



LENIN'S arguments for a strong socialist state against Trotsky's 'permanent' counter-revolution



1

The survival of imperialism depends on the ability of petty-bourgeois thinking to continue keeping the working class split and fragmented on the basis of anti-Soviet anti-communism.

The only growth industry in the West is the churning out of increasingly hysterical lies and distortions about the triumphant 65-year-history of the development of socialism in the USSR, and the steady spread of the international socialist revolution and the expansion of the Soviet-led socialist camp.

A vital factor in imperialism's Cold War to divert workers under capitalism from the socialist revolution by confusing and demoralising them with the idiotic myth of the 'threat' of 'Soviet tyranny' etc, is played by Trotskyism.

Its amply-funded publications about 'inevitable Soviet crisis' and 'unavoidable collapse' (based on the completely anti-Marxist illusion that the destruction of the capitalist class in Russia, and the establishment of socialist production and property relations, somehow gave rise to a phantom 'new ruling caste'), - crucially fill the 'left' wing of bourgeois ideology's anti-communist spectrum.

Trotskyism keeps certain sections of workers and middle class intelligentsia (who like to think they are for 'socialist revolution') IN PRACTICE tied to capitalism's anti-Soviet anti-communist Cold War crusade by means of the pipedream of 'perfect socialism' being achieved somewhere sometime without the need for the harsh bitter struggle of building the dictatorship of the proletariat and an all-powerful state structure as happened in the USSR.

By various sleights of hand, they try to pretend that Lenin was opposed to a powerful state structure, was opposed to the idea that socialism could be built in Russia without socialist revolution first occurring in West Europe, and was opposed to Soviet trading and diplomatic compromise with the West all the time imperialism was far more powerful than the USSR. In addition Trotsky's lifelong fight against Bolshevism, and Lenin's lifelong fight against Trotsky (see the 400-page Progress volume of Lenin's writings against Trotsky, 1972; or the shorter 1981 Novosti summary (120 pages)), are deliberately suppressed in order farcically to try to pass off Trotsky

(who opportunistically jumped on the Bolshevik bandwagon only 12 weeks before the Great October Revolution 1917) as the living embodiment of Bolshevism-Leninism.

The climax of the bourgeoisie's 'left' anti-communist fraud on which Reagan and Thatcher are so heavily dependent for their survival, is the total departure from reality that pretends the 'Soviet masses' are about to carry out a 'socialist revolution' against the Soviet socialist state, and 'wipe out' the Communist Party.

This deranged subjectivism is so out of touch with the plainly observable actuality of the advanced socialist society now unassailably established in the USSR, that it virtually completes Trotskyism's journey into wilful superstitious obscurantism - (the world of the anti-Christ and the fearful judgment of Doomsday, by which more conventional bourgeois ideology can alone keep itself functioning) - in the face of the now irresistibly overwhelming evidence that the socialist revolution, led by the Soviet camp, has already as good as WON the historic confrontation with imperialism, and all that remains to be settled is how and in what order the capitalist 'free' world collapses beyond salvation.

In just about his last published work in his lifetime, 'Better Fewer, But Better', Lenin aired some remarkably far-sighted thinking on this theme.

‘Can we save ourselves from the impending conflict with these imperialist countries? May we hope that the internal antagonisms and conflicts between the thriving imperialist countries of the West and East will give us a second respite as they did the first time when the campaign of the West-European counter-revolution in support of the Russian counter-revolution broke down owing to the antagonisms in the camp of the counter-revolutionaries of the West and the East, in the camp of the Eastern and Western exploiters, in the camp of Japan and the USA?...

“...the outcome of the struggle as a whole can be forecast only because in the long run capitalism itself is educating and training the vast majority of the population of the globe for the struggle.

“In the last analysis, the outcome of the struggle will be determined by the fact that at Russia, India, China, etc., account for the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe. And during the past few

years it is this majority that has been drawn into the struggle for emancipation with extraordinary rapidity, so that in this respect there cannot be the slightest doubt what the final outcome of the world struggle will be. In this sense, the complete victory of socialism is fully and absolutely assured.

“But what interests us is not the inevitability of this complete victory of socialism, but the tactics which we, the Russian Communist Party, we the Russian Soviet Government, should pursue to prevent the West-European counter-revolutionary states from crushing us.

“To ensure our existence until the next military conflict between the counter-revolutionary imperialist West and the revolutionary and nationalist East, between the most civilised countries of the world and the Orientally backward countries (which however comprise the majority), this majority must become civilised. (Lenin means that Russia, as a symbol and inspiration of the 'uncivilised majority' of the planet, should get on and build socialism).

“We too lack enough civilisation to enable us to pass straight on to socialism, although we do have the political requisites for it. We should adopt the following tactics, or pursue the following policy, to save ourselves.

“We must strive to build up a state in which the workers retain the leadership of the peasants, in which they retain the confidence of the peasants, and by exercising the greatest economy remove every trace of extravagance from our social relations...

“...we shall be able, -by exercising the greatest possible thrift in the economic life of our state, -to use every saving we make to develop our large-scale machine industry, to develop electrification, the hydraulic extraction of peat, to complete the Volkhov Power Project, etc.

“In this, and in this alone, (emphasis added), lies our hope. Only when we have done this shall we, speaking figuratively, be able to change horses, to change from the peasant muzhik horse of poverty, from the horse of an economy designed for a ruined peasant country, - to the horse which the proletariat is seeking and must seek, - the horse of largescale machine industry, of electrification, of the Volkhov Power Station, etc. ♪

It is a matter of history that the Soviet economy has since become the most pow-

erful in human history, now more securely based and organised than the most 'civilised' Western power, utterly impregnable to any kind of imperialist onslaught, - and able to turn out in just one shift the EQUIVALENT of an entire Volkhov Power Station, which then took years and untold suffering.

This idea of the victory of socialism in first one and then a group of countries had been a consistent understanding of Lenin's, - and one which Trotsky had consistently opposed with sterile subjective schemes about what the world should be like, (which he pretentiously dressed up with the slogan 'the permanent revolution' borrowed from Marx but reduced to mechanical inappropriateness by Trotsky's conceited opportunism).

As early as 1915 in writing against the slogan 'For a United States of Europe' (another of Trotsky's favourite but misleadingly empty catch-phrases), Lenin called this and the 'United States of the World' slogan incorrect "because it may be wrongly interpreted to mean that the victory of socialism in a single country is impossible, and it may also create misconceptions as to the relations of such a country to the others.

"Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence the victory of socialism is possible first in several or even in one capitalist country alone. After expropriating the capitalists and organising their own socialist production, the victorious proletariat of that country will arise against the rest of the world, the capitalist world, attracting to its cause the oppressed classes of other countries, stirring uprisings in those countries against the capitalists, and in case of need using even armed force against the exploiting classes and their states. . . .

"The abolition of classes is impossible without a dictatorship of the oppressed class, of the proletariat. A free union of nations in socialism is impossible without a more or less prolonged and stubborn struggle of the socialist republics against the backward (meaning imperialist Western) states."

A remarkable picture of the world today with the socialist camp rallying the oppressed in El Salvador, Namibia, Thailand, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola, The Philippines, Ethiopia, Kampuchea, etc, etc, - and helping in whatever way possible including military support, to rout the exploiting classes, - just as has been done already in China, Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, Laos, East Europe, etc.

Against Leninism, in his endless struggle to destroy the influence of the Bolshevik Party, Trotsky specifically wrote in his 'Peace Program' pamphlet (1917):

"The only more or less concrete historical argument advanced against the slogan of

a United States of Europe was formulated in the Swiss 'Sotsial-Demokrat' (the émigré Bolshevik organ in which Lenin's article had been published) in the following sentence. 'Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism'. From this the 'Sotsial-Demokrat' draws the conclusion that the victory of socialism is possible in one country, and that therefore there is no reason to make the dictatorship of the proletariat in each separate country contingent upon the establishment of a United States of Europe. That capitalist development in different countries is uneven is an absolutely incontrovertible argument. But this unevenness is itself extremely uneven. The capitalist level of England, Austria, Germany, or France is not identical. But in comparison with Africa and Asia all these countries represent capitalist 'Europe' which has grown ripe for the social revolution. That no country in its struggle must 'wait' for others, is an elementary thought which it is useful and necessary to reiterate in order that the idea of concurrent international action may not be replaced by the idea of temporizing international inaction. Without waiting for the others, we begin and continue the struggle nationally, in the full confidence that our initiative will give an impetus to the struggle in other countries; but if this should not occur, it would be hopeless to think (as historical experience and theoretical considerations testify) that, for example, a revolutionary Russia could survive in the face of a conservative Europe."

This doctrinaire woodenness was the hallmark of so-called Trotskyist 'theory' throughout his lifetime's opposition to Leninism, from his 1906 'Our Revolution' pamphlet where his abstract sloganising stated that "Without direct state support from the European proletariat, the working class of Russia will not be able to maintain itself in power and to transform its temporary rule into a lasting socialist dictatorship. This we cannot doubt for an instant."; to his conscious and contented republication in 1924, after a whole era of change, of his same 'Peace Program' formula in his new collection "The Year 1917", published in the USSR.

Lenin however continued to help transform the world with his brilliant MARXIST scientific socialist appraisal of ever-changing reality.

In 1916 in his 'Military programme of proletarian revolution', Lenin wrote: "The victory of socialism in one country does not at one stroke eliminate all war in general. On the contrary, it presupposes wars. The development of capitalism proceeds extremely unevenly in different countries. It cannot be otherwise under commodity production. From this it follows irrefutably that socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously in all countries. It will achieve

victory first in one or several countries, while the others will for some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois. This is bound to create not only friction but a direct attempt on the part of the bourgeoisie of other countries to crush the socialist state's victorious proletariat."

Via hundreds more incisive analyses of how socialism was in fact developing, and likely to continue developing in the REAL world, Lenin reached the final public speech of his epoch-making contribution to human history, a speech to the Moscow Soviet which ended with the words: "We have approached the very core of the everyday problems. and that is a tremendous achievement. Socialism is no longer a matter of the distant future, or an abstract picture, or an icon. Our opinion of icons is the same, - a very bad one. We have brought socialism into everyday life and must here see how matters stand. That is the task of our day, the task of our epoch. Permit me to conclude by expressing confidence that difficult as this task may be, new as it may be compared with our previous task, and numerous as the difficulties may be that it entails, we shall all, - not in a day, but in a few years, - all of us together fulfil it whatever the cost, so that NEP Russia will become socialist Russia." (November 21, 1922).

And just a few weeks later in writing about the first steps towards cooperative farming and other cooperative enterprises in the Soviet economy, Lenin wrote even more specifically: "The power of the state over all large-scale means of production, political power in the hands of the proletariat, the alliance of this proletariat with the many millions of small and very small peasants, the assured proletarian leadership of the peasantry, etc., - is this not all that is necessary to build a complete socialist society out of cooperatives, out of cooperatives alone. it is all that is necessary and sufficient for it."

But in the same year, 1922, when Trotsky was already preparing his factional attempt to overthrow the Bolshevik Party and Soviet state leadership (first launched with his 'New Course' pamphlet at the end of 1923), Trotsky reiterated his demoralised middle class defeatism about the possibility of building socialism in the USSR, (later rationalised into ceaseless counter-revolutionary denunciation and vilification of the USSR.)

In a new postscript of a new edition of his 'Peace Program' pamphlet, Trotsky wrote: "The assertion reiterated several times in the 'Peace Program' that a proletarian revolution cannot culminate victoriously within national bounds may perhaps seem to some readers to have been refuted by the nearly five years' experience of our Soviet republic. But such a conclusion would be unwarranted. The fact that the wo-

rkers state has held out against the whole world in one country, and a backward country at that, only testifies to the colossal might of the proletariat, which in other more advanced more civilised countries will be truly capable of performing miracles. But while we have held our ground as a state politically and militarily, we have not arrived, or even begun to arrive, at the building of a socialist society. . . . As long as the bourgeoisie remains in power in the other European countries we will be compelled, in our struggle against economic isolation, to strive for agreement with the capitalist world; - at the same time it may be said with certainty that these agreements may at best help us to mitigate some of our economic ills, to take one or another step forward; but real progress of a socialist economy in Russia will become possible only after the victory of the proletariat in the major European countries."

It is the hallmark of petty-bourgeois subjectivism to turn an inability and unwillingness to see the world as it really is into a defeatist despair to see everything destroyed, as a demented and belated 'justification' of original hopelessly out-of-touch anticipations. In this way have the Trotskyists become the most rabid haters and vilifiers of the socialist states, utterly bankrupt themselves to build a successful revolutionary movement anywhere, but all the more determined therefore to help the comfortable capitalist 'free' world to slander and undermine the socialist camp.

2

Trotsky's subjectivism, which had caused Lenin to spend a lifetime destroying among revolutionary workers the credibility of Trotsky and all the other compromisers and purveyors of petty bourgeois illusions who had split from the Bolsheviks, - (see the 1972 Progress Publishers volume of Lenin's writings "Against Trotskyism"), - was again rampant even before Lenin was in his grave.

Trotsky's pamphlet 'The New Course' was not merely renewing the factionalising which Lenin had ferociously denounced two years earlier in the row over the role of the trade unions.

The 'New Course' was a thinly-veiled full-scale counter-revolutionary attempt to topple the entire Party and State leadership. It was the launching of this utterly hostile and uncompromising vilification of the Bolshevik Party leadership, and inner-party struggle from top to bottom of the entire Soviet regime, which made Trotsky's eventual expulsion from the Party inevitable.

At the end of the trade union debate, Lenin had written: "Is Comrade Trotsky's pamphlet 'The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions' a factional pronouncement? Irrespon-

sive of its content, is there any danger to the Party in a pronouncement of this kind? Attempts to hush up this question are a particularly favourite exercise with the members of the Moscow Committee. . . and with Comrade Bukharin, who however felt obliged to make the following statement on behalf of the 'buffer group': '... when a train seems to be heading for a crash, a buffer is not a bad thing at all.'

"So there is some danger of a crash. Can we conceive of intelligent members of the Party being indifferent to the question of how, where and when this danger arose?"

"Trotsky's pamphlet opens with the statement that 'it is the fruit of collective work', that 'a number of responsible workers, particularly trade unionists (members of the Presidium of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, the Central Committee of the Metalworkers Union, Tsektran, and others)' took part in compiling it, and that it is a 'platform pamphlet'. At the end of thesis 4 we read that 'the forthcoming Party Congress will have to CHOOSE between the two trends within the trade union movement.'

"If this is not the formation of a faction by a member of the Central Committee, if this does not mean 'heading for a crash', then let Comrade Bukharin or anyone of his fellow-thinkers, explain to the Party any other possible meaning of the words 'factionalism' and '(the Party) seems to be heading for a crash'.

"Just imagine: after the Central Committee had spent two plenary meetings in an unprecedentedly long detailed and heated discussion of Comrade Trotsky's original draft theses and of the entire trade union policy that he advocates for the Party, one member of the Central Committee, one out of nineteen, forms a group outside the Central Committee and presents its 'collective work' as a 'platform', inviting the Party Congress 'to choose between TWO trends'. This, incidentally, . . . is a glaring exposure of the Bukharin group's true role as abettors of the worst and most harmful sort of factionalism.

"But I ask any Party member: Don't you find this attack and insistence upon 'choosing' between two trends in the trade union movement rather sudden? What is there for us to do but stare in astonishment at the fact that after three years of the proletarian dictatorship even one Party member can be found to 'attack' the two trends issue IN THIS WAY?"

"Nor is that all. Look at the factional attacks in which this pamphlet abounds. In the very first thesis we find a threatening 'gesture' at 'certain workers in the trade union movement' who are thrown 'back to trade-unionism, pure and simple, which the Party repudiated in principle long ago' (evidently the Party is represented by only one member of the Central Committee's 19).

Thesis 8 grandiloquently condemns 'the craft conservatism prevalent among the top trade union functionaries' (note the truly bureaucratic concentration of attention on the 'top!').

"...the pronouncement must be assessed from the standpoint of factionalism. Imagine what Trotsky would have said, and how he would have said it, if Tomsky had published a platform accusing Trotsky and 'many' military workers of cultivating the spirit of bureaucracy, fostering the survivals of savagery, etc. What is the 'role' of Bukharin, Preobrazhensky, Serebryakov, and the others who fail to see - positively fail to note, utterly fail to note - the aggressiveness and factionalism of all THIS, and refuse to see how much more factional it is than the pronouncement of the Petrograd comrades?"

"Take a closer look at the approach to the subject: many trade unionists 'tend to cultivate in their midst a spirit' - this is an out-and-out bureaucratic approach. The whole point, you see, is not the level of development and living conditions of the masses in their millions, but the 'spirit' which Tomsky and Lozovsky tend to cultivate 'in their midst'.

"What is the point at issue? Is it the fact that many trade unionists are balking at the new tasks and methods and tend to cultivate in their midst a spirit of hostility for the new officials?"

"Or is it that the masses of organised workers are legitimately protesting and inevitably showing readiness to throw out the new officials who refuse to rectify the useless and harmful excesses of bureaucracy?"

"Is it that someone has refused to understand the 'new tasks and methods'?"

"Or is it that someone is making a clumsy attempt to cover up his defence of certain useless and harmful excesses of bureaucracy with a lot of talk about new tasks and methods?"

"It is this ESSENCE of the dispute that the reader should bear in mind. . . ."

Lenin's attack here on Trotsky is infinitely significant in view of the challenge for power and unbridgeable split Trotsky was to unleash in the last year of Lenin's life with his 'The New Course', (an analysis of which follows in full later on).

1. The essence of that notorious work to discredit and undermine the Party and State leadership was the same viciously destructive, vague charge of 'cultivating the spirit of bureaucracy' that he had levelled against Tomsky, a general insult the sole content of which was pure 'aggressiveness and factionalism' as Lenin correctly diagnosed above.

2. It was Trotsky's factionalism that was ITSELF the real ESSENCE of the 'out-and-out bureaucratic approach', again as Lenin so astutely explained above.

3. More than that, the whole purpose of

Trotsky's attack on Tamsky was itself a purely bureaucratic smokescreen. All the huffing and puffing about 'new tasks and methods' etc was to cover up Trotsky's own embarrassed refusal to condemn the Tsektran railway and water workers union bureaucracy, merely because it was close to him politically.

4. Worse still, the reason that Lenin wanted Tsektran reprimanded was precisely because of some bureaucratic excess.

5. As Lenin explains elsewhere in these quotes, the ONLY way to deal with these problems was to upbraid them whenever and wherever they occurred. But that was the one thing Trotsky was resisting.

6. The way NOT to deal with it was to let fly useless and demoralising panic about 'bureaucracy in general' with useless 'instant panaceas' for a problem which would last for as long as the workers state would be forced to last - i.e. many, many decades. But this was the one line Trotsky was determined to pursue. /

3

Lenin continued: "Will any serious-minded person who is not blinded by the factional egotism of 'Tsektran' or of the 'buffer' faction, will anyone in his right mind say that SUCH a pronouncement on the trade union issue by SUCH a prominent leader as Trotsky does promote THE REVOLUTIONARY INTEREST?"

"Can it be denied that, even if Trotsky's 'new tasks and methods' were as sound as they are in fact unsound, his very approach would be damaging to himself, the Party, the trade union movement, the training of millions of trade union members, and the Republic? . . .

"For even if the 'shake-up' policy were partly justified by the 'new tasks and methods' (Trotsky's thesis 12), it cannot be tolerated at the present time, and in the present situation, because it threatens a split.

"... Any difference, even an insignificant one, may become politically dangerous if it has a chance to grow into a split, and I mean the kind of split that will shake and destroy the whole political edifice...

"Clearly, in a country under the dictatorship of the proletariat, a split in the ranks of the proletariat, or between the proletarian party and the mass of the proletariat, is not just dangerous; it is extremely dangerous, especially when the proletariat constitutes a small minority of the population. And splits in the trade union movement... mean precisely splits in the mass of the proletariat....

"For EVEN IF the 'shake-up' policy were partly justified by the 'new tasks and methods' (Trotsky's thesis 12), it cannot be tolerated at the present time, and in the present situation, because it threatens a split...

"Take this famous 'industrial democracy' . . . it was Trotsky and Bukharin who put themselves into the ridiculous position by insisting in their theses on this very term . . . The term is theoretically wrong. In the final analysis, every kind of democracy, as political superstructure in general (which must exist until classes have been abolished and a classless society established), serves production and is ultimately determined by the relations of production in a given society. It is therefore meaningless to single out 'industrial democracy', for this leads to confusion, and the result is a dummy. . . .

"The reasoning there is obviously artificial and incorrect... not all elections should be held with an eye to political staunchness and business efficiency. Comrade Trotsky notwithstanding, an organisation of many millions must have a certain percentage of canvassers and bureaucrats (we shall not be able to make do without good bureaucrats for many years to come). But we do not speak of 'canvassing' or 'bureaucratic' democracy....

"... 'industrial democracy' is a term that lends itself to misinterpretation. It may be read as a repudiation of dictatorship and individual authority. It may be read as a suspension of ordinary democracy or a pretext for evading it. Both readings are harmful....

"Trotsky's 'production atmosphere' is even wider of the mark, and Zinoviev had good reason to laugh at it.... 'production atmosphere' will only earn you a smile or a shrug. Comrade Trotsky's 'production atmosphere' has essentially the same meaning as production propaganda, but such expressions must be avoided when production propaganda is addressed to the workers at large. The term is an example of how NOT to carry it on among the masses.

"It is strange that we should have to return to such elementary questions (politics and economics; dialectics and eclecticism) but we are unfortunately forced to do so by Trotsky and Bukharin....

"Bukharin's insistence on combining the political and the economic approach has landed him in theoretical eclecticism.

"Trotsky and Bukharin make as though they are concerned for the growth of production whereas we have nothing but formal democracy in mind. This picture is wrong, because the ONLY formulation of the issue (which the Marxist standpoint allows) is: without a correct political approach to the matter, the given class will be unable to stay on top, and consequently will be incapable of solving its production problems either.

"Let us take a concrete example. Zinoviev says: 'By carrying things to a split within the trade unions, you are making a political mistake. I spoke and wrote about the growth of production back in January 1920

citing the construction of the public baths as an example.' Trotsky replies: 'What a thing to boast of: a pamphlet with the public baths as an example "and not a single word" about the tasks of the trade unions'.

"This is wrong. The example of the public baths is worth a dozen 'production atmospheres' with a handful of 'industrial democracies' thrown in. It tells the masses, the whole bulk of them, what the trade unions are to do, and does this in plain and intelligible terms, whereas all these 'production atmospheres' and 'democracies' are so much murk blurring the vision of the workers masses, and dimming their understanding. . . .

"... bonuses in kind, and disciplinary comrades courts mean a great deal more to economic development, industrial management, and wider trade union participation in production than the absolutely abstract (and therefore empty) talk about 'industrial democracy', 'coalescence', etc.

"Behind the effort to present the 'production' standpoint (Trotsky) or to overcome a one-sided political approach and combine it with an economic approach (Bukharin) we find:

"1. Neglect of Marxism, as expressed in the theoretically incorrect, eclectic definition of the relation between politics and economics;

2. Defence or camouflage of the political mistake expressed in the shake-up policy, which runs through the whole of Trotsky's platform pamphlet, and which, unless it is admitted and corrected, leads to the collapse of the dictatorship of the proletariat;

3. A step back in purely economic and production matters, and the question of how to increase production; it is in fact a step back from Rudzutak's PRACTICAL theses with their concrete, vital and urgent tasks (develop production propaganda; learn proper distribution of bonuses in kind and correct use of coercion through disciplinary comrades courts), to the highbrow, abstract, 'empty' and theoretically incorrect general theses which ignore all that is most practical and businesslike....

"... Comrade Trotsky's political mistakes, aggravated by Comrade Bukharin, distract our Party's attention from economic tasks and production work, and unfortunately make us waste time on correcting them and arguing it out with the syndicalist deviation (which leads to the collapse of the dictatorship of the proletariat), objecting to the incorrect approach to the trade union movement (which leads to the collapse of the Soviet power), and debating general 'theses', instead of having a practical and businesslike 'economic' discussion as to whether it was the Saratov millers, the Donbas miners, the Petrograd metalworkers or some other group that had the best results in coalescing, distributing bonuses in kind, and organising comrades courts....

"Let us now consider what good there is in a 'broad discussion'. Once again we find political mistakes distracting attention from economic tasks. I was against this 'broad' discussion, and I believed, and still do, that it was a mistake, - a political mistake, - on Comrade Trotsky's part to disrupt the work of the trade union commission which ought to have held a businesslike discussion. . . .

"... His charge is that 'Lenin wants at all costs to disrupt or shelve the discussion of the matter in essence. . . . My reasons for refusing to serve on the commission were clearly stated in the Central Committee: until such time as I am permitted, on a par with all other comrades, to air these questions fully in the Party press, I do not expect any good to come of any cloistered examination of these matters, and, consequently, of work on the commission'.

"What is the result? Less than a month has passed since Trotsky started his 'broad discussion', and you will be hard put to find one responsible Party worker in a hundred who is not fed up with the discussion and has not realised its futility (to say no worse). For Trotsky has made the Party waste time on a discussion of words and bad theses, and has ridiculed as 'cloistered' the BUSINESSLIKE economic discussion in the commission, which was to have studied and verified practical experience and projected its lessons for PROGRESS in real 'production' work, in place of the REGRESS from vibrant activity to scholastic exercises in all sorts of 'production atmospheres'

"... it was bureaucratic projecteering for Trotsky to propose in his theses that from a third . . . to two thirds of the economic councils should consist of trade unionists. . . .

"... We who are breaking new ground must put in a long, persistent and patient effort to retrain men and change the old habits which have come down to us from capitalism. But this can only be done little by little. Trotsky's approach is quite wrong. . . . he exclaimed: 'Do or do not our workers, Party and trade union functionaries have any production training? Yes or no? I say: No.' This is a ridiculous approach. . . .

"It is safe to say that even ten years from now we shall have to admit that all our Party and trade union functionaries do not have enough production training, in much the same way as the workers of the Military Department, the trade unions and the Party will not have had enough military experience. But we have made a START on production training by having about a thousand workers and trade union members and delegates take part in management and run factories, head offices and other bodies higher up the scale. The basic principle underlying 'production training', - which is the training of OUR OWN SELVES, of the old underground workers and professional journalists, - is that we should start a pains-

taking and detailed study of our own practical experience, and teach others to do so, according to the rule: Look before you leap. The fundamental and absolute rule behind 'production training' is systematic, circumspect, practical, and businesslike verification of what this one thousand have done, and even more efficient and careful correction of their work, taking a step forward only when there is ample proof of the usefulness of a given method, system of management, proportion, selection of men, etc. And it is this rule that Comrade Trotsky has broken by his theses and approach. All his theses, his entire platform pamphlet, are so wrong that they have diverted the Party's attention and resources from practical production work to a lot of empty talk. . . .

4

Lenin continued:

"The state is a sphere of coercion. It would be madness to renounce coercion, especially in the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat, so that the administrative approach and 'steerage' are indispensable. The Party is the leader, the vanguard of the proletariat, which rules directly. It is not coercion but expulsion from the Party that is the specific means of influence and the means of purging and steeling the vanguard. The trade unions are a reservoir of the state power, a school of communism, and a school of management. The specific and cardinal thing in this sphere is NOT administration but the 'ties' 'between the central state administration' (and of course the local as well), 'the national economy, and the BROAD MASSES of the working people' (see Party Programme, economic section, *5, dealing with the trade unions).

"The whole of Trotsky's platform pamphlet betrays an incorrect approach to the problem and a misunderstanding of this relationship. . . .

"Trotsky and Bukharin have produced a hodgepodge of political mistakes in approach, breaks in the middle of the transmission belts, and unwarranted and futile attacks on 'administrative steerage'. It is now clear where the 'theoretical' source of the mistake lies. . . . in Bukharin's substitution of eclecticism for dialectics. His eclectic approach has confused him and has landed him in syndicalism. Trotsky's mistake is one-track thinking, compulsiveness, exaggeration, and obstinacy. . . .

"... Trotsky's thesis 8 says: 'Having lost the old basis of their existence, - the class economic struggle, - the trade unions. . . ' (that is wrong, and is a hasty exaggeration; the trade unions no longer have to face the CLASS economic struggle but the NON-CLASS 'economic struggle', - which means combating bureaucratic distortions of the Soviet apparatus, safeguarding the wo-

rking people's material and spiritual interests in ways and means inaccessible to this apparatus, etc. This is a struggle they will unfortunately have to face for many more years to come). 'The trade unions,' says Trotsky 'have for various reasons not yet succeeded in mustering the necessary forces and working out the necessary methods enabling them to solve the new task, that of ORGANISING PRODUCTION set before them by the proletarian revolution and formulated in our Programme.'

"That is yet another hasty exaggeration which is pregnant with grave error. The Programme does not contain any such formulation nor does it set the trade unions the task of 'organising production'. Let us go over the propositions in the Party's Programme as they unfold in the text:

"'The organisational apparatus' (but not the others) 'of socialised industry should rely chiefly' (but not exclusively) 'on the trade unions'. 'They must to an ever-increasing degree divest themselves of the narrow craft-union spirit' (how? under the leadership of the Party and through the proletariat's educational and other influence on the non-proletarian mass of working people) 'and become large industrial associations, embracing the majority, and eventually all of the workers in the given industry'.

"That is the first part of the section of the Party Programme dealing with the trade unions. You will have noted that it starts by laying down very STRICT conditions demanding a long sustained effort for what is to follow. And what follows is this:

"'The trade unions being, on the strength of the laws of the Soviet Republic and established practice, participants' (note the cautious statement: participants only) 'in all the local and central organs of industrial management, should eventually arrive at a de-facto concentration in their hands of the whole administration of the whole national economy, as a single economic entity' (note this: should arrive at a de-facto concentration of management not of branches of industry and not of industry as a whole, but of the whole national economy, and moreover, as an economic entity. In economic terms, this condition may be considered fulfilled only when the petty producers both in industry and agriculture account for less than one-half of the population and the national economy). 'The trade unions ensuring in this way' (the way which helps to realise all the conditions listed earlier) 'indissoluble ties between the central state administration, the national economy and the broad masses of working people, should draw the latter' (that is the masses, the majority of the population) 'into direct economic management on the widest possible scale. At the same time, the participation of the trade unions in economic management and their activity in drawing the broad

6 masses into this work are the principal means of combating the bureaucratisation of the economic apparatus of the Soviet power and making possible the establishment of truly popular control over the results of production'.

"There again, in that last sentence, we find a very cautious phrase: 'participation in economic management'; and another reference to the recruitment of the broad masses as the chief (but not the only) means of combating bureaucratic practices; finally we find a highly cautious statement: 'MAKING POSSIBLE' the establishment of 'POPULAR' - that is workers and peasants, and not just purely proletarian - 'CONTROL'.

"It is obviously wrong to boil this down to the Party Programme 'formulating' the trade unions task as 'organisation of production'. And if you insist on this error, and write it into your platform theses, you will get nothing but an anti-communist, syndicalist deviation.

"Incidentally, Comrade Trotsky says in his theses that 'over the last period we have not made any headway towards the goal set forth in the Programme but have in fact retreated from it'. That statement is unsupported, and I think wrong...

"...the question of combating red-tape was laid before the 8th Congress of Soviets. Consequently the whole Central Committee, the whole Party and the whole workers and peasants Republic had recognised that the question of the bureaucracy and ways of combating its evils was high on the agenda. Does any 'repudiation' of the 9th Congress of the RCP follow from all this? Of course not... What does follow is that we shall be extending democracy in the workers organisations, without turning it into a fetish; that we shall redouble our attention to the struggle against bureaucratic practices; and that we shall take special care to rectify any unwarranted and harmful excesses of bureaucracy, no matter who points them out...

"...it is exactly one month since Comrade Trotsky's factional statement. It is now patent that this pronouncement, inappropriate in form and wrong in essence, has diverted the Party from its practical economic and production effort into rectifying political and theoretical mistakes...

"Rumour has it that some terrible things have been said about the disagreements on the Central Committee. Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries undoubtedly shelter (and have sheltered) behind the opposition, and it is they who are spreading the rumours, incredibly malicious formulations, and inventions of all sorts to malign the Party, put vile interpretations on its decisions, aggravate conflicts, and ruin its work. That is a political trick used by the bourgeoisie, including the petty-bourgeois democrats, the Mensheviks and the Soc-

ialist Revolutionaries, who for obvious reasons hate and cannot help hating the Bolsheviks...."

(All quotations from Lenin's January 25, 1921 pamphlet 'Once again on the trade unions, the current situation, and the mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin'.)

5

In the midst of writing the pamphlet, Lenin elaborated on his denunciation of Trotsky in a speech to the communist group at the miners congress, in Moscow.

"...Is it becoming for such an influential person, such a prominent leader, to attack his Party comrades in this way?...

"I could well understand such a statement if Comrades Tomsky and Lozovsky were guilty. .of, say, having flatly refused to sign the Brest Peace Treaty [as Trotsky had been guilty], or of having flatly opposed the war. The revolutionary interest is higher than formal democracy. But it is fundamentally wrong to approach the subject in such haste at the present moment. It won't do at all. This point says that many trade unionists tend to cultivate in their midst a spirit of hostility and exclusiveness. What does that mean? What sort of talk is this? Is it the right kind of language? Is it the right approach? I had earlier said that I might succeed in acting as a 'buffer' and staying out of the discussion, because it is harmful to fight with Trotsky, - it does the Republic, the Party, and all of us a lot of harm, - but when this pamphlet came out, I felt I had to speak up.

"Trotsky writes that 'many trade unionists tend to cultivate a spirit of hostility for the new men'. How so? If that is true, those who are doing so should be named. Since this is not done, it is merely a shake-up, a bureaucratic approach to the business. ... Trotsky accuses Lozovsky and Tomsky of bureaucratic practices. I would say the reverse is true. It is no use reading any further because the approach has spoiled everything; he has poured a spoonful of tar into the honey, and no matter how much honey he may add now, the whole is already spoiled...

"... a spirit of hostility has been aroused among the masses by a number of tactless actions. My opponent asserts that certain people have been cultivating a spirit of hostility. This shows that the question is seen in the wrong light... where the 'shake-up' catchword was launched. Trotsky was wrong in uttering it. Politically it is clear that such an approach will cause a split and bring down the dictatorship of the proletariat. We must understand that trade unions are not government departments, like Peoples Commissariats, but comprise the whole organised proletariat; that they are a special type of institution and cannot be approached in this way. And when there arose

this question of a wrong approach, latent with the danger of a split, I said: 'Don't talk about any broad discussion for the time being; go to the commission and examine the matter carefully over there.' But the comrades said: 'No we can't do that; it is a violation of democracy'. Comrade Bukharin went so far as to talk about the 'sacred slogan of workers democracy'. Those are his very words. When I read that I nearly crossed myself.

"I insist that a mistake always has a modest beginning and then grows up. Disagreements always start from small things. A slight cut is commonplace, but if it festers, it may result in a fatal illness. And this thing here is a festering wound. In November there was talk about a shake-up; by December, it had become a big mistake.

"The December Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee was against us. The majority sided with Trotsky and carried Trotsky and Bukharin's resolution, which you must have read. But even the CC members who did not sympathise with us had to admit that the water transport workers had more right on their side than Tsektran. That is a fact. When I ask what Tsektran's fault was, the answer is not that they had brought pressure to bear, - that goes to their credit, - but that they had allowed bureaucratic excesses.

"But once you have realised that you had allowed excesses you ought to rectify them, instead of arguing against rectification. That is all there is to it. It will take decades to overcome the evils of bureaucracy. It is a very difficult struggle, and anyone who says we can rid ourselves of bureaucratic practices overnight by adopting anti-bureaucratic platforms is nothing but a quack with a bent for fine words. Bureaucratic excesses must be rectified right away. We must detect and rectify them without calling bad good, or black white.

"The workers and peasants realise that they have still to learn the art of government, but they are also very well aware that there are bureaucratic excesses, and it is a double fault to refuse to correct them... Even the best workers make mistakes. There are excellent workers in Tsektran, and we shall appoint them, and correct their bureaucratic excesses.

"Comrade Trotsky says that Comrades Tomsky and Lozovsky, - trade unionists both, - are guilty of cultivating in their midst a spirit of hostility for the new men. But this is monstrous. Only someone in the lunatic fringe can say a thing like that. This haste leads to arguments, platforms and accusations, and eventually creates the impression that everything is rotten...

"... To start a factional struggle and accuse Tomsky of cultivating among the masses a spirit of hostility for the Tsektranites is utterly to distort the facts, absolutely to spoil all the work, and entirely to damage

all relations with the trade unions. But the trade unions embrace the whole proletariat. If this thing is persisted in and voted on by platforms, it will lead to the downfall of the Soviet power....

"... Trotsky's whole approach is wrong. I could have analysed any one of his theses but it would take me hours and you would all be bored to death. Every thesis reveals the same thoroughly wrong approach: 'Many trade unionists tend to cultivate a spirit of hostility'. There is a spirit of hostility for us among the trade union rank and file because of our mistakes, and the bureaucratic practices up on top, including myself, because it was I who appointed Glavpolitput... We must correct Tsektran's excesses, once we realise that we are a solid workers party with a firm footing and a head on its shoulders.

"But we are not renouncing either the method of appointment, or the dictatorship. This will not be tolerated by workers with a twenty years schooling in Russia. If we condone this mistake, we shall surely be brought down. It is a mistake, and that is the root of the matter....

"... We are not renouncing the dictatorship, or one-man management; these remain, I will support them. But I refuse to defend excesses and stupidity..

"... Tsektran has allowed excesses. We propose calling a spade a spade. It is no use covering up excesses with 'new tasks'; they must be corrected.

"But we have no intention of renouncing coercion. No sober-minded worker would go so far as to say that we could now dispense with coercion, or that we could dissolve the trade unions, or let them have the whole of industry....

"... Let us talk about vesting the rights in the trade unions when electricity has spread over the whole country. If we manage to achieve this in twenty years it will be incredibly quick work, for it cannot be done quickly. To talk about it before then will be deceiving the workers. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the most stable thing in the world because it has won confidence by its deeds, and because the Party took great care to prevent diffusion. What does that mean?

"Does every worker know how to run the state? People working in the practical sphere know that this is not true, that millions of our organised workers are going through what we always said the trade unions were, namely a school of communism and administration. When they have attended this school for a number of years they will have learned to administer, but the going is slow. We have not even abolished illiteracy. We know that workers in touch with peasants are liable to fall for non-proletarian slogans. How many of the workers have been engaged in government? a few thousand throughout Russia and no more. If we say that it

is not the Party but the trade unions that put up the candidates and administrate, it may sound very democratic, and might help us to catch a few votes, but not for long. It will be fatal for the dictatorship of the proletariat....

"... You cannot lead the proletariat without a Party. You all know that this is a fact. And it is quite improper for the proletariat to rush into the arms of syndicalism and talk about mandatory nominations to 'all-Russia producers congresses'. This is dangerous and jeopardizes the Party's guiding role. Only a very small percentage of the workers in the country are now organised. The majority of the peasants will follow the Party because its policy is correct, and because, during the Brest peace ordeal, it was capable of making temporary sacrifices and retreats, which was the right thing to do. Are we to throw all this away? Was it all a windfall? No, it was all won by the Party in decades of hard work. Everybody believes the word of the Bolsheviks, who have had twenty years of Party training.

"To govern you need an army of steeled revolutionary Communists. We have it, and it is called the Party. All this syndicalist nonsense about mandatory nominations of producers must go into the wastepaper basket. To proceed on those lines would mean thrusting the Party aside and making the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia impossible. This is the view I believe it to be my Party duty to put to you. It is, in my opinion, enunciated in the form of practical propositions in the platform called 'Draft Decision of the 10th Congress of the RCP' and signed by Lenin, Zinoviev, Tomsky, Rudzutak, Kalinin, Kamenev, Lovosky, Petrovsky, Sergeyev and Stalin."

This remarkably blunt affirmation of the Bolshevik dictatorship and the Party's long 20-year preparation for the deadly serious business of wiping out bourgeois state power for the first time in human history - is aimed directly at Trotskyism and Trotsky, who only jumped on board the Bolshevik bandwagon just 12 weeks before the Great October Revolution, and was only allowed on board because of his usefulness as a leading socialist figure in Russia and his considerable abilities. But in frankly stressing the Marxist-Bolshevik grasp of how the masses are slowly BROUGHT INTO the business of running the state, - and 'eventually' running the whole of social and economic administration without a state, - Lenin is underlining that the Bolshevik dictatorship intends keeping firm control over the whole process, - including control over any revivals of factionalising confusion-mongering by leading public figures, whoever they are.



In his reply to the discussion at the miners communist group, Lenin was forced to return to the attack on Trotsky and Shlyapnikov's continued obstinate subjectivism, re-asserting the Bolshevik Party's total, long-prepared determination to impose the dictatorship of the proletariat and to let nothing stand in its way.

Against the crass petty bourgeois illusions of formal 'workers democracy', Lenin reconfirmed the unshakable Bolshevik Programme intention to steadily lead the masses to themselves administering the whole of social and economic activity, a way of life a million times more advanced, enlightened, and 'democratic' than the most progressive parliamentary democracy the rest of the world has ever known.

"Years of educational work lie ahead for the Party, ranging from the abolition of illiteracy to the whole round of Party work in the trade unions. An enormous amount of work must be done in the trade unions to achieve this properly. This is exactly what it (the Programme) says: 'should eventually arrive at a de-facto concentration in their hands of the whole administration of the whole national economy'....

"... What does it say? Something that is absolutely indisputable: 'should eventually arrive'. It does not say that they are arriving. It does not contain the exaggeration which, once made, reduces the whole to an absurdity. It says, 'should eventually arrive'.... When are you due to arrive at this point? This calls for education, and it must be so organised as to teach everyone the art of administration.... Anyone who takes the trouble to read this Paragraph 5 right through and give it ten minutes thought will see that Shlyapnikov has departed from the Programme, and that Trotsky has leaped over it....

"... First there are the ties within the central state administration. This is a huge machine. You have not yet taught us to master it. And so you must ensure ties between the central state administration, - that's one; national economy, - that's two; and the masses, - that's three. Have we got those ties? Are the trade unions capable of administration? Anybody over thirty years of age with some little practical experience of Soviet organisation will laugh at this....

"First there is need to create ties between the central state organisations. We have no intention of concealing this malaise, and our Programme says: ensure ties with the masses, and ensure the participation of the trade unions in economic management. There are no loud words in this. When you have done that in such a way as to reduce absenteeism by, say, 3 percent, let alone 30 percent, we shall say: you have done a fine job. Our present Programme says: '.. the participation of the trade unions in ec-

8
onomic management and their activity in drawing the broad masses into this work.. ' It does not contain a single promise or a single loud word; not does it say anything about your doing the electing. It does not resort to demagogy, but says that there is an ignorant, backward mass, that there are trade unions which are so strong that they are leading the whole of the peasantry, and which themselves follow the lead of the Party with a 20-year-schooling in the fight against tsarism. No country has gone through what Russia has, and that is the secret of our strength. Why is this regarded as a miracle? Because in a peasant country, only the trade unions can provide the economic bonds to unite millions of scattered farms, if this mass of 6 million has faith in its Party, and continues to follow it as it had hitherto. That is the secret of our strength, and the way it works is a political question. How can a minority govern a huge peasant country, and why are we so composed? After our three years experience, there is no external or internal force that can break us. Provided we do not make any extra-stupid mistakes leading to splits, we shall retain our positions; otherwise everything will go to the dogs. That is why, when Comrade Shlyapnikov says in his platform: 'The All-Russia Congress of Producers shall elect a body to administer the whole national economy', I say: read the whole of Paragraph 5 of our Programme, which I have read out to you, and you will see that there is no attempt at intimidation either on Lenin's or anyone else's part.

"Shlyapnikov concluded his speech by saying: 'We must eliminate bureaucratic methods in government and the national economy'. I say this is demagogy.... "

7

Lenin continued against Trotsky:

"...The malaise is there. In our 1919 Programme we wrote that bureaucratic practices existed. Whoever comes out and demands a stop to bureaucratic practices is a demagogue. When you are called upon to 'put a stop to bureaucratic practices', it is demagogy. It is nonsense. We shall be fighting the evils of bureaucracy for many years to come, and whoever thinks otherwise is playing demagogue and cheating, because overcoming the evils of bureaucracy requires hundreds of measures, wholesale literacy, culture, and participation



in the activity of the Workers and Peasants Inspection. Shlyapnikov has been People's Commissar for Labour and People's Commissar for Trade and Industry. Has HE put a stop to bureaucratic practices? Kiselyov has been on the Central Board of the Textile Industry. Has HE put a stop to the evils of bureaucracy?....

"...Nothing can break us, neither external nor internal forces, if we do not lead things up to a split. I say that Tsektran is more than a bludgeon, but exaggerating this has led up to a split. Anyone can be guilty of an excess of bureaucratic practices, and the Central Committee is aware of it, and is responsible for it. In this respect, Comrade Trotsky's mistake lies in that he drew up his theses in the wrong spirit. They are all couched in terms of a shake-up, and they have all led to a split in the union. It is not a matter of giving Trotsky bad marks, - we are not schoolchildren and have no use for marks, - but we must say that his theses are wrong in content and must therefore be rejected."

A couple of months later at the 10th Congress of the RCP (Russian Communist Party - later CPSU (Soviet Union)), Lenin restated his condemnation of Bukharin, Trotsky, and Shlyapnikov, and others. "Engels speaks of a communist society which will have no classes, and will consist only of producers. Do we now have classes? Yes we do. Do we have a class struggle? Yes, and a most furious one. To come in the midst of this furious class struggle and talk about an 'All-Russia Congress of Producers', - isn't that a syndicalist deviation which must be emphatically and irrevocably condemned? We saw that in this platform hurly-burly even Bukharin was tripped up by the one-third nomination proposal. Comrades, in the history of the Party we must not forget such waverings.... "

In the light of the deliberate promotion of factionalism by Trotsky, the 10th Party Congress on Lenin's initiative armed itself with extraordinary measures of banning factions completely, and, for the first time ever, giving the Central Committee power to expel from the Party any party member including any Central Committee member.

Lenin's resolution read in part: "...the whiteguards strive, and are able, to disguise themselves as Communists, and even as the most LEFT-wing Communists, solely for the purpose of weakening and destroying the bulwark of the proletarian revolution in Russia. Menshevik leaflets distributed in Petrograd on the eve of the Kronstadt mutiny likewise show how the Mensheviks took advantage of the disagreements and certain rudiments of factionalism in the Russian Communist Party actually in order to egg on and support the Kronstadt mutineers... while claiming to be... supporters of the Soviet power, only with supposedly slight modifications.... "

"... comprehensive explanation of the harmfulness and danger of factionalism from the standpoint of Party unity and of achieving unanimity of will among the vanguard of the proletariat as the fundamental condition for the success of the dictatorship of the proletariat.... "

"Propaganda must also teach the lessons of preceding revolutions in which the counter-revolution made a point of supporting the opposition to the extreme revolutionary party which stood closest to the latter, in order to undermine and overthrow the revolutionary dictatorship.... "

"...every critic must see to it that the form of his criticism takes account of the position of the Party, surrounded as it is by a ring of enemies, and that the content of his criticism is such that, by directly participating in Soviet and Party work, he can test the rectification of the errors of the Party or of individual Party members in practice.... "

"...while ruthlessly rejecting impractical and factional pseudo-criticism, the Party will unceasingly continue, - trying out new methods, - to fight with all the means at its disposal against the evils of bureaucracy, for the extension of democracy and initiative, for detecting exposing and expelling from the Party elements that have wormed their way into its ranks, etc.

"The Congress, therefore, hereby declares dissolved and orders the immediate dissolution of all groups without exception formed on the basis of one platform or another.... "

"In order to ensure strict discipline within the Party and in all Soviet work and to secure the maximum unanimity in eliminating all factionalism, the Congress authorises the Central Committee, in cases of breach of discipline or of a revival or toleration of factionalism, to apply all Party penalties, including expulsion, and in regard to members of the Central Committee, reduction to the status of alternate members and, as an extreme measure, expulsion from the Party.... "

In his summing up speech on these questions, Lenin justified this unprecedented extension of expulsion powers. "It is an extreme measure. I hope we shall not have to apply it. It merely shows that the Party will resort to what you have heard about in the event of disagreements which in one aspect verge on a split. We are not children. We have gone through some hard times. We have seen splits and have survived them. We know what a trial they are, and are not afraid of giving the danger its proper name.... "

The 10th Congress precautions were well advised for no sooner had Lenin become totally incapacitated 2 years later than Trotsky launched a factional attack of such bureaucratic viciousness on the Party and State leaders as to be virtually a counter-revol-

utionary onslaught in itself.

For Trotsky's demagoguery about the problems of bureaucracy and for just one arrogant insult to two leading comrades, Lenin had read the riot act against Trotsky's factionalism over the trade union question, banning all factions and threatening expulsion, and tolerating only three months debate.

What would Lenin, had he lived, have made of 'The New Course' - and the FOUR YEARS factional struggle the Party leaders allowed Trotsky to spread his new demagoguery?

Bearing in mind Lenin's furious denunciations above of Trotsky's ridiculous 'shake-up' strategy which would destroy the proletarian dictatorship and bring down Soviet power, of Trotsky's quackery in pretending there could be instant solutions for the obviously very long-term problem of bureaucracy, and of Trotsky's 'monstrous lunacy' for wrecking Party unity with his relatively mildly derogatory comments on other leading comrades' work, consider the following typical sample from the opening of Chapter 1 of 'The New Course'.

Trotsky characterises the entire Party and State leadership in the following way.

"It is precisely during these last months that the 'old course' revealed the most negative and most insufferable traits: apparatus cliquism, bureaucratic smugness, and complete disdain for the mood, the thoughts, and the needs of the party. Out of bureaucratic inertia it rejected from the very beginning, and with an antagonistic violence, the initial attempts to put on the order of the day the question of the critical revision of the internal party regime."

Never mind a 'shake-up' in trade union work and a couple of mild insults to Tomsky creating the impression that 'everything is rotten' in Lenin's words, what would the enemies of the Bolshevik dictatorship be able to do with this mouthful, - and have done ever since. No less than a complete revolt against the whole Party regime is being proposed, - EXACTLY the aim of the entire counter-revolutionary clamour against the Soviet workers state right from the start, particularly as led by the non-Bolshevik 'socialist revolutionaries' such as the Mensheviks were, -(along with Trotsky until just before the Great October Revolution.)

Instead of the quiet practical struggle inside the Party and State regime for improvements, slow step by slow step, in the work of building socialism in the USSR, - as demanded by the special 10th Congress resolution against factionalism and the dangers of a split, Trotsky publishes an entire pamphlet of nothing but the most destructive general vilification of the entire leadership.

"... a growing tendency to counterpose a few thousand comrades who form the leading cadres, to the rest of the mass whom

they look upon only as an object of action. If this regime should persist... the regime that has lasted too long and become synonymous in the party with bureaucratism... is not a question of isolated deviations... but precisely of the general policy of the apparatus... weakening their revolutionary spirit...."

8

Where Lenin above insisted that the only way the dictatorship of the proletariat could survive and socialism be built, and not swamped by the surrounding tide of capitalist imperialism, was the patient development of a millionfold ties between the Party, the masses, and the economy with the 'central state administration' and the 'central state organisations', Trotsky deliberately tries to put the boot into this development of a powerful socialist state by declaring: "The source of bureaucratism resides in the growing concentration of the attention and the forces of the party upon the governmental institutions and apparatuses."

Where Lenin had staked the whole survival of socialism's future in the world on the Party openly leading the Workers State and the whole masses into ever-greater participation in the running of affairs, thereby overcoming all the age-old bureaucratic backwardness of capitalist culture and society (illiteracy, inability to administer, etc, etc), the 'New Course' sought to persuade the Party to relinquish its controlling role in the state and the economy, - on the imbecile grounds that the 'apparatus' as such is the source of bureaucracy.

"The whole question is to realise this (the Party's) leadership without merging into the bureaucratic apparatus of the state, in order not to expose itself to a bureaucratic degeneration." (Ch 2).

Once again, divorcing the Party leadership from the State leadership was EXACTLY one of the more ridiculously blatant demands of the whole counter-revolutionary clamour against the Bolshevik dictatorship from the start.

Even more laughably, Trotsky tried the oldest bourgeois propaganda in the book, - the attempt to set up a bogus hostility between the Party's leaders and the Party's rank and file.

This was the longest-running of all slanders against Leninism. From 1903 onwards, from the first independent organisation of Bolshevism, the sneer against Lenin among the Menshevik circles of Martov, Plekhanov, Trotsky, etc, was against Lenin's 'dictatorial Bonapartism'. This jibe was redoubled in fury after the establishment of the Bolshevik state dictatorship in 1917.

Lenin took it up in 'Leftwing Communism'.

Trotsky writes in the 'New Course': "... bureaucratism threatens to detach the leaders from the masses.... The task of the

present is to shift the centre of party activity toward the masses of the party... (Ch 1)... bureaucratic methods which transform the youth into the passive material of education and inevitably create an estrangement between the apparatus and the mass... (Appendix 1 - Trotsky's letter published in Pravda and distributed throughout the Party, summarising his 'New Course' vilification of the Party and State leadership)".

Three years earlier in 'Leftwing Communism', Lenin had written: "The mere presentation of the question 'dictatorship of the party OR dictatorship of the class; dictatorship (party) of the leaders OR dictatorship (party) of the masses' testifies to most incredibly and hopelessly muddled thinking... classes are led by political parties; political parties, as a general rule, are run by more or less stable groups composed of the most authoritative, influential and experienced members, who are elected to the most responsible positions, and are called leaders. All this is elementary. All this is clear and simple. Why replace this with some kind of rigmarole..."

"...one can see simply a thoughtless and incoherent use of the now fashionable terms 'masses' and 'leaders'. These people have heard and memorised a great many attacks on 'leaders' in which the latter have been contrasted with the 'masses'...."

"...to contrast IN GENERAL the dictatorship of the masses with a dictatorship of the leaders is ridiculously absurd and stupid. What is particularly amusing is that, in fact, instead of the old leaders, ,, NEW LEADERS are brought forth (under cover of the slogan 'Down with the leaders')...."

"Repudiation of the Party principle and of Party discipline, - that is what the opposition has arrived at. And this is tantamount to completely disarming the proletariat in the interests of the bourgeoisie. It all adds up to that petty-bourgeois diffuseness and instability, that incapacity for sustained effort, unity and organised action, which if encouraged must inevitably destroy any proletarian revolutionary movement. From the standpoint of communism, repudiation of the Party principle means attempting to leap from the eve of capitalism's collapse not to the lower or the intermediate phase of communism, but to the higher. We in Russia, in the third year since the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, are making the first steps in the transition from capitalism to socialism or the lower stage of communism. Classes still remain, and will remain everywhere FOR YEARS AFTER the proletariat's conquest of power... The abolition of classes means not merely ousting the landowners and the capitalists... it also means abolishing the small commodity producers, and they cannot be ousted, or crushed; we must learn to live with them. They can (and must) be transformed and re-

educated only by means of very prolonged slow and cautious organisational work. They surround the proletariat on every side with a petty-bourgeois atmosphere which permeates and corrupts the proletariat, and constantly causes among the proletariat relapses into petty-bourgeois spinelessness, disunity, individualism, and alternating moods of exaltation and dejection. The strictest centralisation and discipline are required within the political party of the proletariat in order to counteract this, in order that the ORGANISATIONAL role of the proletariat (and that is its PRINCIPAL role) may be exercised correctly, successfully, and victoriously. The dictatorship of the proletariat means a persistent struggle - bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative - against the forces and traditions of the old society. The force of habit in millions and tens of millions is a most formidable force. Without a party of iron that has been tempered in the struggle, a party enjoying the confidence of all honest people in the class in question, a party capable of watching and influencing the mood of the masses, such a struggle cannot be waged successfully. It is a thousand times easier to vanquish the centralised big bourgeoisie than to 'vanquish' the millions upon millions of petty proprietors; however through their ordinary, everyday, imperceptible, elusive and demoralising activities, they produce the VERY results which the bourgeoisie need and which tend to RESTORE the bourgeoisie. Whoever brings about even the slightest weakening of the iron discipline of the party of the proletariat (especially during its dictatorship), is actually aiding the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. . . .

"... There HAVE ALWAYS BEEN attacks on the 'dictatorship of leaders' in our Party...." (Leftwing Communism Ch 5).

But far from any question of the Party principle of iron discipline behind its leadership and programme elected by its Congresses, Trotsky's 'New Course' preached nothing but contempt, vilification, and dissent. "...the apparatus, in spite of the ideological growth of the Party (i. e. Trotsky's vaulting ambitions following Lenin's new paralysing stroke), continued obstinately to think and decide for the Party (i. e. refused to dance to Trotsky's tune). Thence the bureaucratism of the apparatus, its cliquism, its exclusive internal life, in a word, all the traits that constitute the profoundly negative side of the old course. . . . (Ch 1). . . ."

Trotsky hoped that with Lenin paralysed for good, it would be safe to bureaucratically overcome the 10th Congress ban on factionalising with some sly demagoguery. So in Ch 3 of the 'New Course' he delivered the following broadside against the Leninist Party principle. "The decision of the 10th Congress prohibiting factions can only have an

auxiliary character; by itself it does not offer the key to the solution of any and all internal difficulties. It would be gross 'organisational fetishism' to believe that whatever the development of the party, the mistakes of the leadership, the conservatism of the apparatus, the external influences, etc, a decision is enough to preserve us from groupings and from upheavals inherent in the formation of factions. Such an approach is in itself profoundly bureaucratic."

Not a single word of the tens of thousands spoken by Lenin at the 10th Congress said a thing about a ban on factions 'solving any internal difficulties'. Its sole purpose was to prevent ADDING TO those difficulties with something far worse than the arguments and difficulties themselves, - namely a FACTIONAL SPLIT IN THE PARTY which in the Soviet workers state's perilous position, still surrounded by vastly stronger and endlessly hostile imperialism, would have been fatal.

And Trotsky's absurdly bureaucratic comment that no bans can prevent 'groupings and upheavals inherent in the formation of factions' is a ridiculous self-fulfilling prophecy. If Trotsky was absolutely determined to go ahead and factionalise against the Party leadership, then obviously nothing could prevent a major upheaval. Which is exactly what followed over the next four years. And which was exactly the purpose of Lenin unprecedentedly extending the powers of the Central Committee to expel another Central Committee member, - as an extreme measure and if unavoidably necessary, - to put an end to such deliberate factionalising.

And after four years of unheard-of counter-revolutionary factionalising against the Party and State's elected leaderships and decisions from 1923 to 1927, that is what finally had to happen to Trotsky. And he laid the inevitable seeds of this damaging development with the arrogant and intolerant vilification of the Party and State leadership in the "New Course".

9

For Trotsky's mild abuse of Tomsky and Lozovsky over the trade union factionalising, Lenin described it as a spoonful of tar having been poured into a barrel of honey to spoil the entire work of the Party.

The unrestrained viciousness of the 'New Course' derision of the Party and State leadership was closer to a barrel of tar being poured onto a spoonful of honey. The incurably bitter taste of a fight to the finish had been unstoppably launched by Trotsky in an arrogantly subjective act of political self-destruction. Exactly 60 years later, the Soviet Union is now well on the way to completing the Bolshevik Programme of first building a powerful socialist state and then beginning the transition to communism, and is leading an ever-

expanding and invincibly powerful camp of socialist states. Trotskyism is reduced to the middle class anti-communist intrigues of petty writ-serving factional squabbles between the Militantites, the Redgraveites, the Thornettites, the Paul Footites, the Tariq Aliites, the Sparts, the Workers Power, etc, etc, etc, etc.

To keep the Trotskyist illusions alive as a bulwark against communism, the actual history of the international class struggle is daily falsified by bourgeois and Trotskyist propaganda in a million and one ways. Some of the major distortions are taken up below.

Adding considerably to the confusion of course was the real damage done to the development of the world socialist revolution by the mistakes arising out of the cult of personality around Stalin, and the defeatist conservatism caused by the failure of any new overthrows of imperialism in the 20s and 30s. These problems of bureaucratic centrism still persist in the formal communist movement to such an extent that the British Communist Party, for example, is now an irrevocably rightwing reformist sect but still has the official approval of Moscow (even if it is unofficially despised.)

But the rampant subjective factionalism of Trotsky's 'New Course' which later degenerated even further into an open call for a counter-revolutionary putsch against the Soviet workers state, - dressed up as the so-called 'political revolution', - and into demoralising predictions that the fascist NAZI wehrmacht of German imperialism would finish off 'Stalinist Bonapartism', - none of this petty-bourgeois revisionism known as Trotskyism was of any use whatever to the actual problems and course of development of the world socialist revolution once Trotsky had in practice severed all relations and influence with the Soviet workers State by the attitude he adopted with the "New Course".

It is not a question of staying inside or outside the formal communist movement. The Workers Party's correct line towards the Soviet Union and the world socialist revolution is unaffected by being outside the utterly ridiculous and decrepit reformist British Communist Party (CPGB). It has nothing whatever to do with avoiding at all costs being booted out of the Soviet Communist Party. It is impossible to stipulate how Leninists might have survived a thousand different difficult circumstances in the Stalin period.

The essential question was to maintain a correct OVERALL GRASP of the nature of the Soviet workers state and the problems of building socialism, together with the requirements of the world socialist revolution. Once Trotskyism had immediately fallen down at the very first hurdle in its hopelessly subjective and factional petty-bourgeois sectarian attitude to the Party and

State leadership of the Bolshevik Revolution, its practical influence was nil, and deservedly so, regardless of any chance insights into later problems of the international class struggle which were denied to the Soviet workers state and its supporters by the misleadership of Stalinism.

Whatever occasional isolated perceptive analysis came later to Trotsky (along with a lot more destructive, subjective dross), his reactionary counter-revolutionary attempt to wipe out the Party and State leadership in the Soviet Union in 1923 with his 'New Course' made nonsense of all subsequent, vain, exhibitionist swank about extending the world socialist revolution this way and that way.

To this day, Trotskyism has never built a party ANYWHERE to achieve A SINGLE THING for the working masses, nor is there the remotest chance that it ever will.

10

There is only ONE international class struggle, led by US imperialism on one side and by the Soviet socialist camp on the other. No working masses can possibly achieve any REVOLUTIONARY advance against imperialism and remain hostile to the Soviet workers state. The working masses are not schizophrenic. Either they are still under the sway of bourgeois-imperialist propaganda, and therefore anti-communist and anti-revolutionary of any kind. Or else they are beginning to make the complete ONCE-AND-FOR-ALL BREAK with bourgeois anti-communist propaganda, PRECISELY because it represents capitalist democracy and imperialism which they have learned to hate and wish to destroy. In which case they will see through the deeply anti-Soviet Spartacists and other posing 'defenders of the USSR' immediately and ignore them.

In the above quotes from Lenin, it has already been demonstrated how hopelessly muddled was Trotsky on the way forward through building socialism in Russia; on the importance of the state administration and how to develop it towards that goal; on the key role of the Bolshevik dictatorship and how to preserve it; and on the causes of bureaucracy and the long, slow cure for it.

Trotsky's scarecely-veiled hatred of a strong Soviet workers state is worth further examination because it goes to the heart of the petty-bourgeois intellectual's terror of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the kernel of Marxism-Leninism, and the starting-off point for the falling away and reformist decay of many present-day Communist Parties in the West (still scandalously formally recognised by Moscow) as well as of Trotskyist revisionism and anti-communism.

In Ch 4 of the 'New Course', he treacherously declared that: "The essential source of bureaucratism resides in the necessity of creating and sustaining a state apparatus

that unites the interests of the proletariat and those of the peasantry in a perfect economic harmony from which we are still far removed. The necessity of maintaining a permanent army is likewise another important source of bureaucratism."

"It is quite plain that precisely the negative social phenomena we have just enumerated and which now nurture bureaucratism could place the revolution in peril should they continue to develop."

Reality is exactly the other way about. Bureaucratic difficulties in trying to reorganise the entire economy and society of the vast mass of war-destroyed Russia on a completely new and untried socialist basis faced with the utter hostility and disruption of the rest of the planet, - were a massive and never-ending nightmare because of the centuries-old BACKWARDNESS of the country. The only WAY OUT of that backwardness from the depths of depravity to which economic crisis and imperialist war had reduced Tsarist Russia by 1917 was for the masses to seize the power for the first time in history, to destroy all capitalist-imperialist counter-revolution for the first time in history, and to build a powerful SOCIALIST STATE for the first time in history to ensure the triumph of socialism and a new way of life for all.

In other words, what Trotsky idiotically and treacherously describes as the SOURCE of bureaucratic backwardness, inability to administer the economy and society efficiently, failure to provide adequate defence, etc, - namely the MILITARY and STATE APPARATUS, - is in fact for Marxism-Leninism the ONLY SOLUTION to that backwardness.

Trotskyism has gone on ever since, - along with the rest of the bourgeois anti-communist clamour, - in sneering at the 'bureaucratic state apparatus' as making impossible the successful development of industry and agriculture, etc; hindering the Soviet Union's science and technology, etc; endangering the USSR's military defences, etc; - always with the same poisonous objective of undermining confidence in the Soviet workers state and trying to derail the Leninist road to socialism through the all-powerful Bolshevik state dictatorship.

Thanks to the defeat of Trotskyism by the Party and State leadership in the 1923-1927 period after the paralysis and death of Lenin, the Soviet workers state has gone on growing from strength to strength under the lead of the Party dictatorship in the economy, the military, science, education, and society generally, drawing ever-wider millions into the art of efficient administration, innovation, and control. Precisely through STRENGTHENING its state apparatus and all its related central economic and social organisations, the Bolshevik dictatorship has SOLVED all the 'disaster cr-

ises' that have been predicted for it EVERY SINGLE DAY since 1917 in the anti-communist press, allegedly caused by that very same 'bureaucratic state apparatus'.

The most insistent, insidious, and vicious predictions of 'disaster crises' of all have come from the Trotskyist revisionist wing of petty-bourgeois democracy starting from the 'New Course' in 1923, the moment when Trotsky resolved to try to destroy the Bolshevik Party and State dictatorship. The main target throughout has been the 'bureaucratic state apparatus'.

11

Trotsky began his counter-revolutionary campaign with predictions of bureaucratic disaster in the "New Course" in 1923 and ended it on the same note with his final writings in 1940 predicting bureaucratic disaster in the coming war with Hitler. Every single thing he wrote in between had the same sole purpose, - to undermine confidence in the Soviet workers state by predicting its disaster as a result of its 'bureaucratic state apparatus'. And, of course, the one thing which guided the Soviet Union successfully through one of the most perilous, difficult, and heroic periods of all human history - leading eventually to the greatest achievements ever in the record of civilisation - was PRECISELY that very 'bureaucratic state apparatus', - (or the Party and State leadership of Bolshevik dictatorship, as Leninist reality describes it.)

"Bureaucratism has reached an excessive, truly alarming development," Trotsky starts off in Ch 1 of the 'New Course'. 'The fact that the party lives on two separate storeys bears within it numerous dangers...

"...The rapid development of private capital... would show that private capital is interposing itself more and more between the workers state and the peasantry, is acquiring an economic and therefore a political influence... such a rupture between Soviet industry and agriculture, between the proletariat and the peasantry, would constitute a grave danger for the proletarian revolution, a symptom of the possibility of the triumph of the counter-revolution.

"What are the political paths by which the victory of the counter-revolution might come if the economic hypothesis just set forth were to be realised?... the political process would assume in the main the character of the degeneration of the state apparatus in a bourgeois direction... If private capital increased rapidly and succeeded in fusing with the peasantry, the active counter-revolutionary tendencies directed against the Communist Party would then probably prevail..."

"The counter-revolutionary tendencies can find a support among the kulaks, the middlemen, the retailers, the concession-

aries, in a word, among elements much more capable of surrounding the state apparatus than the Party itself. . . .

" . . . the negative social phenomena we have just enumerated and which now nurture bureaucratism could place the revolution in peril should they continue to develop. . . . bureaucratism in the state and party apparatus is the expression of the most vexatious tendencies inherent in our situation, of the defects and deviations in our work which. . . might sap the basis of the revolution. . . . Quantity will at a certain stage be transformed into quality. (Ch 4). "

Hand-in-glove with this age-old bourgeois anti-communist propaganda trick of constantly predicting disaster for the new system as a way of trying to undermine any enthusiastic support for it, Trotsky also used the other well-known demagogic practice of 'reporting' widespread demoralisation in order to achieve precisely that consequence.

The tactics here of the practised bourgeois journalist Trotsky make interesting comparison with the daily present-day outpourings in the capitalist press against Afghanistan, - endlessly predicting 'disaster', 'demoralisation', etc, etc, in order to try to poison opinion throughout the world against the revolutionary regime which took power there in April 1978 and against the Soviet military help it received later on to stem (US imperialist-financed-and-led) reaction's incessant subversion and counter-revolutionary incursions from across the borders of Pakistan's feudal military dictatorship.

In his factional letter sent to all Party meetings summing up his 'New Course' diatribe, and finally published in 'Pravda' on Dec 8 1923, Trotsky tried to talk Party 'demoralisation' into existence in the following way.

"The initiative of the Party was reduced to the minimum. Thence the habits and the procedures of leadership, fundamentally contradicting the spirit of revolutionary proletarian organisation. The excessive centralisation of the apparatus at the expense of initiative engendered a feeling of uneasiness, an uneasiness which at the extremities of the party, assumed an exceedingly morbid form. . . . The whole of the Party disapproved more and more of apparatus-methods. . . . The idea. . . that bureaucratism threatened to get the Party into a blind alley had become pretty general. . . .

". . . It is upon the political training of the young communist generations that bureaucratism has its most grievous repercussions. . . . bureaucratic methods which transform the youth into the passive material of education, and inevitably create an estrangement between the apparatus and the mass, the old and the young. . . . The already ossified bureaucratic degeneration of party morals and relations."

Trotsky is leaving nothing to chance in

this TOTAL denunciation of the entire Bolshevik Party, outrageously published in 'Pravda' two months BEFORE Lenin's death.

On the one hand, the Party and State leadership is said to be alienating the entire younger generation, as Trotsky daydreams of being cheered forward by the adoring youthful masses to become the undisputed LEADER of the world revolution.

But on the other hand, looking around realistically and seeing that the overwhelming majority of youth were eagerly coming forward to support the Revolution and specifically to back the Bolshevik Party which had MADE the revolution, and to join its Young Communist League, Trotsky also tried to cover his own inevitable failure with the sour remark that in the USSR, the "youth were being transformed into the passive material of education".

The truth, of course, is that despite its weaknesses the leadership of the Party and the State after Lenin's death organised and inspired a whole epoch of 5-year-plan developments and defence of the Soviet Union against the 1941 fascist blitzkrieg by German imperialism (which was THREE TIMES MORE POWERFUL than the USSR at that period) - an unprecedented feature of which was the overwhelming enthusiastic mass public support, particularly from the youth.

Sour cynicism about the self-inflicted damage the Soviet Union did itself by the crude fanaticism associated with the cult of Stalin in the period of the triumph of socialism in the USSR, cannot obscure the DECISIVE role of the Party and State dictatorship in that triumph. And it was precisely the workers STATE which eventually overcame and remedied the sickening crimes and mistakes of the needless Stalin terror moreover, and is still grappling successfully with its appalling consequences by continuing to strengthen the USSR and the socialist camp, and continuing the spread of the world socialist revolution. The Soviet workers STATE goes from strength to strength, forcing a way through the warmongering degeneracy which dying imperialism is trying to bequeath to mankind, and by its unbeatable might making possible a communist future for the world in which there will no longer be a need for any states, including socialist states.

Trotskyism's claim-to-fame at the end of the 1930s (and subsequently) about having been right about 'Stalinism' all along, and of being 'for' socialism in the Soviet Union but 'against' its 'degenerate betrayal' by Stalin is, of course, the most viciously misleading nonsense, as this series demonstrates. Trotsky was against building a powerful STATE of proletarian dictatorship, the sole guarantee of socialism. He was for all kinds of subjective illusions, in which his supporters still wallow - under capitalism,

Even as early as 1936 Trotsky was already being forced to acknowledge the 'temporary' truth of enormous 'apparent' success in the USSR. This was in order not to completely lose all credibility in a world which already knew better than to believe Trotsky's basic sermon from the 1923 'New Course' onwards that only 'disaster crisis' awaited the 'doomed' Party and State 'bureaucratic' leadership of the Soviet Union. So in 'Revolution Betrayed' of that year, the latest in his periodic updates of catastrophe predictions, Trotsky felt obliged to admit:

"Gigantic achievements in industry, enormously promising beginnings in agriculture, an extraordinary growth of the old industrial cities and a building of new ones, a rapid increase of the number of workers, a rise in cultural level and cultural demands, - such are the indubitable results of the October Revolution. . . .

"Socialism has demonstrated its right to victory, not on the pages of 'Das Kapital' but in an industrial arena comprising a sixth part of the earth's surface, - not in the language of dialectics, but in the language of steel, cement, and electricity. . . . a backward country has achieved in less than ten years successes unexampled in history.

"This also ends the quarrel with the reformists in the workers movement. Can we compare for one moment their mouselike fussing with the titanic work accomplished by this people AROUSED TO A NEW LIFE by revolution? . . . (Ch 1) (And then in Ch 7) . . ." To be sure, the youth are very active in the sphere of economics. In the Soviet Union there are now 1.2m Communist Youth in the collective farms. Hundreds of thousands of members of the Communist Youth have been mobilised during recent years for construction work, timber work, coal mining, gold production, for work in the Arctic, Sakhalin, or in Amur where the new town of Komsomolsk is in process of construction. The new generation is putting out shock brigades, champion workers, Stakhanovites, foremen, underadministrators. The youth are studying, and a considerable part of them are studying assiduously. They are as active, if not more so, in the sphere of athletics in its most daring or warlike forms, such as parachute jumping and marksmanship. The enterprising and audacious are going on all kinds of dangerous expeditions.

"The better part of our youth," said recently the well-known polar explorer, Schmidt, 'are eager to work where difficulties await them,' This is undoubtedly true. . . .

". . . it would be a crude slander against the youth to portray them as controlled exclusively, or even predominantly, by personal interests. No, in the general mass they are magnanimous, responsive, enterprising. . . . In their depths are various unformulated tendencies grounded in heroism and still only

awaiting application. It is upon these moods in particular that the newest kind of Soviet patriotism is nourishing itself. It is undoubtedly very deep, sincere, and dynamic... Naturally, Trotskyism would not be Trotskyism without these gestures towards reality being accompanied in the rest of 'Revolution Betrayed' by some of the most treacherous bureaucratic demagogy (Lenin's description of Trotsky, see above) and bourgeois-idealist subjectivism ever concocted against Marxism-Leninism and the Soviet workers state.

Where he does make these begrudging concessions to the Soviet workers state, Trotsky deceitfully makes no reference at all to his 1923 'New Course' slanders that NOTHING now lay ahead but 'ossification', 'estrangement', 'morbid uneasiness', 'degeneration', and 'initiative-killing bureaucratism'. But without turning a hair, what Trotsky now admits the Soviet state has organised is 'ten years successes UNEXAMPLED IN HISTORY'.

From being a "smug, negative, disdainful, neglectful, cliquish, bureaucratic apparatus" capable only of "inertia" on the one hand or "antagonistic violence towards criticism" on the other, full of only "functionaries, careerists, and political hangers-on" who are so out-of-touch that they are in danger of losing majority support and dominant state influence to the counter-revolutionary tendencies among "retailers, middlemen, concessionaries, and kulaks", the Bolshevik Party and State leadership has suddenly (and unacknowledged as far as Trotsky is concerned) become capable of organising in economic, political, and social development in an illiterate, devastated, semi-feudal, historical backwater "10 years successes UNEXAMPLED IN HISTORY".

But Trotsky's belated concessions to reality and to the REAL HISTORY of the Soviet Workers State (as opposed to the West's shallow anti-communist myths) is not in order to set the record straight. His SOLE purpose in 'Revolution Betrayed' (as in numerous other rehashes of his basic reactionary sermon) is for the umpteenth time to re-launch on a 'new' basis his 'theory' of insoluble and fatal 'contradiction' and inevitable 'collapse' of the Bolshevik Party dictatorship.

Despite his 'New Course' predictions of 'unresolvable contradictions' having proved to be complete nonsense, Trotsky arrogantly, maliciously, treacherously and irresponsibly now pontificates: (Ch 11)

"The bureaucracy's autocratic rule is coming into greater and greater contradiction with the development of the productive forces of the country, just as absolute monarchy became in its time IRRECONCILABLE with the development of the bourgeois market... the growth of power and independence in a bureaucracy is not unlimited..."

"...the farther you go, the more the economy runs into the problem of quality which slips out of the hands of a bureaucracy like a shadow... Quality demands a democracy of producers and consumers, freedom of criticism and initiative, - conditions incompatible with a TOTALITARIAN REGIME of fear, lies, and flattery... (See Lenin's derision above for Trotsky's 1921 reactionary demagogy about summoning a 'democratic congress of producers')

"Behind the question of quality stands a more complicated and grandiose problem which may be comprised in the concept of independent, technical, and cultural creation... No new values can be created where a free conflict of ideas is impossible... The dictatorship of the proletariat opens a wider scope to human genius the more it CEASES to be a dictatorship. The socialist culture will flourish only in proportion to the dying away of the state. In that simple and unshakable historic law is contained the DEATH SENTENCE of the present political regime in the Soviet Union."

Compare this viciously disruptive bourgeois academic nonsense to Marxism-Leninism's understanding (see Lenin quotes above) that only THROUGH the massive STRENGTHENING of the Soviet state and proletarian dictatorship to involve ever-wider sections of the population in its administration and control would the advanced, efficient, self-regulatory, disciplined society of advanced socialism and then communism be reached. This REPRESENTS the withering away of the state. It supercedes in a non-antagonistic way the very far-advanced level of human civilisation which an efficient, invincible socialist state is. Communist culture does not develop AGAINST the dictatorship of the proletariat but BECAUSE OF it.

13

In the most monstrous propaganda smear against the world's first workers state, the rapidly degenerating Trotsky keeps his fingers crossed and sneers: "No independent technical cultural creation" can possibly be achieved in the USSR, this "totalitarian regime of fears, lies, and flattery".

To this day, this remains the basic ingredient of ALL bourgeois anti-communist propaganda, - to say that the proletarian dictatorship is hopelessly backward compared to the innovative brilliance of 'free' entrepreneurial science and technology.

But today, in every area of scientific, technological, and social research and development, the story is the same - that this IDENTICAL 'bureaucratic' political regime in the Soviet Union is steadily catching up and SURPASSING the West in one department after another. Overall, Soviet science and technology is the most powerful human civilisation has ever seen.

But in 1936, nothing could contain Trotsky's demented bourgeois subjectivism and his boundless vindictiveness and disruption against the world's first workers state because it had decided to boot him out for his incorrigible egotistical factionalism.

"Stalinism and fascism... are symmetrical phenomena. In many of their features they show a deadly similarity..."

"The improvement of the material situation of the workers does not reconcile them with the authorities; on the contrary, by increasing their self-respect and freeing their thought for general problems of politics, it prepares the way for an OPEN CONFLICT with the bureaucracy..."

"The Soviet population cannot rise to a higher level of culture without freeing itself from this humiliating subjection to a caste of usurpers... They will inevitably drive out the dishonest, impudent and unreliable watchman as soon as they see another possibility... (Ch 11)

"...with the working class and its sincere champions among the intelligentsia... our work will actually cause doubts and evoke distrust, - not of the revolution but of its usurpers. But that is the very goal we have set ourselves." (Appendix).

This Trotskyist 'distinction' is utterly dishonest and shallow. The 'distrust' he admitted he was deliberately evoking in the international working class INEVITABLY fell on the Soviet workers state itself (as Trotsky would have wanted and specifically spelled out in other places) and not on the narrower popular understanding of what is implied by 'usurpers'. In other words the hatred and distrust is bound to be engendered for the WHOLE concept of the Soviet Union, and in no way limited to Stalin's mistakes.

Trotsky ended his lifelong hostility to Leninism and his half-a-lifetime's dedication to 'evoking distrust of the Soviet workers state' with his most outrageous attempt to spread defeatist demoralisation in 1940, almost gleefully predicting fascism's triumph over the Soviet regime.

"We always started from the facts that the international policy of the Kremlin was determined by the new aristocracy's... incapacity to conduct a war.

"...the ruling caste is no longer capable of thinking about tomorrow. Its formula is that of all doomed regimes: 'after us the deluge'..."

"The war will topple many things and many individuals. Artifice, trickery, frame-ups and treasons will prove of no avail in escaping its severe judgment." (Statement to the British capitalist press on 'Stalin-Hitler's Quartermaster')...

"Stalin cannot make a war with discontented workers and peasants and with a decapitated Red Army." ('German-Soviet

Alliance').

"The level of the USSR's productive forces forbids a major war. . . . The involvement of the USSR in a major war before the end of this period would signify in any case a struggle with unequal weapons.

"The subjective factor, not less important than the material, has changed in the last years sharply for the worse. . . .

"Stalin cannot wage an offensive war with any hope of victory.

"Should the USSR enter the war with its innumerable victims and privations, the whole fraud of the official regime, its outrages and violence, will inevitably provoke a profound reaction on the part of the people, who have already carried out three revolutions in this century. . . .

"The present war can crush the Kremlin bureaucracy long before revolution breaks out in some capitalist country. . . ." (The Twin Star: Hitler-Stalin).

With Trotsky's declared intention of evoking international distrust of the Soviet workers state among ALL workers everywhere; - and with the Soviet Union facing the monstrous threat of fascist invasion from a German imperialism which was three times more developed and powerful than the still weak and backward USSR; and with Trotsky already having said many times (as above) that there was nothing to choose between fascism and 'Stalinism'; then the above deliberate spread of demoralisation that the Soviet workers state was about to get slaughtered, with the clear implication from Trotsky that no fate in history could be more thoroughly deserved, must rank as the most infamous treacherous attack on the world socialist revolution in all history. (For a more detailed analysis of Trotsky's deliberate spread of demoralisation to try to weaken the Soviet Workers State, read the Workers Party pamphlet: 'For a Leninist Party and World Socialist Revolution. Against Solidarity, Trotskyism, and Bureaucratic Centrism').

And once again, it is already a profound development in human HISTORY what actually happened in the Soviet workers state's war against fascism, exposing to ridicule

Trotsky's degenerate bourgeois-subjective wishful thinking. Fascism, as led by German imperialism, - the greatest counter-revolutionary strategy ever assembled by imperialism to wipe out for good from the face of the earth every last trace of the Bolshevik Revolution, - fascism was CRUSHED by the Soviet workers state, led by its Party and State leadership. And further huge chunks of the world fell to the socialist revolution as a direct result of that, principally China, changing the whole balance of international class forces, and ensuring the unbeatable consolidation of the socialist camp, and the USSR in particular.

And Trotsky's most notorious catch-phrases (which passed for 'Marxist theory' with this unchanging petty bourgeois opportunist) proved equally as bankrupt, then as now.

In the 'New Course', with Lenin paralysed, Trotsky's bragging reached absurd proportions.

"One cannot discover in my writings of that time (post-1905 Revolution) the slightest attempt to leap over the peasantry. The theory of the permanent revolution led directly to Leninism, and in particular to the April 1917 Theses."

But writing in March 1905 in "Social Democracy and the Provisional Revolutionary Government" against the pamphlet just brought out by Parvus and Trotsky where their 'permanent revolution' call for immediate purely working class dictatorship in Russia first appeared, Lenin declared:

"Only a revolutionary dictatorship supported by the vast majority of the people can be at all durable. . . .

"The Russian proletariat, however, is at present a minority of the population in Russia. It can become the great, overwhelming majority only if it combines with the mass of semi-proletarians, semi-proprietors, i. e. with the mass of the petty-bourgeois urban and rural poor."

After the Bolshevik Revolution had produced the concrete historical revolutionary dictatorship, Lenin repeatedly categorically confirmed his earlier analysis against Trotsky and Parvus.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is a special form of class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the working people, and the numerous nonproletarian strata of working people (the petty bourgeoisie, the small proprietors, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, etc), or the majority of these. It is an alliance against capital, an alliance aiming at the complete overthrow of capital, at the complete suppression of the resistance of the bourgeoisie and of any attempt on its part at restoration, an alliance aiming at the final establishment and consolidation of socialism." (Vol 24).

The class alliance of the proletariat and the overwhelming mass of poor peasantry remained the unshakable basis of Bolshevik state power throughout the 65 years consolidation of the socialist revolution to the point where the Soviet Union now describes itself as a state of the whole people where the industrialisation and modernisation of the countryside has reached such proportions that the beginnings of the complete disappearance of all differences between town and country are now clearly visible.

How did Trotsky view the now unarguable reality of history, - the class alliance in power of the proletariat and peasantry?

In the 1905 Revolution when he was an open Menshevik (petty bourgeois opportunist), Trotsky's slogan was for "no Tsar but

a workers government", - a revolution without the peasantry, or in other words an immediate pure working class dictatorship against ALL the petty bourgeois strata, - including the overwhelmingly most numerous, the mass of the peasantry.

Lenin's consistent line against this ultra-left nonsense, beginning with the March 1905 work quoted above, was correctly used by the Bolsheviks for the rest of Trotsky's life to secure the Revolution's triumph and the oblivion of Trotskyism (except for a few remaining petty bourgeois sects in the richest imperialist countries today).

In June 1914, for example, in "The disruption of unity under cover of outcries for unity", Lenin noted: "The old participants in the Marxist movement in Russia know Trotsky very well, and there is no need to discuss him for their benefit. But the younger generation of workers do not know him, and it is therefore necessary to discuss him, for he is typical of all the five groups abroad which in fact are also vacillating between the liquidators and the Party. . . .

"The only ground the 'Tushino turncoats' have for claiming that they stand above groups is that they 'borrow' their ideas from one group one day and from another the next day. . . . At the end of 1903, Trotsky was an ardent Menshevik, i. e. he deserted from the Iskrais to the Economists. . . . In 1904-05, he deserted the Mensheviks and occupied a vacillating position, now cooperating with Martynov (the Economist), now proclaiming his absurdly Left 'permanent revolution' theory. In 1906-07 he approached the Bolsheviks, and in the spring of 1907 he declared that he was in agreement with Rosa Luxemburg.

"In the period of disintegration, after long 'non-factional' vacillation, he again went to the Right, and in August 1912, he entered into a bloc with the liquidators. He has now deserted them again, although in substance he reiterates their shoddy ideas.

"Such types are characteristic of the flotsam of past historical formations, of the time when the mass working-class movement in Russia was still dormant. . . ."

Trotsky's unstable shallow impressionism was still dominant in his 1915 article 'The Struggle for Power' where he concluded that the revolutionary role of the peasantry was bound to subside.

Lenin attacked this article, accusing Trotsky of "denying" the "role of the peasantry", declaring: "Trotsky is in fact helping the liberal labour politicians in Russia who by 'denial' of the role of the peasantry mean REFUSAL to rouse the peasants to revolution". (November 1915 'Two Lines in the Revolution').

Even after the Bolshevik Revolution, over to which Trotsky had yet again opportunistically swapped sides in August 1917 just eight weeks before the seizure of power as soon as he saw which way the wind was blowing

ocial, the arrogant, irresponsible, egotistical, impressionist muddle remained an incurable characteristic of Trotsky's 'theoretical' contribution.

In 1922, Trotsky was already planning his attempt to bamboozle the Soviet masses and seize supreme power in view of Lenin's inevitable approaching early death, and so he dusted down his 'permanent revolution' claim to theoretical fame for the preface of his new pamphlet 'The Year 1905', preparing the way for the 'New Course' attempt to rewrite Bolshevik and Leninist history (see above quotes).

Being the complete idealist (dominated by the subjective ideas in his petty bourgeois head rather than by the material class reality on the ground), Trotsky provocatively asserted that in the wake of the Revolution five years earlier, the proletarian vanguard would now "come into hostile collision not only with all the bourgeois groupings which supported the proletariat during the first stages of its revolutionary struggle, but also with the broad masses of the peasants with whose assistance it came into power. The contradictions in the position of a workers government in a backward country with an overwhelmingly peasant population can be solved only on an international scale, in the arena of the world proletarian revolution."

The reality of the Bolshevik proletarian dictatorship for Lenin, (who gave it theoretical consciousness and led it) was an alliance between the labouring masses of the peasantry and the working class, "an alliance aiming at the complete overthrow of capital... at the final establishment and consolidation of socialism".

The philistine muddle in the head of Trotsky (who only opportunistically joined the Bolshevik proletarian dictatorship at the last minute after having fought against it all his life) provocatively preached that there would be a "hostile collision... with the broad masses of the peasants", and that the incurable "contradictions" of the world's first workers state "can be solved ONLY in the arena of the world proletarian revolution." In reality, the opposite happened.

This basic rightwing defeatism of middle class Trotskyism is the same outcome in practice of Trotsky's ultra-left provocations at the other extreme of his endless vacillations. The effective insoluble contradictions IN FACT of Trotsky's 'permanent revolution' opportunist schematism as applied to Russia add up in reality to permanent hostility to the proletarian dictatorship, — the essence of Menshevism.

15

Trotsky's ultra-left provocative splitting tactics associated with his 'own' self-publicised 'permanent theory' have nothing whatever to do with the correct Marxist-Leninist understanding of uninterrupted revolution

(wrongly credited to Trotsky in a Workers Party publication four years ago before the Party's break with Trotskyism).

As early as 1850 in his Address to the Communist League, Marx gave tentative outlines of the general pattern of revolutionary struggle. "While the democratic petty bourgeois wish to bring the revolution to a conclusion as quickly as possible... it is our interest and our task to make the revolution permanent until all more or less possessing classes have been forced out of their position of dominance, until the proletariat has conquered state power, and the association of proletarians, not only in one country but in all the dominant countries of the world, has advanced so far that competition among the proletarians of these countries has ceased and that at least the decisive productive forces are concentrated in the hands of the proletarians."

To all but the totally politically illiterate or the most extreme petty bourgeois anti-Soviet anti-communists, Trotsky's ludicrous boast in "New Course" (see above) that Lenin had to crib an understanding of the uninterrupted revolution from Trotsky before Lenin's historic April Theses could appear is not even worthy of refutation. But for the record, Lenin for example declared in 1905 in "Two Tactics" (July):

"The proletariat must carry to completion the democratic revolution by allying to itself the mass of the peasantry in order to crush by force the resistance of the autocracy and to paralyse the instability of the bourgeoisie. The proletariat must accomplish the socialist revolution by allying to itself the mass of the semiproletarian elements of the population in order to crush by force the resistance of the bourgeoisie and to paralyse the instability of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie." In September in 'Attitude toward the peasant movement', he added: "From the democratic revolution we shall at once... in accordance with... the strength of the... organised proletariat, begin to pass to the socialist revolution. We stand for uninterrupted revolution. We shall not stop half way."

In November 1915, Lenin wrote: "The proletariat is fighting... to capture power, for a republic, for the confiscation of the land... for the participation of the 'non-proletarian masses of the people' in freeing bourgeois Russia from military-feudal 'imperialism' (tsarism). And the proletariat will immediately take advantage of this liberation of bourgeois Russia from Tsarism and from the agrarian power of the landlords, not to aid the rich peasants in their struggle against the rural worker, but to bring about the socialist revolution in alliance with the proletarians of Europe."

And in "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", Lenin refers to his "Two Tactics" quote (see above) to conclude on the uninterrupted development be-

tween the two revolutions in 1917:

"Things have turned out just as we said they would. The course taken by the revolution has confirmed the correctness of our reasoning. First, with the 'whole' of the peasantry against the monarchy, against the landlords, against the medieval regime (and to that extent the revolution remains bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic). Then, with the poor peasants, with the semiproletarians, with all the exploited, against capitalism, including the rural rich, the kulaks, the profiteers, and to that extent the revolution becomes a socialist one. To attempt to raise an artificial Chinese Wall between the first and second, to separate them by anything else than the degree of preparedness of the proletariat and the degree of its unity with the poor peasants, means monstrously to distort Marxism, to vulgarise it, to substitute liberalism in its place."

Against this matchless grasp of Marxist revolution and the ability to lead it, no wonder Lenin so ridiculed Trotsky's anti-Marxist philistinism of 'instant revolution', scorning him in 1915 for refusing to "stop to think why, for ten whole years, life has passed by this fine theory." (Nov 1915, 'Two Lines').

Dismissing Trotsky's divisive ultra-left opportunism as semi-Menshevik theory, Lenin added that the 'permanent revolution' gimmick "borrows from the Bolsheviks their call for a resolute revolutionary struggle and the conquest of political power by the proletariat, and from the Mensheviks the 'repudiation' of the role of the peasantry." (On Two Lines of the Revolution).

He then condemns "Trotsky's muddled thinking" for confusing workers whether the beginnings of the next revolutionary upsurge in Russia would be 'bourgeois-democratic' or directly 'socialist' at first. (See above quotes from "The Renegade Kautsky".)

Thus Trotsky's 'permanent' gibberish led him into fundamental (and dangerously misleading) error on all three revolutions. His shallow ultra-left bankruptcy totally ignored the important role of the revolutionary peasant upsurge in the 1905 rising; failed to prepare workers for the bourgeois-democratic content of the February 1917 revolution; and provocatively tried to persuade the proletariat after the October 1917 revolution to break up its vital alliance with the mass of poor labouring peasantry.

The other frail thread of Trotskyist 'theory' fared even worse, — his reactionary refusal to support the building of socialism in the USSR because it was 'impossible'.

In 1906 in his pamphlet 'Our Revolution' Trotsky pontificated: "Without direct STATE support (emphasis added) from the European proletariat, the working class of Russia will not be able to maintain itself in power and to transform its temporary rule into a lasting socialist dictatorship. This we cannot doubt for an instant."

16 In 1917 in his 'Peace Program' pamphlet, Trotsky directly attacked Lenin's conclusion from the uneven development of imperialism that "the victory of socialism is possible first in one separate capitalist country" and with Russia particularly in mind.

Trotsky replied categorically: "It would be hopeless to think, as historical experience and theoretical considerations testify, that for example a revolutionary Russia could survive in the face of a conservative Europe."

Trotsky plunged even deeper into reactionary defeatism in 1922 in a new postscript he wrote for a new edition of his 'Peace Program' pamphlet, declaring: "The assertion reiterated several times in the 'Peace Program' that a proletarian revolution cannot culminate victoriously within national bounds may perhaps seem to some readers to have been refuted by the nearly five years experience of our Soviet republic. But such a conclusion would be unwarranted. The fact that the workers state has held out against the whole world in one country, and a backward country at that, only testifies to the colossal might of the proletariat which in other more advanced more civilised countries will be truly capable of performing miracles. But while we have held our ground as a state politically and militarily, we have not arrived, or even begun to arrive, at the building of a socialist society... As long as the bourgeoisie remains in power in the other European countries we will be compelled, in our struggle against economic isolation, to strive for agreement with the capitalist world; at the same time it may be said with certainty that these agreements may at best help us to mitigate some of our economic ills, to take one or another step forward, but real progress of a socialist economy in Russia will become possible only after the victory of the proletariat in the major European countries."

And as quoted above from 1922 in Trotsky's preface to his book 'The Year 1905' provocatively calling for a "hostile collision" between the working class and "the broad masses of the peasants" in demented egotistical justification for his bankrupt, splitting, 'permanent revolution' schematism, Trotsky proclaims that the insurmountable "contradictions in the position of a workers government in a backward country with an overwhelmingly peasant population can be solved ONLY on an international scale, in the arena of the world proletarian revolution."

Marxism-Leninism sees things quite differently. It was against another reactionary ultra-left slogan from Trotsky "For a United States of Europe" that Lenin first explained in August 1915 that:

"The victory of socialism is possible first in several or even in one capitalist country alone. After expropriating the capitalists and organising their own socialist production,

the victorious proletariat of that country will arise against the rest of the world, the capitalist world, attracting to its cause the oppressed classes of other countries, stirring uprisings in those countries against the capitalists, and in case of need using even armed force against the exploiting classes and their states... The abolition of classes is impossible without a dictatorship of the oppressed class, of the proletariat. A free union of nations in socialism is impossible without a more or less prolonged and stubborn struggle of the socialist republics against the backward states.

"It is for these reasons that...the slogan for a United States of Europe is an erroneous one..."

"The slogan...may be wrongly interpreted to mean that the victory of socialism in a single country is impossible."

From then until his last published article in 'Pravda' in March 1923 ('Better Fewer, But Better'), Lenin maintained his line against the defeatist doctrinaire illusions of Trotskyist shallow schematism which tried to divert the Russian workers state into paralysis with daydreams about the longed-for revolutionary breakthrough in West Europe, or else to provoke it into desperate foreign adventures to try to get this breakthrough started.

Outlining the tactics for the USSR, Lenin then wrote: "We must display extreme caution so as to preserve our workers government and to retain our small-scale and very small-scale peasantry under its leadership and authority. We have the advantage that the whole world is now passing to a movement that must give rise to a world socialist revolution. But we are labouring under the disadvantage that the imperialists have succeeded in splitting the world into two camps..."

"Can we save ourselves from the impending conflict with these imperialist countries?...the outcome...can be forecast only because in the long run capitalism itself is educating and training the vast majority of the population of the globe for the struggle."

"In the last analysis the outcome of the struggle will be determined by the fact that at Russia, India, China, etc, account for the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe. And during the past few years it is this majority that has been drawn into the struggle for emancipation with extraordinary rapidity so that in this respect there cannot be the slightest doubt what the final outcome of the world struggle will be. In this sense, the complete victory of socialism is fully and absolutely assured."

"But what interests us is not the inevitability of this complete victory of socialism but the tactics which we, the Russian Communist Party and the Russian Soviet Government, should pursue to prevent the West-European counter-revolutionary states

from crushing us. To ensure our existence until the next military conflict between the counter-revolutionary imperialist West and the revolutionary and nationalist East, between the most civilised countries of the world and the Orientally backward countries which, however, comprise the majority, - this majority must become civilised..."

"We must strive to build up a state in which the workers retain the leadership of the peasants, in which they retain the confidence of the peasants, and by exercising the greatest economy remove every trace of extravagance from our social relations..."

"...we shall be able by exercising the greatest possible thrift in the economic life of our state, to use every saving we make to develop our large-scale machine industry, to develop electrification, the hydraulic extraction of peat, to complete the Volkhov Power Project, etc."

"In this, and in this alone, lies our hope..."

Lenin only dreamed of the hydraulic extraction of peat, and one tiny power project. Today, the colossal Soviet economy produces as much in just one day as this entire programme Lenin dreamed of. But the greatest triumph was Lenin's understanding that the victory of world socialism would arrive via this slow painful build-up, first in a single country, Russia, and later through socialism in the other great 'oriental' countries (as it later turned out, first through the rest of impoverished 'oriental' Europe (East Europe), then Korea and China, then South East Asia (Indo-China), then Central America followed by southern Africa, and so on).

Lenin's consistent understanding for the triumph of socialism first in one country, in Russia, and then via the backward countries to a final position of world dominance, - a line he persistently fought for against the paralysed doctrinaire middle class defeatism of the Trotskyists who saw hope only in a West European revolution, - is exactly how the world has developed in its dialectical materialist, Marxist reality which the petty bourgeois opportunist Trotsky could never grasp.

16

Once the four-year open struggle for supreme power was launched by the Trotskyists after Lenin's death, and the Bolshevik Party began organising in earnest behind the Leninist line winning victory after victory throughout the Party and the Soviet Union, the middle class slander and hysteria of the Opposition grew steadily more irresponsible, swinging from one extreme of sneering at "socialism in one country" to the other extreme of accusing the leadership of trying to reinstate the capitalist class counter-revolution.

Even the West's favourite, most poisonous, anti-Marxist dissident 'historian' Roy

Medvedev in his lifeless bourgeois-idealist impressions of the 1920s struggle has to conclude that the Opposition was almost a laughing stock with its inconsistent, opportunist criticism which was overwhelmingly rejected by the Soviet masses.

Medvedev has collected and analysed various Opposition-Trotskyist attacks on the Party and State leadership in the 1924-27 period when they were still allowed full access to all the media, the Party press, and to all Party meetings. He lists the following contradictions.

“The technological backwardness of our country and the resulting low productivity of labour are enormous obstacles to the building of a socialist society. Because of this backwardness, the transition to a truly socialist organisation of production (in which the workers are transformed from instruments into masters of production, and the commodity character of production is eliminated) is impossible without aid from advanced countries, without a world socialist revolution.”

“There are two mutually exclusive positions. One is the position of the proletariat building socialism, the other the position of the bourgeoisie trying to switch our development onto the rails of capitalism... Between these two positions, but moving closer all the time to the second, lies the Stalinist line which consists of brief zigzags to the left, and extended ones to the right.”

“Ambassadors of Ustrialov (emigre bourgeois academic), yes and of Miliukov too (exiled head of Russia's main capitalist party the Cadets), are in Moscow. They are in fact directing work in the Commissariat of Finance, the Commissariat of Agriculture, the State Planning Commission; they are directing more than we and Kalinin are. In words, these 'Changing Landmarks' (emigre bourgeois academic paper) professors are merely working for us, but in fact they are making the decisions.”

(Opposition statements 1926-1927 quoted in Medvedev's 'Let History Judge').

Trotsky wrote: "The ruling circles are increasingly growing together with the upper strata of Soviet-Nepman society. Two strata are being created, two life styles, two types of attitudes, two types of relationships, or, to put it more strongly, the elements of a dual power in everyday life are being created." This ludicrous exaggeration is accusing the Party and Government leaders of the Soviet workers state of allowing capitalist counter-revolution ('dual power'), (- which had been smashed FOR EVER by the Bolshevik dictatorship,) - to be reintroduced into the USSR. The Party and Government leadership was in fact building socialism, - exactly as the Opposition hysterically accused them with the sneer "socialism in one country" in the other contra-

dictory half of their vicious, destructive, and irresponsible propaganda.

"Further development may transform it," Trotsky went on, "into a political dual power; and a political dual power would be a direct threat to the dictatorship of the proletariat..." (From the official 1927 publication of Opposition criticism and Party replies).

Even the rightwing anti-Marxist liberal Roy Medvedev feels obliged to comment in retrospect: "It goes without saying that the upper echelons of Party and State were NOT growing together with the upper levels of the Nepman bourgeoisie in 1926", (or at any other time.)

"Stalin stressed Party unity; he accused the Opposition of fomenting factional conflict. At a time when the building of socialism was only beginning, and the question of 'who will win' was still far from decided, the Party masses felt a powerful urge for unity, which allowed Stalin to rally round himself an overwhelming majority of the Party.

"Practically speaking, by the autumn of 1926, that is only a few months after the creation of the 'united' Opposition, - it had become clear that this Opposition was foundering. When its leaders realised this, they gave the signal for retreat. In 'Pravda' for October 17, 1926, a declaration by Zinoviev, Kamenev, Sokolnikov, Trotsky, Pyatakov, and Evdokimov briefly reaffirmed their views (against the Party leadership)... but acknowledged at length their sins against the Leninist rules of Party organisation. They had formed factions to support their views. Now they called upon their followers to dissolve all factional groups and to confine further advocacy of their views to the forms provided by the Party statute and by the decisions of the Congresses and the Central Committee.' On this basis they hoped that recently expelled Oppositionists would earn readmission to the Party where they could join the struggle....

"However the Opposition leaders could not live up to such declarations. They could not help displaying their dissatisfaction with Stalin and the CC majority. While continuing to defend their views in 'the forms provided by the Party statute', - newspaper and magazine articles, petitions, and declarations, - in many instances they were forced (?) by the logic of struggle (?) to overstep the limits of the Party statute...."

Medvedev tries to put as nice a gloss as he can on the destructive, disruptive, factional wrecking activities of the subjective, petty-bourgeois, individualist opponents of the Bolshevik Dictatorship, who were hoping to bring down the Soviet workers state by accusing its Party and Government leaders of handing over power to the capitalist counter-revolution. But this demagogy was ridiculed by the "overwhelming majority of the Party" and the masses as a

whole.

Having abused their privilege of limitless criticism of Party and Government decisions by their endless self-confessed factional disruption of the still-perilously-difficult work of trying to consolidate the economic reconstruction of the world's first workers state (before imperialist armed intervention was renewed again), the Bolshevik Dictatorship eventually reluctantly carried out the special measures Lenin had insisted upon at the 10th Party Congress to preserve the all-important unity of the Party and State regime, - and began expelling the leading factionalists, including Trotsky.

Even the rightwing anti-communist Medvedev's sour anti-Marxist view of Soviet history cannot conceal the fact that the petty-bourgeois Trotskyist Opposition had every chance to get their views across - but were utterly, contemptuously rejected by the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet proletariat. Medvedev continues:

“The Opposition responded by attempting to stage an independent demonstration on the 10th anniversary (1927) of the October Revolution. But this demonstration (the Opposition leaders spoke from the balcony of a building on what is today Gorky Street) was a demonstration of weakness rather than strength.

"There were almost no workers in attendance. Student youth and office workers predominated. In comparison with the official parade, the Opposition demonstration made a pathetic impression.

"An attempt to organise an Opposition demonstration in Leningrad was even more unsuccessful. Zinoviev, who greatly overestimated his influence in that city, was almost beaten up in the official parade.

"A peculiar Opposition demonstration occurred at the funeral of A A Joffe who committed suicide in 1927. Joffe, a prominent diplomat who had served the Party well, especially in negotiating the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, was one of Trotsky's closest supporters. An eyewitness to the funeral, M P Yakubovitch, describes it in his memoirs.

"The coffin containing Joffe's body was standing in the building of the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs on Lubianka Square, waiting to be taken to the Novodevichi Cemetery. A huge crowd filled all the streets around the building and blocked traffic. Trotsky made his way through the





After nearly 5 years open hostility to the state and party leadership, Trotsky's fake-
18 'Left' Opposition speech at Joffe's funeral is a pathetic failure. For refusing to end
his factionalising against majority rule, the Bolsheviks then expelled him.

crowd with difficulty accompanied by Ra-
dek and Muralov.... (Among those who fol-
lowed the coffin, incidentally, was Nade-
zhda Allilueva, Stalin's wife). A lot of peo-
ple followed the coffin, - for the most part
Komsomol student youth who had Trotskyite
leanings. There were quite a few former
military and military-political officials who
had worked under Trotsky in the past....
At the cemetery after the official funeral
speech delivered by Chicherin on behalf of
the Central Committee, - Trotsky, Zinoviev
and Kamenev spoke. Trotsky's speech was
largely an appeal for the restoration of Party
unity.... it contained no harsh thrusts, the
name of Stalin was not mentioned at all.
But Zinoviev spoke in a vehement, aggress-
ive tone. He spoke of the crimes of Stalin,
who had 'betrayed the Party's interests, vio-
lated its members' rights, misrepresented the
Party's wishes.'

"When the participants were leaving the
gates of the Novodevichi Monastery after the
funeral, a military unit stood nearby in for-
mation, probably sent to fire the funeral
salute. A young man in the group around Tr-
otsky broke away, ran up to the unit, and
shouted: 'Red Army comrades. Give a che-
er for the leader of the Red Army, Com-
rade Trotsky!'. A critical minute followed.
No one moved in the formation. Dead si-
lence reigned. Trotsky stood some distance
away, also silent, and looked at the ground.
Then he turned and went to a car, followed
by Zinoviev and Kamenev. It must have
been obvious for those watching this scene
that Trotsky's cause was hopelessly lost.

The new generation of Red Army soldiers
did not know him, had not taken part in
the Civil War, were raised in a new spirit.
The name of Trotsky meant little or noth-
ing to them. The composition of the fune-
ral demonstration also made one stop and
think, for there were no workers in it. The
united Opposition had no proletarian support?

Most of the basic assumptions of this de-
scription are outrageous, sick, Trotskyist
exaggerations and distortions. But these
falsifications only make more compelling
this Trotskyist acknowledgment of how com-
prehensively Trotsky was trounced by the
Bolshevik Party and State leadership in the
open, democratic, inner-party struggle
for political authority in continuing Lenin's
revolutionary dictatorship.

17

The Bulletin's re-examination of Lenin's
irresistible proof of Trotsky's factional trou-
ble-making and crippled Menshevik-bour-
geois understanding (which made farcical
any notion that Trotsky might have succeed-
ed to the leadership of the Bolshevik dictat-
orship after Lenin), has prompted some over-
hasty and premature conclusions about the
Workers Party's understanding of Stalinism.

The volume and ferocity of such prejudices
is ample evidence that the difficulties of
petty bourgeois shallowness and impression-
ism, which helped create the problem of St-
alinism in the first place, are still hindering
the solution to it.

The anti-regime dissident Roy Medvedev
and his book 'Let History Judge' are a prize
example.

Medvedev admits in the foreword that he
has sent to the West a "solely negative and
one-sided" review of the Stalin era, a ma-
jor part of Soviet history. He naively adds
that he has done this because "thousands of
books have been written about the positive
aspects". Written, but drowned out in the
incessant flood of anti-Soviet propaganda
which swamps everyone in the 'free' world
from the cradle to the grave, and of which
Medvedev and his books are now part.

With even greater naiveness, Medvedev
declares that "the imperialists cannot sup-
port those Communists (i. e. Medvedev) who
criticise Stalinism in order to invigorate
the Communist movement" but that the
West only "supports slanderers who use cri-
ticism of Stalin to discredit socialism, com-
munism, and Marxism-Leninism."

The fact is that no dissident has had more
support in the West than Medvedev.

And this has nothing to do with any fiend-
ishly cunning bourgeois mis-use or adapta-
tion of Medvedev. It is Medvedev himself
who declares in the same foreword, which
masquerades as a 'Marxist-Leninist' evalu-
ation of the world class struggle into which
his book is launched, - that "many forces
are pushing the world Communist movem-
ent onto a wrong road full of new tragedies,
new dangerous gambles, adventures, new
cults of personality. The road to disaster
can be by-passed only if the dogmatists and
sectarians (i. e. the Soviet regime) can be
confronted...."
And that is the sole major point he makes

about the world situation in 1968. Not a
word does he utter about what dominant
world imperialism is preparing for mankind.

With a sick bourgeois world-view of this
kind, no wonder the West gives rapt attent-
ion every time Medvedev coughs, let alone
sends his biased drivel to the West.

And when Medvedev is called in for que-
stioning about his dissident political activ-
ities against the Soviet regime as he was
recently, the capitalist press and television
in the West have an absolute field day.

Medvedev's slanderous presentation of the
world's problems as consisting of the 'com-
munist road to disaster' and 'the need to sp-
eak the truth about the continuing Stalinist
danger' is nothing but a shallow repackaging
of Trotsky's counter-revolutionary factional-
ising. It was having to deal with such dead-
ly opposition to the Bolshevik dictatorship
with such inadequate Party leadership res-
ources (after Lenin's death) that was one of
the greatest contributions to Stalinism in
the first place.

It was hard enough for Lenin to cope with
Trotsky's bourgeois factionalising, requiring
the bitterly regretted special expulsion pro-
visions of the 10th Party Congress to protect
the Party adequately.

The most remarkable thing about the sav-
age conflict of opposing class forces, exp-
ressing themselves through various factions
after Lenin's death, is not the appalling mi-
stakes and crimes that were committed,
but the fact that the Soviet workers state
survived at all in such an unlikely and hos-
tile international environment.

And not only survived but has expanded
into a world socialist system (which is now
challenging imperialism's rule totally,) -
the greatest development in all human hi-
story. Revolution is surging forward to ch-
allenge US capitalist class financial
and military domination of the planet in
one country after another, one region after
another. And this the miserable bourgeois
worm Medvedev calls "the communist road
to disaster".

Those who argue that a visit from the
KGB and confiscation of Medvedev's man-
uscripts will not help the 'quest for truth'
against Stalinist distortions and past mista-
kes are missing the point in a giant Trotsk-
yist way.

As Lenin stressed ceaselessly, the greatest
danger to be guarded against for the prec-
arious survival of the Soviet Union was to
avoid any major split in the class forc-
es backing the Party and State leadership.

If such a split had occurred, imperialist
intervention would have finished off the
world's first workers state in no time at all.

The dangers if bourgeois propaganda could
engineer major splits in the Soviet state to-
day, or within the socialist camp as a whole,
could be no less disastrous.

That imperialism has never been
further from creating a split in the



The Menshevik-minded minority in 1927 against the Leninist socialist state.

The Bolshevik majority for the greatest possible strengthening of the socialist state.



Soviet Union than it is today is true but also a remark of scandalous irresponsibility from Trotskyists because it begs the all-important question of why?

It is ONLY the Leninist grasp of the paramount importance of maintaining an all-powerful united Party and State dictatorship (which the anti-Trotsky leaders showed after Lenin's death) that has made the USSR and the socialist camp the invincible anti-imperialist historic force that it is.

It is piddling light-mindedness to reduce this unprecedented period of human political and economic achievement to smart-alec cynicisms like "But did Stalinism as such do more harm than good?"

Viewing as a whole the totality of world development in the epoch in which Stalinism was a phenomenon does not at all prevent the real world communist revolutionary movement from examining the hideous mistakes and crimes of the Stalin period and learning the lessons from them. It is Medvedev himself who declares in the foreword to 'Let History Judge': "This work is based on the numerous Soviet publications that have followed the policy of the 20th and 22nd Party Congresses in examining Stalin's cult honestly and truthfully."

This does not at all mean that everything the Kremlin now does is either faultlessly Leninist or above criticism. Far from it.

But it does emphasise the ONLY possible correct revolutionary approach to the modern world, - one which bases itself on UNCONDITIONAL SOLIDARITY with the Soviet workers state, (or 'the Kremlin regime' to put it at its bluntest to disarm the hypocritical phrasemongering of all the Trotsk-

ist bogus 'defenders' of the USSR. The Soviet workers state is synonymous with its Party and State leadership in this argument. It is one of the oldest and silliest dirty tricks of the Trotskyists to try to pretend that the 'Bolshevik revolution as a whole' is supported but not its Party and State leaderships. Lenin's abusive reply to this bureaucratic muck-stirring is one of the gems of his anti-Trotskyist writings.)

It is a childish and philistine rejection of dialectics to pretend that such an approach of unconditional solidarity with the Kremlin regime 'precludes criticism' or means the 'unchallengeable tenure of office of particular individuals.'

What it precludes is the hopelessly disruptive "everything is rotten" subjectivism which Lenin so far-sightedly exposed and disarmed in Trotsky in the 'trade union' debate over how socialism was actually going to be achieved in the Soviet Union.

It precludes the degenerate counter-revolutionary swamp the present-day Trotskyists have sunk into, ending up even further to the right than Thatcher or Reagan by organising Cold War shipping-trade boycotts of the Soviet workers state in support of the CIA-Vatican 'Solidarity' Catholic counter-revolution in Poland. (See ILWP book),

Compared to the criminal cover-ups and institutionalised lack of accountability of the 'free' world capitalist states for their endless crimes against humanity such as the Vietnam war, the build-up of Hitler fascism, two world wars, endless counter-revolutionary overthrows of progressive regimes, etc, etc, - the 65 years of Soviet history have been a revolutionary open

book of minute examination, criticism, and removal of leaders - and not only in the majority of that time (either side of Stalin's 20-year-period of unrivalled ascendancy) but also during Stalin's period itself.

The need for unconditional solidarity with the 'Kremlin regime', - while in no way reducing the requirement to expose, analyse, and learn from every mistake, - asserts the rootedness in Soviet historical conditions of Stalinism.

There is a world of difference between stressing this and the completely false assertion that 'Stalinism was inevitable', an anti-Marxist philosophical approach.

It was precisely the need better to understand the real material political and economic circumstances (of the Bolshevik Revolution and the world socialist revolution) that alone could have continued Lenin's masterly leadership through the indescribable hardships and difficulties of Soviet Russia's survival, after Lenin's premature death, thereby possibly helping to soften the bitterness and sharpness of the internal struggles of the Soviet workers state and avoid some of the more tragic injustices and errors.

The Soviet socialist revolution that had to be fought for in reality, however, was the multi-million struggling mass, - with all its faults and weaknesses, - that was left AFTER Lenin's death, - struggling with an already-hard-to-control bureaucratic-conservative framework and surrounded by the unexpected durability of the imperialist system and the unexpected strength of counter-revolutionary revisionist ideology.

This emphasises how in the Russia of the time there was no comparison between the prodigious genius of Lenin and the abilities of the rest of the Bolshevik leadership, not that Stalinism was inevitable.

But it also emphasises that such a high level of mastery and understanding did NOT emerge after Lenin's death, - or anything like it, - from any quarter. Individual points of correct criticism - in retrospect sounding very 'far-sighted' or 'wise' sometimes - can be found among all the factions and pretenders to the Soviet leadership. But the historical record shows, - led by Lenin's demolition of Trotsky's inability to grasp how socialism had to be built and the proletariat's Party dictatorship and alliance with the peasantry implemented (in the trade union debate), - that the overwhelming majority of the Party and the working class CORRECTLY united around the Stalinist majority leadership in the DECISIVE all-out struggle after Lenin's death. Stalin as an individual would no doubt have been inclined towards authoritarian arbitrariness anyway, (although no more than Trotsky, Bukharin, Kamenev, and Zinoviev, as individual egotists had shown signs of being.) But what conspired to give Stalin's particular limitations such a prominent historical role later on was largely the hopelessly sub-



jectiv and sectarian factionalising and INCORRECT policies of the other groups in the post-Lenin period. (See past Bulletin analyses of the hopelessly wrong policies of the most 'talented' anti-Leninist pretender - Trotsky).

Notions that Stalin's personality cult and authoritarianism were 'necessary' because of the peculiar cultural backwardness of the semi-feudal vastnesses and poverty of the Tsarist empire run into the same philosophical objections as the 'Stalinism was inevitable' argument smacking of anti-Marxist fatalism and ruling out that better understanding based on a higher level of Leninist struggle could have provided the needed leadership without the damaging weaknesses of the Stalinist leadership.

Playing down the wretched crimes and distortions of Stalinism is not to be compared with the ludicrous counter-revolutionary betrayal of the Bolshevik Revolution that Trotskyism's false identification of the overall Soviet triumph with the failures of Stalinism clearly represents. But such uncritical solidarity with the Soviet workers state does great harm. The negative aspects of the Stalin epoch obviously did enormous damage to the world socialist revolution. For living proof of this, just examine on one side the abysmal reformist and anti-communist, - and anti-Soviet, - imbecilities of most of the 'official' (still!) Communist Parties in the West; and on the other side the demented anti-communist Trotskyist 'alternatives' spawned in part by the very feebleness of these CPs.

Imperialism and its bourgeois ideology remain the SOURCE of reformist and revisionist illusions. And it is ludicrous Trotskyist counter-revolutionary nonsense to muddle up the Stalinist symptom of counter-revolutionary influence with its CAUSE in bourgeois ideology and imperialist power.

But it remains the task of revolutionaries to isolate within the workers movement ALL expressions of anti-Marxist understanding reflected from bourgeois influence, - including the temptation to play down or

rationalise Stalinist mistakes in Soviet history.

It was precisely Lenin's point in his withering demolition of Trotskyism in the trade union debate that while he was utterly opposed to Trotsky's bureaucratic wrecking of Party unity with his poisonous, careerist accusations against Tomsky and Lozovsky, and against Trotsky's posturing quackery in pretending that the generations-long struggle to overcome the cultural backwardness of state bureaucracy could be achieved overnight with one 'clever' resolution, - Lenin was nevertheless adamant that the particular Tsektran trade union leadership's bureaucratic EXCESSES which had started the row, should, like ALL such EXCESSES wherever they occurred, be specifically pointed out and condemned, even if there was not the slightest chance that such excesses could be prevented from occurring again, again, and again, for decades to come, throughout the Soviet workers state.

Enormous progress has been made since the October 1917 Revolution in the absurdly backward, ignorant, and superstition-riddled Tsarist Russia, - progress all the way to the world socialist revolution now being poised on the brink of outright final victory over imperialism on an international scale, able to outstrip capitalism economically, politically, socially, militarily and technologically.

This does not lessen the tragedy caused by bureaucratised fanaticism in the period (under Stalin) of the first spectacular triumphs of socialist construction (simultaneous with Trotsky's agitation for the regime's overthrow, and the insidious fifth-column preparations of German imperialism for a fascist-military onslaught on the USSR with the encouragement of the entire West,) - but it does put that tragedy in context.

It also puts in context the never-ending problems of bureaucratic conservatism which will still be observable to some extent all the time that state structures are still needed for the development of civilisation, - until the arrival of communism in fact,

and the withering away of all need for any formal authority of any kind because of the universally high levels of culture and education achieved permitting society to work best through self-regulation.

The final triumph of the world socialist revolution now in view is also an indispensable understanding for dialectically combining correct criticism of Soviet policy mistakes with unconditional support for the Moscow regime. It also makes clear the ultimate counter-revolutionary bankruptcy of Trotsky's reactionary un-Marxist nonsense about a 'ruling caste' based on socialist production and property relations which in fact can only support the working class in power, and about a non-existent 'political revolution' to overthrow this 'caste', - a bourgeois ideological idiocy which has been a godsend for the CIA and fascism to dress up as 'socialism' one degenerate right-wing putsch after another against the socialist states. (Read the Workers Party book "For a Leninist Party & World Socialist Revolution. Against Solidarity, Trotskyism, and Bureaucratic Centrism").

Two generations of 'lefts' in the affluent West have now been seduced into the sterile dead-end of Trotskyist anti-Sovietism by the boom-time illusions of 'freedom' and 'democracy' and the relentless pressure of anti-communist propaganda. The capitalist system is not only safe from these joke 'revolutionaries' but often subtly encourages them (to help split and weaken Western working class solidarity with the real world revolutionary socialist movement led by the socialist camp.)

But in the overwhelming majority of the 'free' world where the brutal realities of the slump and imperialist exploitation make a farce of all pretence of capitalist democracy and have forced the masses into real revolutionary struggle, there is contempt for the armchair-socialist charades of academic Trotskyist point-scoring.

Faced with a life-or-death struggle against armed imperialism for their socialist revolution, the masses of Vietnam, China, Korea, Cuba, Angola, Mozambique, Laos, Kampuchea, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Zimbabwe, Namibia, Azania, Grenada, Nicaragua, El Salvador, etc, have turned not to Trotskyism, comfortably domesticated in the West in places like the British Labour Party (helping prop up a fixture of capitalist democracy with a bloody imperialist record almost as long as the Tories'), - but to the Soviet socialist camp. The rest of the world will not be far behind. ●

PRINTED & PUBLISHED by Bulletin Publications for the International Leninist Workers Party & the ILWP Bulletin (10p weekly) at This reprint made May 2020 by EPSR [Bulletin Publications, PO Box 76261 London SW17 1GW] Contact@epsr.org.uk