazi drive into the USSR last autumn. At the time Stalin tried to explain away the defeats of the Red Army by the failure on the part of Britain to open up such a front. In November 1941 he promised the Soviet people that the second front would materialize shortly. This campaign, however, was dropped as suddenly as it had been launched when the Red Army began scoring its first successes and beat back the German armies.

"During the winter months the Soviet masses were then told that the invaders would be driven out of the occupied territory by the unaided forces of the country itself. The previous defeats were minimized and explained away as having been entirely due to the element of surprise. After the Germans had lost this initial advantage they would never regain it. The Red Army, it was confidently predicted, would not surrender the initiative again.

"Now with the approach of spring and the threat of another offensive by Hitler, the Kremlin has changed its tune. The danger is self-evident.

"Despite the heroic efforts of the Red Army, the Nazis have succeeded in retaining their positions in the Ukraine. They still hold the approaches to Leningrad and are within striking distance of Moscow. . . .

"Hitler has undoubtedly been able to reorganize and replenish his military machine. The Kremlin's only answer is to plead once again for a diversion elsewhere. . . .

"So far as London and Washington are concerned, *they do not even dream of being able to terminate the conflict in the near future. The British imperialists rejected the plan for a 'second front' last year when Churchill was talking confidently of forcing [a] military decision by 1943.*" (Emphasis added.)

The article goes on to explain how the imperialists would prefer to let the Soviet Union exhaust itself in the struggle against Hitler, without doing more than create minor diversions.

"What will be the relation of forces," it asks prophetically, "if the Axis is finally defeated but the Soviet Union has been drained and weakened to the point of exhaustion?"

As events turned out, the Western imperialists held off from invading the Axis stronghold for *three years* (1941, 1942, 1943), waiting for the Nazi and Soviet armies to mutually exhaust themselves, hoping the "democracies" would emerge as masters of the world. As Trotsky suggested in the hypothetical case cited above, the bourgeoisie aided the workers state in the expectation "of later crushing the proletarian revolution with their own weapons."

The Trotskyists, then, did not call "for preventing the opening of the Second Front." They simply pointed out that it was illusory to expect that Roosevelt and Churchill were about to bail out their Soviet "ally."

It was only the victories of the Soviet armies in 1943 and after, which the imperialists did not expect and to which they contributed very little, that spoiled the imperialists' plan of eventually crushing a weakened USSR.

After 1943 the real meaning of a second front became clear. When Roosevelt and Churchill finally did open a second front, it was precisely in order to "delay the revolutionary struggle in Europe." The first "Allied" landing on the continent was in mid-1943, after the Red Army victories began to inspire revolutionary moods all through Europe. This landing, in Italy, coincided with mass unrest and a preventive palace coup whereby Mussolini's collaborators threw him to the aroused masses in hope of saving their own skins. Armed workers organizations began carrying on an insurrectionary struggle against the Nazi occupiers. This held the potential of social revolution. The "democratic" Allies, landing in southern Italy, promptly established a regime little different from Mussolini's—retaining the monarchy and putting Mussolini's No. 2 man, Marshal Badoglio, conqueror of Ethiopia, in as premier. The function of the Allied military regime was to head off and control the Italian revolutionary upsurge, not to hurt the Nazis or help the Soviets.

Ironically, in accordance with Stalin's policies, the Italian Communists *supported* Badoglio and the monarchy—all in the name of the "anti-Hitler coalition" with the Allies.

And why was the "second front" at Normandy in 1944 finally opened?

For three years, from June 1941 to the Normandy invasion of June 1944, "the Soviet Union withstood, contained, and eventually repulsed an average of about 180 German divisions," writes John Bagguley in *Containment and Revolution* (London, 1967). In the same period an average of *twelve* Western divisions engaged about as many Axis divisions in North Africa and Italy, an effort Bagguley rightly describes as "squandered in a secondary theatre of war"—squandered, that is, in terms of the anti-Nazi struggle, but not squandered so far as halting revolution went.

The "second front" came to Normandy in June 1944, not to save the USSR but because the Red Army was sweeping toward Berlin, carrying the threat of anticapitalist nationalizations in its train despite Stalin's assurances to his capitalist "fellow coalitionists." Moreover, powerful armed resistance movements led by worker-militants contained a revolutionary potential that Roosevelt and Churchill had to try to control.

The defeat of Hitler was only a question of time, and

social revolution was on the order of the day. Eisenhower's second front, then, with Patton racing into Germany, was precisely intended to "beat the Russians," or as Basmanov phrases it, to "delay the revolutionary struggle in Europe." But we are "enemies of socialism" to say that.

Let us look closer at the "liberating nature" of the struggle against fascism as conducted by the countries "subjected to aggression" (the U. S. and Britain) when they reconquered North Africa and invaded western Europe (leaving aside for the moment MacArthur's return to the Philippines, putting down the Hukbalahap independence struggle). In North Africa, French colonial rule was reimposed — under a formerly profascist French general.

Later in France, the "democratic" victory meant instead of Vichy — de Gaulle; in Germany, Adenauer and a regime riddled with old Nazis. And the "anti-Hitler coalition" policy meant that the French Communists *helped* de Gaulle reestablish a bourgeois state apparatus in France. Likewise Communists in India were instructed not to fight for independence from Britain because it was a Soviet "ally."

The Vietnamese, too, in 1945-46 were urged by Stalin to let the British and French "allies" reenter that country — even though the Vietnamese had taken it over for themselves in the wake of the Japanese surrender.

How can such a policy — one truly "hostile to the interests of the Russian and the world revolution" — be explained? Having survived a mortal attack mainly through its own efforts, why should the USSR still make concessions like these to world imperialism?

The social position of the Soviet bureaucracy is the only explanation. This privileged caste, forced to fight off Hitler for self-preservation, still had a deadly fear of revolution. They did not object to the Allied containment of the revolutionary mass movement in Italy. They did not object to the British suppression of the Communist side in civil war in Greece. They never utilized revolutionary appeals to the German soldiers or workers. They shortsightedly preferred to let imperialism continue in the West, rather than encourage socialist revolution, for they shared the social outlook of the imperialist vultures. So it was that Stalin sat down with Roosevelt and Churchill in secrecy at Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran to divide the world into "spheres of influence."

Trapped by their fears and illusions, the Kremlin hierarchs seemingly never dreamed that these "anti-Hitler coalition" agreements would explode in their faces. They apparently never guessed that the era of nuclear arms, cold war, and Pax Americana would be a logical outcome of the war policies of Roosevelt and Churchill disguised as a "united anti-fascist front."

Readers of *Political Affairs*, if not its editors, might benefit from the reminder of what the "anti-Hitler coalition" (or "everything for the war") policy meant in the United States. The CPUSA supported a "no-strike" pledge that condemned the workers to a wage freeze while the war sent profits soaring. And the Stalinists meant it. When the coal miners went on strike, the Stalinists backed Roosevelt to the hilt in seeking to break it. They opposed the 1941 March on Washington by black Americans, arguing that the equal-rights fight should be suspended during the war. They backed the capitalist witch-hunt by supporting the Smith Act jailing of American Trotskyist leaders who opposed the war aims of the "anti-fascist" Roosevelt.

In fact Earl Browder, then national secretary of the American Communist party, told a meeting of the party's National Committee, January 7-9, 1944:

"We shall have to be prepared to break with anyone that refuses to support and fight for the realization of the Teheran Agreement and the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. We must be prepared to give the hand of cooperation and fellowship to everyone who fights for the realization of this coalition. *If J.P. Morgan supports this coalition and goes down the line for it, I as a Communist am prepared to clasp his hand and join with him to realize it.* Class divisions or political groupings have no significance now except as they reflect one side or the other side of the issue." (Emphasis added.)

Echoing Stalin, Browder suggested that the Teheran-type conferences would bring a lasting era of peace, prosperity, and reforms. "The Teheran Declaration, which was signed by Churchill, Roosevelt, and the great Marxist Stalin, represents the only program in the interest of the toiling masses of the whole world." (*Daily Worker*, January 13, 1944.)

"The program of Teheran is the kind of world program for which all peoples have fought for generations. . . . Teheran constitutes the *greatest turning point in world history.*" (*Sunday Worker*, January 16, 1944 — emphasis added.)

Browder insisted that as a result of the Teheran coalition, "capitalism and socialism have begun to find the way to peaceful coexistence and collaboration in the same world." (And the Maoists tell us Khrushchev initiated the policy of "peaceful coexistence"!.) Browder called for "the continuation of national unity into the post-war period for long terms of years." And he explained Stalin's policy of "anti-Hitler coalition" more fully:

"British and American ruling circles had to be convinced that their joint war together with the Soviet Union against Hitlerism would not result in the Soviet Socialist system being extended to Western Europe under the stimulus of the victorious Red Armies." (*Sunday Worker*, January 16, 1944.)

Thus the Stalinists assured the imperialists they were not interested in spreading revolution. With such collaborators, one wonders, why did the American imperialists ever need to launch the Cold War?

Here the contradictions of Stalin's own position come to the fore and make a shambles of the policies he himself projects. While ready to suppress social revolution anywhere, especially at home, the Soviet bureaucracy has to insist on certain measures of defense of Soviet territory — for its own survival. Thus Stalin had to insist on primary influence over the territories conquered by the Red Army. He did not wish to introduce socialism into Eastern Europe. It was a matter of indifference to him whether the East European masses would be freed from capitalism, so long as that territory never again became a launching area for invasion of the USSR.

But the Allies could not accept the extension of Soviet influence into Eastern Europe because the Soviet state still rested on noncapitalist foundations, and its exclusive control implied an end to capitalism in that part of the world. The aim of the Marshall Plan and the Berlin airlift, the first moves in the Cold War, was to reassert capitalist influence in Eastern Europe. It was only under these Cold War pressures that Stalin was forced, out of self-

defense, to abolish — by military and bureaucratic means, from the top down — the already severely eroded vestiges of capitalist property in the "people's democracies."

All of Stalin's services then in preventing the Italian, French, German, and Greek revolutions were not enough to make the Western imperialists put aside fundamental differences and enter the era of peaceful coexistence, however frantically the Communists and "friends" of the Soviet Union might beg them.

The demands of the international capitalist economy, which requires expansion and cannot endure shrinkage of its scope, were sure to prevail. The Cold War was inevitable despite any and all peace offerings and good services by the former Soviet partner in the great "anti-Hitler coalition."

9. 'Simply Disintegrated'

It is true that in a series of countries the Trotskyists were decimated. During the German occupation of Belgium, Greece, the Netherlands, France, etc., the Nazis systematically murdered every Trotskyist they could get their hands on. In some countries the Stalinists played a primary role in physically liquidating the Trotskyists.

Despite the savage repression, however, the Trotskyists managed to survive and to recruit. At the end of the war, when they were able to reestablish communications, they reknit the Fourth International and founded new groups in a whole series of countries.

10. The 1953-54 Split

Despite his obvious eagerness to turn it to advantage, Basmanov in touching on the split that occurred in the world Trotskyist movement in 1953-54 displays a cautiousness that is instructive in its own way.

One of the big points under discussion in the Trotskyist movement at the time was the possible repercussions of the death of Stalin, the meaning of the first signs of "de-Stalinization," and how the "thaw," as it was called at the time, could best be fostered and developed. It is a pity that Basmanov does not offer his Soviet audience at least a glimpse, however distorted, of what the Trotskyists were debating.

It should be added that organizational questions were also involved in the split as well as misunderstandings that could not easily be resolved in the McCarthyite witch-hunt period when the American Trotskyists were barred from traveling abroad.

11. Opportunities for Trotskyism

The special resolution to which Basmanov refers is no doubt "The Crisis of Stalinism Since the XXIst Congress of the CP of the USSR." It is to be found in the winter 1960-61 issue of *Fourth International* (the English-language edition of *Quatrième Internationale*), page 51.

The phrase cited by Basmanov is evidently from the last sentence of the two closing paragraphs:

"In conclusion, the events since the end of the Second

World War have more and more confirmed the Trotskyist thesis that Stalinism, i.e., the subordination of the Communist movement to the Soviet bureaucracy, was a phenomenon incompatible with any great revolutionary development. The Yugoslav revolution very quickly found itself breaking with Stalinism. Then, in the USSR and in the other workers' states of Eastern Europe, a series of contradictions appeared about the masses' immediate demands, which caused explosions (the Polish and Hungarian October). Despite all the Khrushchev leadership's attempt to reabsorb the crisis by a 'reformism' not lacking in dynamism and based on the Soviet Union's immense economic and technical advances, new contradictions ripened, especially because of the development of the Chinese revolution.

"Up till then, each of these crises was accompanied by limited demands which were contained in the general programme of the Fourth International or which went in the direction of these demands. At present the new phase of the international crisis of Stalinism raises a constellation of problems which are those of the world revolution and of the international transition toward socialism, and, behind them, that of the new mass international leadership. The new phase in the crisis of Stalinism that is ripening will thus be eminently favorable to the progress of Trotskyism and its organization, the Fourth International."

12. 'An Important Stage of Reconstruction'

The Political Committee of the Socialist Workers party drew up a list of sixteen points, stating the issues on which the two major factions in the world Trotskyist movement appeared to be in agreement. This document was adopted at the Reunification Congress in 1963 as a principled basis for reuniting the movement. The document was made public in the October-December 1963 issue of *Fourth International* (pages 69-72).

In combing through this statement in search of something that might be torn out of context and twisted to his own ends, Basmanov appears to have taken a phrase from the last sentence of point No. 11:

"(11) The differences which finally shattered the monolithic structure of Stalinism began in a spectacular way with the ideological and political conflict between the Yugoslav and Soviet Communist party leaderships. This conflict was widened by the attempted political revolution undertaken by the Hungarian workers. The Cuban Revolution deepened the crisis still further. With the Chinese-Soviet rift it has become one of the most important questions of world politics. While expressing in an immediate sense the conflict of interests among the various national bureaucratic groups, and between the Soviet bureaucracy and the working classes of countries under its influence, the crisis reflects fundamentally the incompatibility of Stalinism with living victorious revolutions in which the militant vanguard seeks a return to the doctrines of Lenin. The crisis is thus highly progressive in character, marking an important stage in the rebuilding of a revolutionary Marxist world mass movement."

13. 'Majority' and 'Minority' at 'Loggerheads'

The reunification of 1963 brought together the great majority of groups that had formerly adhered either to the International Committee or the International Secretariat.

A British group headed by Gerry Healy, which developed sectarian views, refused to join with the majority of the International Committee in reunifying the movement. A similar group in France headed by Pierre Lambert also refused to abide by the majority decision of the International Committee.

On the side of the International Secretariat, a small grouping in Latin America headed by Juan Posadas refused to join in reunifying the movement. Later Michel Pablo, adopting a conciliatory posture toward Titoism and Khrushchevism, undertook a split of his own after first greeting the reunification.

These groups in their totality represented only a small part of the world Trotskyist movement at the time and they have declined in relative significance since then.

It is not clear what Basmanov means by "divided" into a "majority" and a "minority" at the Reunification Congress. The Trotskyist movement from its inception has adhered to the norms of democratic centralism as taught by Lenin. This means—in contrast to the authoritarian practices and monolithism characteristic of the Stalinists and similar bureaucrats—guaranteeing the rights of minority tendencies. As a consequence, minorities have often appeared in the Fourth International, and have argued for their positions at congresses, as well as in the preceding discussion periods, as they exercised their right to seek to win a majority.

The Trotskyist movement is justly proud of this tradition of proletarian democracy and strongly advocates its adoption in the Soviet Union and the other workers states.

14. 'Several Dozen' Trotskyists

(See also note No. 4.) One of the hard things to understand in reading Kremlin productions like this is why the men running the second most powerful government on earth should show so much concern over a few groups of Trotskyists seldom exceeding "several dozen" members and scattered in various countries.

Can it be that there are more than "several dozen"? Or can it be that the heads of the bureaucracy are in position to know how explosive the social situation really is in the Soviet Union and how insecure they and their privileges are in face of the masses moving restlessly toward the program of proletarian democracy represented by Trotskyism?

15. 'Initiative' Groups

It is curious that Basmanov should refer to Trotskyists as forming "initiative" groups, inasmuch as one group of oppositionists in the Soviet Union used that very term, founding an "Initiative Group for the Defense of Human

Rights in the USSR." (For the text of their first public declaration, an appeal to the United Nations Human Rights Commission, see *Intercontinental Press*, June 16, 1969, page 606.)

Not that the dissident Communists and others now prominent in the Soviet opposition movement are Trotskyists. But the nature of their political position and their attitude toward the Kremlin bureaucracy are such that the ruling privileged caste must naturally fear that this new opposition will pick up and renew the heritage of the Left Opposition, as well as link up with the international continuation of the Left Opposition, the Fourth International.

Hence the Kremlin's panicky reaction to the dissidents, extending all the way to the expulsion of Solzhenitsyn from the Writers Union. Since June 1969 nearly all those who designated themselves members of the "Initiative Group" have been arrested by the secret-police arm of the bureaucracy.

16. Youth 'Infected with Leftism'

In line with Basmanov's new look of pseudo objectivity, a purported sociological explanation is given for the "tenacity" of Trotskyism. Trotskyist ideas supposedly appeal to newly radicalized, petty-bourgeois layers driven to ultra-leftism out of desperation, and in reaction against the "original sin" of a conservatized, reformist Social Democracy. There is some truth here, almost enough to make it sound real.

Of course, other arguments are included in passing, kept in reserve as it were: the splitting activities of the Maoists and the alleged buildup given Trotskyism by the bourgeois press are also blamed for its "tenacity." But the thesis of Trotskyism's appeal to the new radicals of middle-class origin, especially the student youth, is repeated several times and given a lot of stress.

Along with this the label of "Trotskyism" is placed on ideas widely held by the "New Left," e.g., that the working class has lost its revolutionary potential, or that guerrillaism or putschist street fighting are the only means to accomplish the revolution. These of course are the opposite of the ideas held by the Trotskyists, who in fact have consistently polemicized against such erroneous perspectives.

Basmanov is absolutely right when he repeats Lenin's formula that ultraleftism frequently appears as a reaction to the superconservatism of a reformist bureaucracy in the labor movement. But to apply this only to the Social Democracy is a joke. The big, bureaucratized, pure-and-simple trade-unionist CPs like those of France and Italy have driven many militant youth, and not only student youth, to "rashness and violence." Some workers, too, after watching the CPs play reformist, parliamentary, hat-in-hand games for years with their capitalist bosses, turn against political struggle altogether and adopt syndicalist, spontanéist, or other ultimately ineffective lines of struggle.

But that is not the only reaction to the ineffectiveness of bureaucratic-reformist leadership in the era of capitalism's chronic crisis. Especially among the youth there is also a drawing of Leninist conclusions. This is the real reason for the attractiveness of the Fourth International

as the organization that has carried on and enriched the revolutionary Marxist, the Bolshevik-Leninist, position.

Basmanov does not mention the international youth radicalization but he clearly has it in mind when he speaks of the social layers that have "in recent years been drawn into the anti-imperialist movement." He specifically talks about the student movements in France and Japan, where this radicalization has been perhaps the most striking.

He does not try to analyze the student radicalization, but confines himself to what are after all old Stalinist clichés about how the Trotskyists supposedly feed upon the "left sickness."

Brezhnev, at the conference of seventy Communist parties in Moscow in June 1969, complained in almost the same words about the student unrest in the capitalist countries being too often "spontaneous," assuming "politically immature forms," and becoming exploited by extremist elements hostile to Communism.

A Soviet journal commented in the same vein: "The students often refuse any compromise, any participation in parliamentary activities, temporary coalitions, and similar methods of class struggle."

Not all elements in the Soviet establishment are so eager to write off the youth radicalization. In a discussion in February, 1969, on a new orientation for the official journal *Voprosy Filosofii* [Questions of Philosophy], the leading physicist Pyotr Kapitsa, a major figure in the Soviet intellectual establishment, urged that their ideologists intervene in the debates and discussions of the revolutionary movement in the West. And he stated bluntly that "its leader is the student youth."

"We must not be afraid to acknowledge," he said, "that at present our ideologists stand isolated from this revolutionary process and in practice have no influence upon it." (For the full text of Kapitsa's speech, see *Intercontinental Press*, October 6, 1969, page 883.)

Unlike Basmanov, Kapitsa tried to analyze the causes of the student radicalization: "The forces that brought this movement into being are still not fully understood," he observed, adding, "but it is already established that this movement was not aroused by dissatisfaction with the material conditions of man in society; it is aimed at changing the ideological conditions under which man is forced to live in capitalist society."

Both Kapitsa and Basmanov might profitably study the resolution "The Worldwide Youth Radicalization" presented to the world congress of the Fourth International in April 1969, especially the part on the "Root Causes and Common Features of the Worldwide Youth Radicalization." The economic, social, and political forces that have gone to produce this movement are far from being purely ideological, and they give the youth radicalization a significance that Brezhnev, Basmanov, et al., will continue to scorn at their own peril—for their isolation from it will only grow greater. Meanwhile, as Kapitsa warned, "The Trotskyists and others have entered into the struggle."

Moreover, the Soviet youth will not long remain immune to this worldwide epidemic. The common causes that produced it elsewhere operate in Soviet society, too. Recently the Soviet official press has called repeatedly for strengthening the "ideological-patriotic" indoctrination of the youth, lest they become infected by the "politically immature" ideas abroad in today's world, especially "left revisionism."

April 27, 1970

17. 'No Clear Definite Program'

There is a self-evident contradiction in Basmanov's assertion that Trotskyism has "produced no clear, definite program after the war" followed by his admission that there have been "numerous statements made by the various 'congresses.'" Because his masters do not agree with the programmatic resolutions through which the Trotskyist movement has regularly brought its program up to date, he seeks to wave them away as mere "statements."

The reader may judge for himself. The international political resolution adopted by the 1963 Reunification Congress entitled "The Dynamics of World Revolution" is available from Pathfinder Press, Inc., 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003. A similar resolution entitled "The New Rise of World Revolution," adopted at the 1969 world congress of the Fourth International, appeared in the special issue of *Intercontinental Press* for July 14, 1969, pages 667-688.

A careful reading will show that these documents develop and bring up to date the Transitional Program written by Trotsky and adopted at the founding congress of the Fourth International in 1938. In conjunction with previous documents, including those of the first four congresses of the Communist International, they provide an integrated, international revolutionary perspective and orientation for revolutionary socialists in every part of the world.

18. What Is Meant by 'World Socialism'?

The gains that the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of planned economies have brought to the Soviet Union, the East European countries, China, Korea, Vietnam, and Cuba are great. They are important milestones on the road toward a socialist world society. But as Fidel Castro has said about Cuba, this is not yet socialism.

Socialism, as conceived by Marx and Engels, refers to a society of such high (planned) productive power that material abundance becomes a reality which is registered by the disappearance of classes and the withering away of the state. Economic development *along socialist lines* after the workers come to power in a country was never said to be impossible by the Trotskyists; in the Soviet Union, they were its firmest advocates, in fact. What Trotsky and his cothinkers did say was impossible, was to achieve in one country alone the flowering that will be possible under the extension of planned economy to the highly industrialized areas now held by capitalism. In short, world socialism cannot be built in one country—despite Stalin's boast that this had been accomplished in the mid-1930s!

Stalin's successors and protégés, Brezhnev, Kosygin, and company, now forecast a complete *communist* society separately in the Soviet Union alone. *Communism*, as taught by Marx and Engels, is a future stage of such abundance as to leave even world socialism behind.

The narrow, nationalistic, and utopian outlook of the Stalinists ignores two things—the duty to aid less developed countries where capitalism has been abolished; and the threat which the economic and military might of the advanced capitalist countries continues to pose to the workers states.

Because of the peculiarities of historic development, so-

cialist revolution has not yet been victorious in an *advanced* capitalist country. This fact has influenced the social, economic, and political development of those countries where the revolution has been victorious.

The powerful imperialist states exert enormous pressure on the workers states, not only politically, diplomatically, and militarily, but also economically, through the modern highly integrated, highly interdependent world market, of which the workers states are *not* independent, though they can partly control their relation to it. Only when the entire *world market* has been superseded and all the major forces of the *international world economy* are subjected to *planning for use not profit*, can one begin to speak of socialist society.

Given the continued powerful imperialist segment of the world, to call the existing bastions of workers power "socialist" and complacently ignore the problem of extending the revolution to the centers of greatest productivity, and therefore of social, political, and military force in today's world, is a very dangerous mistake and a betrayal of the basic concepts taught by Marx and Engels, and Lenin.

The fact is that the governments and parties, not only of the Soviet Union but of many other workers states, have adopted the Stalinist attitude. That is why the Trotskyists use the term "deformed workers states"—to explain the social and historical reasons for the abandonment of the revolutionary struggle by those "Communist" ruling parties.

19. 'Deformed Workers States'

It is significant that Basmanov mentions the formula "deformed workers' states." It may help some Soviet readers who are trying to analyze the why and wherefore of Stalinism to become acquainted with that concept. For their sake he should have added "degenerated" workers state, the term used by Trotsky for the Soviet Union under Stalin's rule.

The essence of Trotsky's concept is that while the economic foundations of the Soviet Union continue to be noncapitalist, the ruling layer—similar to a trade-union officialdom or reformist Social Democratic leadership in a capitalist country—under the pressure of world imperialism came to use its leadership position as a source of privilege rather than as a post from which to further revolutionary socialist aims.

In carrying out the goal of advancing the interests of the parasitic ruling caste at the expense of the interests of the world revolution, the usurpers ended control of the state structure by the workers, substituted their own control, and twisted the state away from the purposes conceived by the Bolsheviks. The most striking features of the degenerated workers state are the privileges of the bureaucrats and the absence of proletarian democracy. These tend to generate explosive tensions.

With the appearance of a series of new workers states, the Stalinist pattern was transferred to them. Since, strictly speaking, they had not degenerated like the Soviet Union, yet resembled it, the Trotskyists labeled them "deformed" workers states. The explosive tensions in these countries tend to be directed against both the local Stalinist bureaucracy and the Kremlin.

The uprisings in East Germany in 1953 and in Poland and in Hungary in 1956, and the overturn of the Novotný regime in Czechoslovakia in 1968, were manifestations of the tendency of the masses in these workers states to move toward a political revolution in order to clean out the privileged bureaucracy and bring the state structure into consonance with the Leninist program of workers democracy and the advancement of socialism on a world scale.

20. Whose House?

As indicated previously the Trotskyists view the ruling bureaucracy of the Soviet Union, as well as the bureaucratic castes that have appeared in many other workers states—not the "Soviet people"—as formations opposed to proletarian internationalism. The ruling parties in those states represent the privileged bureaucratic layer which has assumed a monopoly of political power. These bureaucrats prefer to enjoy their relatively comfortable social position, and to seek accommodation with world imperialism, rather than promote social struggle on a world scale that might in the end encourage their own people to put an end to bureaucratic usurpation, restore socialist democracy, and establish direct workers control of both government and economy.

21. M. Basmanov and J. Posadas

In his present article Basmanov has repeated many assertions about Trotskyism or distortions of Trotskyist views that he made in his previous article and that we refuted in our notes and comments on that article. (See *Intercontinental Press*, March 22, 1968, page 245.) He is certainly aware of our counterarguments. Not only does he follow the world Trotskyist press closely, as his references to particular organizations, leaders, or events of our movement show; there is also direct evidence that he consulted our notes replying to his previous production. In the light of that evidence, which we will spell out shortly, it is rather arrogant, though not surprising, that he repeats his distortions without the slightest acknowledgment of the counterarguments. But then, as Kapitsa has noted, the Soviet party's ideologists still, for the time being, have the privilege in their own country of not having to encounter opposing views.

It is in Basmanov's reference to Posadas that it becomes clear he has consulted our notes to his last article. In that article, too, he had quoted Posadas's statement, "Communist society can be built even upon ruins," attributing to all Trotskyists—including Healy's followers—the nuclear fantasies in which Posadas indulges.

In our Note T to that article, we pointed out that Basmanov had made an amalgam "of several rather disparate currents, all of which perhaps call themselves Trotskyist but which differ greatly in program and which have no connection with the Fourth International founded by Leon Trotsky, however much they may use the label 'Fourth International.'"

"In Latin America," we continued, "the ultraleft current headed by J. Posadas, increasingly isolated by its bizarre

policies (such as calling for nuclear war and decrying the Fidelista leadership as 'petty bourgeois'), has repeatedly been denounced and discredited by the world Trotskyist movement."

In our Note BB we commented on Posadas: "Among other illusions, Posadas came to believe that his utterances were read and absorbed by top Maoist circles." Basmanov has taken that and embellished it as follows: "Incidentally, he [Posadas] claims to have been the first to advance this 'theory' and accuses Mao Tse-tung of plagiarism."

The point of Basmanov's tasteless, and plagiarized, joking is to back up his charge that Trotskyists view war "as the only means of 'advancing' or 'pushing through' revolutions." Again, he knows better. Our notes gave a fully documented refutation of this distorted argument as presented in his previous article. It is because the Kremlin ideologists wish to avoid the question of how to extend the revolution that they brand any mention of the problem as an alleged call for nuclear war. And, of course, Posadas is a great boon to them in that endeavor.

22. The Outcome of a Nuclear War

For someone who speaks of "revolutionary humanism," Basmanov uses a rather strange formulation about the effect of "a new world war," which would in all likelihood become a nuclear war. ". . . while burying imperialism," he says, "it would also spell heavy damage for the cause of Communism." Basmanov has been reading too much Mao — or Posadas. Just "heavy damage"?

A nuclear war would spell more than even "horrible" damage to the cause of communism. It would destroy the material basis of civilization, if not the human race itself.

That is one more reason why the extension of the revolution to the centers of imperialism is such an urgent problem: for that will be the only way to finally deliver mankind from the nuclear threat. Far from advocating nuclear war — or light-mindedly referring to the "heavy damage" it might cause — the revolutionary Marxists emphasize the need to prevent it and, to that end, to mobilize the masses to accomplish the socialist revolution in the imperialist countries.

Basmanov's article, of course, was designed primarily for Soviet consumption. There the bureaucracy seeks to play down the danger of a nuclear war and what it would mean. Public realization of the danger might lead to undue questioning of defensive measures and whether or not Stalin's heirs are not paving the way for an even greater disaster to the Soviet Union and all mankind than occurred in 1939.

23. Why the Closed Doors?

If, to believe Basmanov, the Soviet leadership does not desire to achieve an agreement with imperialism to preserve the status quo (or "spheres of influence," as it was termed in the unattributed quote), why has it failed to denounce this very policy followed by Stalin which led to the agreements made with British and American imperialism at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam?

Still more pertinent at the moment, why does the Krem-

lin today continue to engage in secret diplomacy with the imperialist powers (as in the current, secret Strategic Arms Limitations Talks)? Why is it so interested in keeping its conversations and deals with the imperialists hidden from the masses of the world, including the Soviet people?

24. Lenin and the August 1912 Bloc

Did Lenin really attack what Basmanov calls "Trotskyist organizations" while he was still alive? Not unless the August bloc be considered Trotskyist — and Trotskyists certainly do not consider it so.

Lenin's remarks (see his article "Unity" in the English version of his *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, page 321) were directed at a loose assortment of groups and individuals who blocked together at a conference in August 1912 — long before there was a Left Opposition or Fourth International, or a Bolshevik revolution to divide the sheep from the goats.

The bloc included, in Lenin's words, "the liquidators, Plekhanov, Trotsky, the Vperyodists [a Bolshevik faction], the Bundists, and anybody else who pleases." Their aim was to reunify the Menshevik and Bolshevik wings of the Russian party. This hopeless attempt was correctly opposed and defeated by Lenin, as Trotsky himself later acknowledged.

Ever since 1917 Trotsky and those who, like him, remained loyal to the Bolshevik traditions of October have fully supported Lenin's position on the need for a centralized, programmatically solid revolutionary party. The differences that Lenin and Trotsky had before 1917 were resolved by events; and, in the heat of the Russian revolution and civil war, they found themselves in agreement on the basic questions of the revolution, the party, and the International.

Lenin's real attitude toward the incipient Left Opposition in 1923-24 may be judged by the bloc he made with Trotsky in his last year — to fight against the growing bureaucratization in the government and party and the increasing violations of revolutionary principle and comradesly practice engaged in by the apparatus headed by Stalin as secretary-general. Lenin, in his final "testament," called on the party to remove Stalin from that post. He also stressed (Basmanov take note!) that Trotsky's non-adherence to the Bolsheviks before 1917 should not be used against him.

Lenin in his "testament" wrote the following: ". . . the October episode with Zinoviev and Kamenev was, of course, no accident, but neither can the blame for it be laid upon them personally, any more than non-Bolshevism can upon Trotsky." (*Lenin's Last Letters and Articles*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1968, page 7.)

For a fuller discussion of Lenin's letters — and of his political bloc with Trotsky against Stalin and the growing bureaucracy — the reader is referred to three works: *On the Suppressed Testament of Lenin* by Leon Trotsky (Pathfinder Press, 1970); *The Prophet Unarmed* by Isaac Deutscher (the first two chapters); and *Lenin's Last Struggle* by Moshe Lewin (Pantheon, 1968).

Here is what Trotsky himself said in 1940, in his full maturity near the end of a lifelong revolutionary career, looking back upon his role in the August bloc:

"I participated actively in this bloc. In a certain sense I

created it. Politically I differed with the Mensheviks on all fundamental questions. I also differed with the ultra-left Bolsheviks, the *Vperyodists*. In the general tendency of politics I stood far more closely to the Bolsheviks. But I was against the Leninist 'regime' because I had not yet learned to understand that in order to realize the revolutionary goal a firmly welded centralized party is indispensable. And so I formed this episodic bloc consisting of heterogeneous elements which was directed against the proletarian wing of the party.

"In the August bloc the liquidators had their own faction, the *Vperyodists* also had something resembling a faction. I stood isolated, having co-thinkers but no faction. Most of the documents were written by me and through avoiding principled differences had as their aim the creation of a semblance of unanimity upon 'concrete political questions.' Not a word about the past! Lenin subjected the August bloc to merciless criticism and the harshest blows fell to my lot. Lenin proved that inasmuch as I did not agree politically with either the Mensheviks or the *Vperyodists* my policy was adventurism. This was severe but it was true.

"As 'mitigating circumstances' let me mention the fact that I had set as my task not to support the right or ultra-left factions against the Bolsheviks but to unite the party as a whole. The Bolsheviks too were invited to the August conference. But since Lenin flatly refused to unite with the Mensheviks (in which he was completely correct) I was left in an unnatural bloc with the Mensheviks and the *Vperyodists*. The second mitigating circumstance is this, that the very phenomenon of Bolshevism as the genuine revolutionary party was then developing for the first time—in the practice of the Second International there were no precedents. But I do not thereby seek in the least to absolve myself from guilt. Notwithstanding the conception of permanent revolution which undoubtedly disclosed the correct perspective, I had not freed myself at that period especially in the organizational sphere from the traits of a petty bourgeois revolutionist. I was sick with the disease of conciliationism toward Menshevism and with a distrustful attitude towards Leninist centralism. Immediately after the August conference the bloc began to disintegrate into its component parts. Within a few months I was not only in principle but organizationally outside the bloc." (*In Defense of Marxism*, N. Y.: Merit, 1965, page 140.)

25. Trotskyism and Democratic Demands

The charge that Trotskyists "oppose mass demands of a generally democratic nature" is another of the lies Basmanov hopes to strengthen by repetition. In addition to our previous refutation of this lie (see our Note L to his last article), let us mention, as current examples, the prominent role the Trotskyists of the Young Socialist Alliance are playing in defending the democratic rights of U. S. servicemen to express their views on the Vietnam war while in uniform, and the campaign of members of the Ligue Communiste (French section of the Fourth International) in behalf of the right of soldiers in the French army to free speech.

Let us also cite an example of the traditional revolutionary Marxist view of "the general democratic move-

ment," as given by Trotsky in his article "Is Victory Possible in Spain?" which appeared in the Russian-language *Bulletin of the Left Opposition*, No. 56-57 for July-August 1937.

"Before 1934 we tirelessly explained to the Stalinists that even in the imperialist epoch democracy continues to be preferable to fascism; that in all cases where hostile clashes occur between them, the revolutionary proletariat is obliged to support democracy against fascism. [Stalin in the 1930-34 period preached that "fascism and democracy are twins," a notion that led to the disastrous policies practiced by the Communist party in Germany, where the lack of a fighting united front between Communist and Social Democratic workers left the way open for Hitler. —GS]

"However, we always added: We can and must defend bourgeois democracy, not by bourgeois democratic means but by methods of class struggle, which in turn prepare the way for the replacement of bourgeois democracy by the dictatorship of the proletariat. This signifies, in particular, that in the process of defending bourgeois democracy, including with arms in hand, the party of the proletariat takes no responsibility for bourgeois democracy, does not enter its government, but preserves full freedom of criticism and of action in relation to all parties of the Popular Front, thus preparing for the overthrow of bourgeois democracy at the next stage."

It should be noted that Trotsky included the struggle for democratic demands as a key component of the *Transitional Program*, the basic document adopted at the founding congress of the Fourth International in 1938.

This does not exhaust the question. What about the demand of the masses in the Soviet Union for proletarian democracy? At this point Basmanov draws back. But that's Trotskyism! Yes, Trotskyism is consistent in its efforts to advance "mass demands of a generally democratic nature." Basmanov and his cothinkers on the staff of *Political Affairs* are invited to reply to this point.

26. Case of the Missing Facts

This is indeed a scandalous-sounding tale, but which "one of the English Trotskyist groups" is Basmanov talking about? Why doesn't he name it? Why does he not identify the incidents? What strikers were involved? At what plants? Just when? Where and when was the "justification" printed? Really, Basmanov and you editors of *Political Affairs*, isn't this a KGB fabrication?

27. Where Ballot Boxes Come In

During the May-June 1968 revolutionary situation in France, when virtually the entire working class had taken over the factories physically, had raised the red flag over them, and when in some areas action committees were functioning as *de facto* administrations—workers self-government in embryo—it was indeed true that "the working people's power can be found in the streets."

Unfortunately the French Communist party did its utmost to take it out of the streets and bottle it up in the ballot boxes. The French CP used all its influence, especially through the General Confederation of Labor, which it controlled, to get the workers out of the factories, to cool

off and settle the crisis, and to divert it into the bourgeois parliamentary arena. The French CP eagerly grabbed at de Gaulle's tactic of calling for elections, and it campaigned as the "party of order."

The French Trotskyists did not raise "armed struggle" as the solution to the crisis, since it could not be advanced as "the conscious action of the masses." They promoted and extended the action committees as much as possible in hope that these democratic organs of the workers and laboring masses would begin to function like the Russian councils, or *soviets*, of 1917—or like the Commune of Paris in 1871. That is, a new power representing a new, higher order of society would begin to function in fact if not by "law." The question of defending these committees from armed attack by forces of the old order did not arise, since the CP succeeded in preventing things from developing that far.

Basmanov raises the charge that Trotskyists favor "putschism," a view opposed by Marxists traditionally (see, for example, Trotsky's critique of individual terrorism in his pamphlet *The Kirov Assassination*).

As with his charge that we advocate war, this is a red herring to avoid the question of the Kremlin's policy toward the revolutionary situation in France in 1968. As with all their measures of support for "the general democratic movement" the Stalinists do their best never to go beyond the framework of bourgeois democracy.

As for the implication that Trotskyists scorn the "ballot box" at all times and under all conditions, how does Basmanov explain the campaign by the Ligue Communiste, running Alain Krivine for the presidency in May 1969? Didn't he hear about it? He ought to have heard; his French cothinkers certainly denounced the Trotskyists loudly enough for engaging in this action and attempting to make a good showing at the ballot box.

If Basmanov didn't know about Krivine's campaign, surely he must know about the many electoral campaigns of the Socialist Workers party in the United States and its perennial efforts to get on the ballot.

In the Bolshevik tradition, the Trotskyists wherever possible seek to utilize the "ballot box" as a way of broadcasting revolutionary ideas to millions of workers. *Both* struggle in the streets *and* utilization of "the ballot" are necessary, but the aim of both is to make the revolution, not collaborate with the capitalist class as the Stalinists do in seeking to maintain the status quo.

28. A 'Rich Arsenal' of Stalinist Means and Methods

Basmanov paints a beautiful picture of how the pro-Moscow Communists arm the masses "with a rich arsenal of forms, means and methods for carrying on the struggle," preparing them "to be ready to shift them rapidly and resolutely, depending on concrete conditions . . ." He feels it unfair that the Trotskyists should accuse them of favoring only peaceful struggle.

Admittedly the Kremlin does not always react peacefully to events. For example, it used force rather dramatically against socialist democratization in Czechoslovakia. By contrast, its response to imperialist aggression against the Vietnamese workers state has been sluggish, if not

close to corpselike. Under Stalin and his handpicked heirs, the full strength and influence of the Soviet government and Communist party have not been used once to counteract the export of counterrevolution by U. S. imperialism.

As Che Guevara pointed out, both of the "socialist giants," China and the USSR, have stood on the sidelines while the Vietnamese valiantly struggled to make their revolution despite intervention by the world's mightiest military power. Surely in their "rich arsenal of forms, means and methods for carrying on the struggle," Basmanov's cothinkers could find a little more for Vietnam.

But wedded as they are to the status quo through the privileges enjoyed by their caste, the Soviet bureaucrats have a distinct distaste for revolutionary struggle. Hence the insistence on the "possibility of peaceful development of the revolution" in the face of all historical evidence to the contrary.

Hence the peculiar formula that "the working class and its allies" can create a "decisive superiority of forces, capable of preventing the monopolist bourgeoisie from resorting to armed force." What does this formula mean? How can you prevent the imperialist state from acting in the interests of the imperialist class? Can it be inveigled into self-dismantlement? Or have the Kremlin theorists abandoned the Marxist concept of the state (organized bodies of armed men defending a certain form of property)?

Do they believe that the pressure of public opinion can prevent imperialist violence? Surely they are not so naïve. Do they mean, then, that the nuclear weapons of the workers states function as a deterrent? The Cuban missile crisis and the Vietnam war should have taught them otherwise.

Perhaps what is meant is mass strikes by workers and soldiers. That would certainly prevent the imperialists from carrying on a war. But the capitalist class would surely not be dissuaded by that from "resorting to armed force" to suppress such strikes and "mutinies."

In the end the revolutionary workers movement must be able to defend itself against the inevitable resort to armed force by "the monopolist bourgeoisie." Revolutionaries must expect this and prepare for it.

More is needed than to be "ready for armed struggle *should the situation demand it*." A revolutionary situation, assuredly it may be predicted, will always demand it, not because the revolutionists wish it but because certain elements of the old state power will always try to use the force at their disposal to preserve or restore the old order from which they benefited.

It is interesting that Basmanov acknowledges that armed struggle *may* be necessary. In his last article he confined himself to attacking it as not the only way, without mentioning that it might even be one way. This shift reflects the pressure from the new revolutionary elements that have appeared around the world, many of whom are engaging in armed struggle in practice and on whom barefaced class-collaborationist theory and "peaceful coexistence" nostrums simply do not work.

29. Faith in the Working Class

To ascribe to Trotskyism the view that the working class in the advanced capitalist countries is guilty of "eva-

sion of its historic responsibility" is a remarkable twist. More than any other tendency the Trotskyists have polemicized against such ideas commonly held within the New Left (Marcuse, Mills). Perhaps the most recent example of such Marxist theoretical work is the pamphlet *On the Revolutionary Potential of the Working Class* by Ernest Mandel and George Novack.

The logic of Basmanov's distortion is to brand by the terrible name "Trotskyism" the whole New Left development, which threatens to outflank the pro-Moscow "orthodoxy" from the left.

In the Soviet Central Committee's "theses" on the hundredth anniversary of Lenin's birth, printed in *Pravda* December 23, 1969, the pressing danger of "left revisionism" is proclaimed and roundly anathematized, and Communists the world over are called on to fight it. ("Left revisionism" in the pages of *Pravda* is generally equated with the ideas of Trotsky.)

The attempt to bring new layers of young revolutionaries into line by throwing epithets at them is sure to backfire. The Kremlin will only help to create more new Trotskyists.

30. How a Revolutionary Situation Can Develop

Didn't Basmanov just get through telling us that the Trotskyists believe that only a war can arouse the masses and that therefore they advocate war? How short his memory is! Now he tells us that the Trotskyists believe that "only a profound economic crisis can rouse the masses to revolutionary fervor." A Kremlin hack has the easy life. He earns his pay by filling up a page of *Kommunist* with inventions about the Trotskyists. The editors of *Political Affairs*, even lower in level, lap it up.

In fact, on the question of how a revolutionary situation can develop, the exact opposite of the view Basmanov attributes to the Trotskyists was expressed as recently as in the 1963 resolution of the Fourth International's Reunification Congress, which Basmanov previously indicated he had read. The passage, which we quote below, was proved absolutely correct by the way in which the French general strike of May 1968 developed, seemingly "out of nowhere," caused neither by a war nor a profound economic crisis.

"Two generations of revolutionists in the West have been educated in the belief that revolutionary situations in industrialized countries coincide with big crises or complete breakdowns of the capitalist economy and state such as occur in war or military defeat (Germany and Central Europe after World War I, Greece, France and Italy after World War II). But again theory and history prove that this is but one road to possible revolutionary crisis in a highly developed industrial country. The big strike wave of 1936-37, and along with it the Spanish Revolution, came neither at the end of a war nor at the peak of a major economic breakdown. They came in the period of relative economic recovery between the two big crises of 1929 and 1938. A whole series of contributing factors—the most important being the threat of fascism and the desire of the workers to make up for the suffering borne during the big economic crisis—gave this strike wave a pre-revolutionary character in the U.S. and Belgium

and a revolutionary character in France. In the imperialist countries in the next five to ten years such revolutionary crises and opportunities are much more likely to occur than crises of the breakdown type of 1918-19 or 1944-48."

31. The Tactic of 'Entryism'

Basmanov looks really pious when he raises his hands over the tactic of "entryism." And the editors of *Political Affairs* printed what he said without so much as a footnote concerning their own experience. Yet they could have added a word or two. Isn't this what the Communist party U.S.A. has been practicing in relation to the Democratic party since 1935? Their silence, however, is understandable. They have followed this tactic in order to bolster and strengthen the Democratic party, not to win members from it.

The truth is that we answered this point in our reply to Basmanov's previous article (see *Intercontinental Press*, March 22, 1968, page 261 and page 262). For his benefit we will repeat again Lenin's remarks on this question to show that there is nothing unprincipled about the tactic per se:

"There need be no doubt that . . . the 'leaders' of opportunism, will resort to every trick of bourgeois diplomacy, to the aid of bourgeois governments, the priests, the police and the courts, to prevent Communists joining the trade unions, to force them out by every means, to make their work in the trade unions as unpleasant as possible, to insult, bait and persecute them. We must be able to withstand all this, to agree to all and every sacrifice, and even—if need be—to resort to various stratagems, artifices, illegal methods, to evasions and subterfuges, as long as we get into the trade unions, remain in them, and carry on Communist work inside them at all costs." (*"Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, page 38.)

Basmanov is outraged because the general tactic suggested by Lenin has been practiced by Trotskyists in mass organizations controlled by the Stalinists, particularly in Europe.

The tactic has been applied by the Trotskyists in past decades with special modifications to fit special circumstances, which there is no room to discuss here. Sometimes it has met with encouraging successes. In other instances it has brought indifferent results and even led to losses. Sometimes the "'leaders' of opportunism" prove capable of isolating revolutionary socialists or even absorbing them, converting them into left centrists if not worse.

It should please Basmanov to learn that the European Trotskyists are no longer applying the tactic of "entryism" to the Communist parties. Their own organizations, particularly in France, are now strong enough to constitute poles of attraction even to the youth still under Stalinist influence or leadership.

32. 'Constantly Root About Among Teen-agers'

The tale of subversive activities carried on by the Trotskyists among the radicalizing youth in the capitalist

countries makes interesting reading, especially when recounted by the Stalinists. Where is Basmanov seeking to elicit a sympathetic hearing? In London? In Paris? In Tokyo? Perhaps even Washington?

For more on this see note No. 16 "Youth 'Infected with Leftism.'"

33. Relative Importance of the Colonial Revolution

The quotation has been torn from the second paragraph of a resolution "The Latest Developments in the International Situation" adopted by the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International at a meeting held in July 1966. Here are the two opening paragraphs of the document (we have placed the words lifted by Basmanov in italics):

"The object of this resolution is not to examine the world situation as a whole, this having already been done in the political resolution passed at the last World Congress, but rather to bring that resolution up to date, in the light of the events that have taken place since the World Congress and on this basis to see whether we have to modify our conclusions and our tasks.

"The main question facing us arises from the present escalation of the Vietnam war by American imperialism. The escalation points dangerously towards an extension of this war in the direction of a war against the People's Republic of China. Taking into account the setbacks suffered by the colonial revolution in this last period, the most recent example of which is Ghana, we must examine whether a fundamental change in the world situation has taken place in comparison with the preceding period. More precisely the question posed is whether the colonial revolution which started after World War II, which received an enormous impulse through the victory of the Chinese revolution and which has been the *main sector of the socialist revolution* in the course of the past twenty years has exhausted its energy and entered a period of ebb and decline." (*Intercontinental Press*, September 23, 1966, page 20.)

It is standard practice for the school which Basmanov represents to attribute to an opponent a view he does not hold, and to frame up the "evidence" to prove the point.

All revolutionary Marxists, especially since Lenin's time, have recognized the enormous importance of the colonial revolution. The *Transitional Program*, written by Trotsky and adopted at the founding congress of the Fourth International in 1938, devotes an entire section to this question. The Trotskyists have consistently participated in and supported struggles in "the Third World," viewing it as one of the major sectors of the world revolution.

The alleged sudden shift of position is another Basmanov invention. It is true that more material on the colonial revolution is to be found in the Trotskyist press in the past twenty-five years than previously. This represents not a shift in position but the reflection of an objective reality. The colonial sector became *relatively* more active than the two other main sectors of the world revolution. It became the scene of colossal struggles and important victories.

The two other chief sectors may now catch up with the colonial world and even surpass it in the coming period. In the imperialist area, for instance, the May-June 1968 revolutionary situation in France may well prove to be but the first of a series of struggles from which not even the United States will be immune. And in the workers states, the growth of an opposition mood, particularly in the Soviet Union, may soon, we hope, give Basmanov and his cohorts direct experience with an advance of extraordinary importance in this sector of the world revolution.

34. 'Appraisal of the Peasantry'

This is an old Stalinist chestnut. Basmanov seeks to modernize it by claiming that whereas the Trotskyists previously "underestimated" the peasantry as a whole, they have now gone completely overboard in their appraisal of the peasantry in the "Third World," while retaining their previous allegedly "contemptuous" attitude toward the peasants of "the capitalist countries." At the same time the Trotskyists are made out to have reversed their position on "the revolutionary role of the proletariat" in the colonial world (Basmanov adds for good measure "the Communist Parties").

In the old czarist days when the revolutionists were working out their theories on the coming Russian revolution and how to assure its success, Trotsky maintained as part of his theory of the permanent revolution that the peasants were incapable of organizing their own independent political party and that therefore they tended to follow the leadership offered by other classes. This was of the greatest significance in Russia and similar backward areas because it opened up to the proletariat the brightest possibilities of mobilizing the vast revolutionary strength of the peasantry behind a revolutionary-socialist party and a workers government.

Lenin was dubious on one point. Was not Trotsky "underestimating" the capacity of the peasantry to form their own party, one representing different class interests than those of the workers?

Let it be stressed: there was no difference between Lenin and Trotsky on the revolutionary strength of the peasantry and on the absolute necessity for an alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry if the coming revolution were to succeed.

Life itself resolved this question. The Russian revolution followed the pattern predicted by Trotsky.

In the period of ebb, when the bureaucracy headed by Stalin sought arguments that could be used against the Left Opposition, the old dispute about the "appraisal" of the peasantry was dug up. The Stalinists distorted it in the most vulgar fashion. Trotsky, they made out, had displayed a "contemptuous" attitude toward the peasantry, and this was what had aroused Lenin, who had complete faith in the peasantry.

We will repeat it once more: Since the turn of the century, revolutionary Marxists, conscious of the revolutionary potential of the peasantry especially in colonial areas, have consistently sought to solve the difficult problem of linking up that potential with the revolutionary struggle of the workers. The theory of permanent revolution has

all along embodied the key to solving this problem, with no need of updating or changing positions on such a fundamental question.

35. 'Patriotic, Democratic Forces'

What does Basmanov mean by "the unity of patriotic, democratic forces without which neither the abolition of imperialist oppression nor the destruction of the feudal system is possible"?

In a nutshell, he means that the colonial revolution should not be socialist but "antifeudal" and "anti-imperialist." That is, the leadership should be left up to the "patriotic, democratic" national bourgeoisie.

Che Guevara aptly dismissed this concept—the same concept the Mensheviks had for the Russian revolution. Che's phrase was: "No other alternatives exist: it's either a socialist revolution or a caricature of a revolution."

The revolutionary workers in alliance with the peasantry are the only force able to lead an anti-imperialist revolution in a colonial country. But such a force in power already means an immediate leap—as in Cuba—to the stage of socialist revolution.

36. Lenin on Guerrilla Struggle

Far from advocating guerrilla warfare as the "only one universal method," the Trotskyists advocate, in the Leninist tradition, the building of vanguard combat parties based on democratic centralism and participating in a revolutionary international, with each party applying tactics that will be effective in the conditions of its own country.

As historical events have demonstrated (China, Cuba, Vietnam), the tactic of guerrilla warfare can in certain conditions in certain countries be effective in the struggle for power and for the abolition of capitalism.

But as with all of the variety of tactics developed by the revolutionary movement over a century of experience, guerrilla warfare must be applied under conditions and in a manner that will advance the general aim of establishing workers power and eliminating capitalism. It is not an end in itself. It is not a panacea. Incorrectly used, it can prove disastrous.

Nor should it be used as a pressure tactic to win concessions from a wing of the bourgeoisie, as it has by Communist parties like the one in Colombia which Basmanov praises so highly, not to mention similar pressure tactics by pro-Moscow CP leaders in Venezuela and Guatemala.

All the pro-Moscow Communist parties have tended to oppose the kind of guerrilla warfare that aimed at winning power and overthrowing the old order. Where they themselves have practiced guerrilla tactics, it has been as an auxiliary to politicking with the bourgeoisie. (In the case of China, guerrilla warfare merged with much more massive struggles; and under the exceptional conditions of the Japanese imperialist invasion and World War II, the Chinese CP came to power under threat of being outflanked by rival forces if it chose otherwise.)

The view of the Fourth International, then, does not differ substantially from Lenin's as quoted by Basmanov.

In fact it is of interest to look at the full context from which Basmanov tore Lenin's quote. Lenin was polemical in September 1906 against moderates in the Social Democratic movement (both Mensheviks and Western Social Democrats) who criticized the guerrilla "expropriations" of government banks that the Bolsheviks had engaged in during the massive turmoil of the 1905 revolution and its aftermath, when the question of the workers taking power in Russia was first clearly posed.

Lenin's words actually serve as an excellent antidote to the conservative ideas promulgated by Basmanov and his masters and those who think like them.

"When I see Social-Democrats proudly and smugly declaring 'we are not anarchists, thieves, robbers, we are superior to all this, we reject guerrilla warfare',—I ask myself: Do these people realise what they are saying? Armed clashes and conflicts between the Black-Hundred government and the population are taking place all over the country. This is an absolutely inevitable phenomenon at the present stage of development of the revolution. The population is spontaneously and in an unorganised way—and for that very reason often in unfortunate and *undesirable* forms—reacting to this phenomenon also by armed conflicts and attacks. I can understand us refraining from Party leadership of *this* spontaneous struggle in a particular place or at a particular time because of the weakness and unpreparedness of our organisation. I realise that this question must be settled by the local practical workers, and that the remoulding of weak and unprepared organisations is no easy matter. But when I see a Social-Democratic theoretician or publicist not displaying regret over this unpreparedness, but rather a proud smugness and a self-exalted tendency to repeat phrases learned by rote in early youth about anarchism, Blanquism and terrorism, I am hurt by this degradation of the most revolutionary doctrine in the world.

"It is said that guerrilla warfare brings the class-conscious proletarians into close association with degraded, drunken riff-raff. That is true. But it only means that the party of the proletariat can never regard guerrilla warfare as the only, or even as the chief, method of struggle; it means that this method must be subordinated to other methods, that it must be commensurate with the chief methods of warfare, and must be ennobled by the enlightening and organising influence of socialism. And without this *latter* condition, *all*, positively all, methods of struggle in bourgeois society bring the proletariat into close association with the various non-proletarian strata above and below it and, if left to the spontaneous course of events, become frayed, corrupted, and prostituted." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 11, pages 220-21. Emphasis in the original. We leave it to the reader to find the words singled out by Basmanov.)

It is odd that Basmanov should quote from a statement that so eloquently defends armed struggle. To read Lenin's bitter derision of the "hackneyed and stereotyped talk about anarchism, Blanquism, and terrorism" is to recall the use of those very same stereotypes by the detractors of Che Guevara in the pro-Moscow Communist press. "Anarchism, Blanquism, terrorism"—these are precisely the catch phrases used by Basmanov's cothinkers against the new revolutionists whether in France or Bolivia, Brazil or Japan, Vietnam or Palestine.

Lenin's reply to those who opposed guerrilla warfare, of course, was not that it was *wrong*. In a period of acute crisis it may be absolutely necessary. "A Marxist bases himself on class struggle, and not social peace. In certain periods of acute economic and political crises the class struggle ripens into a direct civil war, i.e., into an armed struggle between two sections of the people. In such periods a Marxist is *obliged* to take the stand of civil war. Any moral condemnation of civil war would be absolutely impermissible from the standpoint of Marxism." (Ibid., pages 219-20. Emphasis in original.)

The problem, Lenin argues, is not to condemn or deplore guerrilla action but to make sure, in any critical situations where it may become necessary, that it is well-organized and effective, guided by the party and serving the socialist aims of the party.

"In a period when the class struggle has become accentuated to the point of civil war, Social-Democrats must make it their duty not only to participate but also to play the leading role in *this civil war*. The Social-Democrats must train and prepare their organisations to be really able to act as a *belligerent side* which does not miss a single opportunity of inflicting damage on the enemy's forces." (Ibid., page 223. Emphasis in original.)

Let Basmanov smoke that in his "peaceful coexistence" pipe.

37. 'The Events in Peru'

First of all, Basmanov ought to take the trouble to at least get his dates straight. The great upsurge of the peasantry in Peru occurred in 1961-62 not 1963. Secondly, in view of Basmanov's strictures against taking a "contemptuous" attitude toward the peasantry, he ought to have indicated at least some sympathy for their struggle.

It was the Trotskyist leader Hugo Blanco who saw the revolutionary potentiality of this peasant upsurge and who joined the peasants in their struggle. His leadership was probably decisive in enabling them to form unions that carried out a *de facto* land reform in the Cuzco region.

This upsurge could have led to a great socialist victory in Peru if the organizations of the masses in the cities, including the Communist party, had come to the aid of the forces led by Hugo Blanco when they appealed for help. The Stalinists and the Left under their influence turned a deaf ear.

Again, Basmanov is simply relying on the ignorance of his captive audience when he says that "the Trotskyites repeated the same maneuver in 1965-66." That was when the Ejército de Liberación Nacional and the Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria sought to open up several guerrilla fronts but were brutally smashed by the Peruvian military. While the Trotskyists gave full solidarity to these fighters, they did not necessarily agree with their tactics. The leaders of the ELN and the MIR were not Trotskyists. Nevertheless they had great respect, despite their differences, for the work done by Hugo Blanco.

For an account of this period, we recommend *Peru 1965: Notes of a Guerrilla Experience* by Héctor Béjar, one of the leaders of the 1965-66 struggle. This is the essay that won the 1969 prize of the Casa de las Américas in Havana. It has been published in English by Monthly Review Press. A different translation was published in serial form

by *Intercontinental Press* (in eight issues from January 19 to March 16, 1970). A critical review of this important book "Béjar's Essay on the Peruvian Guerrilla Struggle" by Joseph Hansen appeared in *Intercontinental Press* January 19, 1970, page 44.

The role of Stalinism in preventing aid being sent to the peasant movement led by Hugo Blanco is indicated by Héctor Béjar in the following paragraphs from his book:

"We have already seen how, under the influence of the Left on some occasions and spontaneously on others, the peasant unions spread between 1956 to 1962. The high point of that great wave, thanks to the political quality of its leaders, was reached in the valleys of La Convención and Lares, and its most outstanding figure was Hugo Blanco.

"But Hugo Blanco was and is a disciplined Trotskyist militant. This fact posed a serious problem for the Left. Hadn't it been said for many years that the Trotskyists were imperialist agents? Hadn't Trotskyism been characterized repeatedly as a counter-revolutionary tendency? The years of Stalinism were not far off and, in any case, even after the fall of the idol Stalin, no one had withdrawn the supreme anathema against Trotskyism. It continued in full force.

"This on the one hand. On the other, the Left as a whole did not throw itself wholeheartedly into the peasant struggle. It guided the organizations 'from above,' it advised the unions, and it sent organizers into the countryside on temporary assignments, but it did not lead 'from within' as Hugo Blanco did. While still-existing political prejudices kept the Left from supporting Blanco as he deserved, at the same time, inertia kept it imprisoned in the old urban patterns."

Basmanov's denunciation of the heroic guerrillas led by Luis de la Puente, Guillermo Lobatón, Máximo Velando, Héctor Béjar, and Ricardo Gadea, placing the worst epithet in the lexicon of the Kremlin, "Trotskyites," on them into the bargain, is the clearest possible demonstration that his article, and the Kremlin's whole current anti-Trotskyist campaign, is aimed as much at the Fide-listas and other New Left currents as at the Fourth International itself.

38. Guatemala and Fidel Castro's Speech

This part offers perhaps the clearest evidence that Basmanov's article is intended primarily for readers in the Soviet Union where it is impossible outside of the top circles of the KGB to check the facts.

When Fidel Castro included in his speech of January 16, 1966, an attack on "Trotskyism," it created a furor among a wide sector of the most ardent supporters of the Cuban revolution. They feared that the attack portended blind acceptance of advice from the Blas Rocas and the Aníbal Escalantes of the old Cuban Stalinist bureaucracy. The protests ranged from the United Secretariat of the Fourth International to the editors of *Monthly Review*.

In *The Militant* of January 31, 1966, Joseph Hansen

wrote an article "In Answer to Castro's Attack on 'Trotskyism'" that put the facts straight.

Blas Roca attempted to meet the widespread criticism with an article "The Trotskyist Slanders Cannot Tarnish the Cuban Revolution." This was answered by Joseph Hansen in an article "Stalinism or Trotskyism in the Cuban Revolution?" Both these articles were printed in the Summer 1966 issue of the *International Socialist Review*.

The best that can be concluded is that Fidel Castro was misinformed as to the facts which were briefly as follows:

In Guatemala followers of J. Posadas, claiming to be adherents of the Fourth International, had indeed joined the guerrilla forces led by Yon Sosa. They had participated in guerrilla actions and had apparently fought well. But they became involved in diverting funds for "revolu-

tionary" purposes (the publications of J. Posadas in other countries) without the permission of the guerrilla leaders. For this they were expelled after a trial in the mountains in which they were permitted to testify and to argue their point of view (which was to justify their sending the funds abroad). The Stalinists then sought to parlay the scandal into an attack on "Trotskyism."

For the details on the trial conducted by the guerrillas, including a communiqué of the Movimiento Revolucionario 13 de Noviembre and a communiqué of the Mexican followers of J. Posadas, see *Intercontinental Press*, July 15, 1966, pp. 28-40.

It is to be noted that in subsequent editions of Castro's speech published in Havana, the passage in question has been omitted.

Ceylon

Maoists Make Deal to Back SLFP Candidates

The Ceylonese Maoists have decided to support the Sri Lanka Freedom party [SLFP] in the elections scheduled for May 27, according to the April 16 *Ceylon News*.

The decision was reached only with difficulty. While the SLFP meets the Maoist specification of being a party of the "progressive bourgeoisie," it is running a "United Front" slate in the election. The other members of the United Front are the pro-Moscow Communist party and the Lanka Sama Samaja party [LSSP] which still bears a "Trotskyist" label although it betrayed the principles of Trotskyism in 1964 by joining the SLFP in forming a bourgeois coalition government.

"The Communist Party (Peking wing) was hitherto shut out from the United Front because of its ideological differences with the Communist Party (Moscow wing)," reports the *Ceylon News*. "A strong section of the SLFP however favoured the inclusion of this party and it is to satisfy this section that the party leadership agreed to the two big decisions."

The "two big decisions" smack very much of bourgeois politicking.

The first one: "To nominate Mr. Halim Ishak as SLFP candidate for Colombo Central to contest Communist Party (Moscow wing) leader Mr. Pieter Keuneman."

Thus the Maoists are not confronted with a follower of the "Khrushchev revisionists" as a United Front candidate in Colombo Central. They can

vote for a figure still further to the right obligingly put up by the SLFP at the expense of their Khrushchev partners in the United Front.

The second decision: "Not to nominate a candidate for the Gampaha seat to contest Mr. S. D. Bandaranayake, the Communist Party (Peking wing) nominee."

According to the *Ceylon News*, "Both these decisions were based on requests made unofficially to the SLFP by the Communist Party (Peking wing)."

What was the attitude of the SLFP's Khrushchev partners in the United Front toward this?

"The decisions," says the *Ceylon News*, "were taken despite repeated requests from the Communist Party (Moscow wing), not to nominate an SLFP candidate for Colombo Central."

The United Front, it seems, is rather tight and narrow when it comes to decision-making powers. These are held and exercised by the SLFP leaders (or leader). The same exalted being (or beings) tempers the decisions by distributing pacifiers to those deserving them.

The commentator of the *Ceylon News*, identified as "Observer," says he "understands that the Communist Party (Moscow wing), has been pacified with a guarantee of a place either as a nominated member in the House of Representatives or a place in the Senate for Mr. Pieter Keuneman in the event of his being defeated at the polls.

"The Communist Party (Peking wing)

will however throw its full weight to see that Mr. Keuneman is defeated.

"Its offer is to support the SLFP and not the other two partners of the United Front at the forthcoming elections."

The *Ceylon News* did not bother to report what the third party in the United Front, the LSSP, thought about all this, or how its further political fate might be affected. As a docile captive of the SLFP what its attitude might be seemed hardly newsworthy.

MEMO to:

Intercontinental Press
P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station
New York, N.Y., 10010

from:

Name
Street
City
State Zip
Country

- \$15 enclosed for one year.
- \$7.50 enclosed for six months.
- Send information on first-class and airmail rates.