

The Revolutionary Community Party-USA and Trotsky: A Literal Comparison

February 1994

by MC5 & MC86

In the imperialist countries and, even in some Third World countries, there is a plethora of Trotskyist organizations bombarding young comrades with idealist nonsense. Sometimes Trotskyists succeed in secretly converting certain communist leaders who then sneak Trotskyism into their "Marxism-Leninism" or even their "Maoism." When the leaders of a political organization sneak Trotskyism into their politics without crediting its source, we refer to that organization as "crypto-Trotskyist." The premier crypto-Trotskyist organization in the United States is the Progressive Labor Party. A slightly more subtle imitation is the RCP-USA.

In this article, MIM brings out quotations from Trotsky that made his politics distinctive from those of Stalin and Mao. We also bring out quotations from the RCP-USA, which demonstrate how the RCP has imported Trotskyism into its "Maoism." To know what RCP Chairperson Bob Avakian was going to say in his special 50th issue of *Revolution* in 1981, it was only necessary to read the works of Trotsky himself and the Trotskyist Ernest Mandel's 1978 book *The Bitter Fruits of Socialism in One Country: From Stalinism to Eurocommunism*.(1)

It's been some years since the Communist Party of Peru entered into struggle with the RCP-USA. In that struggle, it has succeeded in getting the RCP-USA to call itself "Maoist" and make a number of other quick line changes.

As the people up front and close to the RCP's practice, however, MIM argues that the RCP has done little to overhaul its general political line. For example, although the RCP calls the document "deliberately provocative" and unofficial today, the RCP still distributes *Revolution* No. 50, which openly denigrates the term "Maoist." *Revolution* No. 50, called "Conquer the World: The International Proletariat Must and Will," is the RCP document that most infuriated the new Maoist forces that formed MIM, and reading it gives one a sense of what it was like to be a Maoist around the RCP in the early 1980s. Another example is the RCP's Black Panther pamphlet, which refers to the "the working class" of North America with no mention of superprofits.

More recently, the RCP has been confronted with the facts of the labor aristocracy and has, if anything, regressed from some of its earlier positions. The Revolutionary Worker opposed the NAFTA in lockstep with the CPUSA and Ross Perot. Another article denounced the MIM line on the Euro-American working class as "counterrevolutionary." (That's just what MIM was thinking about the CPUSA and Ross Perot!)

Throughout all the changes in the RCP's line and its emphases and its local and regional variations, one thing remains the same — its Trotskyism. The RCP has, like Trotsky, consistently maintained that external conditions are the basis of contradiction. In this sense, MIM and the international communist movement was much better off when the RCP openly attacked "Maoism" and called itself "Marxist-Leninist." This was a much more honest position to take than the medley of views that came with taking the Peru franchise. Now the RCP uses the struggle in Peru to adopt a Maoist veneer without changing anything else in its line or practice.

I. THE BASIS OF CONTRADICTION

The basis of contradiction is the most general issue for Marxists, other than the materialist method itself. Unlike Stalin and Mao, Trotsky held that the decisive conditions for the creation of socialism existed *externally* to each society. This is not true for the world's oppressed nations, who do not need change forced on them by the pace of world events. Ironically, Trotsky's external formulation *is* true for the reactionary labor aristocracies Trotsky spoke for.

First, Trotsky quotes Stalin: "'The difference in views lies in the fact,' says Stalin, 'that the party considers that these [internal] contradictions and possible *conflicts can be entirely overcome* on the basis of the inner forces of our revolution, whereas comrade Trotsky and the Opposition think that these contradictions and conflicts can be overcome "only on an international scale, on the arena of the world-wide proletarian revolution."'"(2)

Trotsky then adds, "yes, this is precisely the difference. One could not express better and more correctly the difference between national reformism and revolutionary internationalism. If our internal difficulties, obstacles, and contradictions, which are fundamentally a reflection of world contradictions, can be settled merely by the 'inner forces of our revolution' without entering 'the arena of of the world-wide proletarian revolution' then the International is partly a subsidiary and partly a decorative institution."(3)

Trotsky:

"In our epoch, which is the epoch of imperialism, i.e., of *world economy* and *world politics* under the hegemony of finance capital, not a single communist party can establish its program by proceeding solely or mainly from conditions and tendencies of developments in its own country. ... On August 4, 1914, the death knell sounded for national programs [a reference to World War I—MC5] for all time. ... In the present epoch, to a much larger extent than in the past, the national orientation of the proletariat must and can flow only from a world orientation and not *vice versa*.

Herein lies the basic and primary difference between communist internationalism and all varieties of national socialism.”(4)

“It is impermissible, impossible, and absurd to seek a criterion for the ‘sufficient minimum’ within national states (‘Russian prior to 1917’) when the whole question is settled by international dynamics. In this false, arbitrary, isolated national criterion rests the theoretical basis of national narrowness in politics, the precondition for inevitable national-reformist and social-patriotic blunders in the future.”(5)

“Our internal contradictions, however, which depend directly on the trend of the European and world struggle, may be rationally regulated and abated by a correct internal policy based on Marxian foresight. But they can be finally overcome only when the class contradictions will be overcome, which is out of the question without a victorious revolution in Europe. Stalin is right. The difference lies precisely on this point and this is the fundamental difference between national reformism and revolutionary internationalism.”(6)

Plagiarist Bob Avakian:

“Returning to the question of Mao: also linked to the general erroneous tendencies in Mao — too much of a country by country perspective, the tendency to see things too much in terms of nations and national struggle — something else that should be reviewed here briefly is confusion and some of Mao’s errors on the question of internal and external, and in particular the internal basis of change and the external conditions of change and how this applies in the relationship between revolutions in particular countries, on the one hand, and the overall world struggle and the world situation, on the other. ...

“For example in ‘On Contradiction’ the way it’s presented is that China is the internal and the rest of the world is the external. And what we’ve emphasized in opposition to this is viewing the process of the world historic advance from the bourgeois epoch to the communist epoch as something which in fact takes place in an overall sense on a world scale, is a world process and both arises out of and is ultimately determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which, with the advent of imperialism, has become the fundamental contradiction of this process on a world scale. If we want to look to see what is the underlying and main driving force in terms of the development of revolutionary situations in particular countries at particular times, then too we have to look to the overall development of contradictions on a world scale, flowing out of and ultimately determined by this fundamental contradiction and not mainly to the development of the contradictions within a particular country, because that country and the process there is integrated in an overall way into this larger world process. It’s not simply as it was in the feudal era or the beginning of the bourgeois era where you had separate countries more or less separately developing with interpenetration between them; now they’ve been integrated into this larger process.”(7)

“[W]hat has happened in the Soviet Union and China represents, in its essence, defeats inflicted on the international proletariat by the international bourgeoisie, and that the mistakes of the revolutionaries were secondary ...”(8)

The theory of a potential resurgence of a new bourgeoisie within the communist party was a central contribution of Maoism to communist theory. The above quotation from Avakian places him outside of Maoism.

II. SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY

Trotsky: “The conception of the building of socialism in one country is a social-patriotic conception.”(9)

“In the epoch of imperialism it is impossible to approach the fate of one country in any other way but by taking as a starting point the tendencies of world development as a whole in which the individual country, with all its national peculiarities, is included and to which it is subordinated.”(10)

Bob Avakian: “Maoism without Leninism is national (and also, in certain contexts, social-chauvinism) and bourgeois democracy.”(11)

Trotsky:

“Revolutionary patriotism can only have a class character. It begins as patriotism to the party organizations, to the trade union, and rises to state patriotism when the proletariat seizes power. Whenever the power is in the hands of the workers, patriotism is a revolutionary duty. ... And now it suddenly appears that the ideal of the socialist society may be achieved with the national forces alone. This is a mortal blow to the International.”(12)

“We must tell them that we will enter on the path of *real* socialist construction only when the proletariat of the most advanced countries will have captured power; that it is necessary to work unremittingly for this, using both levers — the short lever of our internal economic efforts and the long lever of the international proletarian struggle.”(13)

Bob Avakian:

“There is the specific criticism to be made of Mao on the question of nations, national struggle and the world revolution: not only in the Anna Louise Strong interview and in ‘On Policy,’ but also in the General Line polemic, the tendency shows up to see things too much country-by-country separated from each other, too much in terms of nations and national struggle, and too much in terms of identifying one enemy and rallying everybody against it.”(14)

“This crucial question of what happened to the revolutionary movement particularly from the mid-’70s on ... cannot be understood fully or resolved by looking at it country-by-country and trying to figure out what happened to the move-

ment in this country and why didn't we go further here, or why were we set back there and so on. Again, it's another example of how things have to be looked at first, foremost and fundamentally on an international basis."(15)

"Imagine, for example, what it would have been like if the revolutionary line in China had been more clearly and firmly an internationalist one and, on that basis, if the revolutionary leadership had been able to mobilize the proletariat to keep power in China —which such a line could not have guaranteed but would have made more possible — and then things erupted the way they did in Iran, think about where we would be on that basis now!" (16)

"Since a lot of emphasis has been put on deviations from Leninism, specifically towards nationalism, would Lenin too have made these deviations from Leninism if he'd been around longer to deal with a lot of the real necessity that arose in the Soviet Union? . . . It should be said, at the same time, that his methodological approach, his grasp and application of materialist dialectics, was head and shoulders (unfortunately) above his successors in the Soviet Union, and in particular head and shoulders above that of the main successor — Stalin."(17)

III. AN INTERNATIONAL PARTY?

Trotsky:

"That is why, for us, the policy of the Comintern dominates all other questions. Without a correct international policy, all the possible economic successes in the U.S.S.R. will not save the October Revolution and will not lead to socialism. To speak more exactly: without a correct international policy, there can be no correct policy in internal affairs either, for the line is one."(18)

Elsewhere, Trotsky does not explain at length what it means to have an "international revolutionary party," but simply proceeds from the obvious need for one. See for example, "The Program of the International Revolution or a Program of Socialism in One Country?" which is the first document in Trotsky's book titled *The Third International After Lenin*.

Trotsky: "World economy has become a might reality which holds sway over the economic life of individual countries and continents. This basic fact alone invests the idea of a world communist party with a supreme reality."(19)

Trotskyist leader Ernest Mandel:

"No such struggle is at all possible in the imperialist epoch unless it is international. No consistent international struggle is possible without an international organization. The idea of 'single centre' was profoundly discredited by Stalin when he converted it into a system of bureaucratic command by the CPSU. Yet its undistorted form remains the only alternative for communist militants who really want to rediscover class independence from the bourgeoisie and the Soviet bureaucracy.

"Any 'national communism' in a capitalist country is

condemned to become a 'communism' integrated into the bourgeois state."(20)

RCP-USA: "RIM [the international party led principally by the RCP-USA] is a decisive element and prerequisite for victory in the struggle to emancipate the world."(21)

IV. THE NATIONAL BOURGEOISIE

Trotsky is the grandfather of all supposedly "Marxist" reductionists that MIM refers to as "fundamentalists" for their simplistic and dogmatist stress on the fundamental contradiction between classes on the world scale. Trotsky and the reductionists refuse to acknowledge the class struggle embodied in some national struggles or gender struggles. For Trotsky, it is all quite simple: there are oppressed nation proletarians and there are proletarian women. They engage in class struggle against the bourgeoisie just like their oppressor nation and male proletarian comrades. The national bourgeoisie is no different than the imperialist bourgeoisie says Trotsky, except that it is even more backward.

Trotsky:

"Lenin did not at all place the wars for national liberation above bourgeois democratic revolutions as is now done by Bukharin, [when Bukharin and Stalin shared the same opinions— MC5] after his 180 degree turn. Lenin insisted on a distinction between an oppressed bourgeois nation and a bourgeois oppressor nation. But Lenin nowhere raised and never could raise the question as if the bourgeoisie of a colonial or a semi-colonial country in an epoch of struggle for national liberation must be more progressive and more revolutionary than the bourgeoisie of a non-colonial country in the epoch of the democratic revolution."(22)

"The new and absolutely false theory promulgated by Stalin- Bukharin about the 'imminent' revolutionary spirit of the colonial bourgeoisie is, in substance, a translation of Menshevism into the language of Chinese politics. It serves only to convert the oppressed position of China into an internal political premium for the Chinese bourgeoisie, and it throws an additional weight on the scale of the bourgeoisie against the scale of the trebly oppressed Chinese proletariat."(23)

"China is still confronted with a vast, bitter, bloody, and prolonged struggle for such elementary things as the liquidation of the most 'Asiatic' forms of slavery, national emancipation, and unification of the country. But as the course of events has shown, it is precisely this that makes impossible in the future any petty-bourgeois leadership or even semi-leadership in the revolution. The unification and emancipation of China today is an international task, no less so than the existence of the U.S.S.R. This task can be solved only by means of a desperate struggle on the part of the downtrodden, hungry, and persecuted masses under the direct leadership of the proletarian vanguard — a struggle not only against world imperialism, but also against its economic and political agency in China, against the bour-

geoisie, including the 'national' bourgeoisie and all its democratic flunkys."(24)

Mao Zedong:

"We are exponents of the theory of the transition of the revolution, and not the Trotskyite theory of 'permanent revolution.' We are for the attainment of socialism by going through all the necessary stages of the democratic republic. We are opposed to tailism, but we are also opposed to adventurism and impetuosity. To reject the participation of the bourgeoisie in the revolution on the ground that it can only be temporary and to describe the alliance with anti-Japanese sections of the bourgeoisie (in a semi-colonial country) as capitulation is a Trotskyite approach, with which we cannot agree. Today such an alliance is in fact a necessary bridge on the way to socialism."(25)

V. NO NEW DEMOCRATIC STAGE

The first break between new-born Maoist forces in the 1980s and the RCP-USA occurred over the question of the New Democratic stage of revolution in semi-feudal and semi-colonial countries. The issue was how to criticize the FMLN/FDR in the early 1980s for its corruption by revisionism. The new-born Maoist forces correctly saw that the RCP-USA showed how *not* to criticize the FLMN when the RCP-USA in close discussions with the predecessors to MIM denied the need for a new democratic stage.

The grandfather of the idea of opposing stages in revolution is none other than Trotsky. (To be fair to the RCP-USA, we should point out that there has been some development of the Third World since Trotsky's day, but the founders of MIM found it necessary to establish concretely that the situation in El Salvador remained semi-feudal and semi-colonial.)

Trotsky:

"These fundamental and, at the same time, incontrovertible social and political prerequisites of the third Chinese revolution [the next revolution to follow 1928 —MC5] demonstrate not only that the formula of the democratic dictatorship has *hopelessly outlived its usefulness*, but also that the third Chinese revolution, despite the great backwardness of China, or more correctly, because of this great backwardness as compared with Russia, will not have a 'democratic' period, not even such a six month period as the October Revolution had (November 1917 to July 1918); but it will be compelled from the very outset to effect the most decisive shake-up and abolition of bourgeois property in city and village."(26)

"To save a hopeless position, the resolution of the E.C.C.I. [Comintern —MC5] (without any connection whatever with the entire trend of its thought) rushes in post-haste to its last argument — taken from imperialism. It appears that the tendency to skip over the bourgeois-democratic stage [what follows is Trotsky's quote from the 'Stalinist' Comintern —MC5] '... is all the more [!] harmful because such a formu-

lation of the question eliminates [?] the most important national peculiarity of the Chinese revolution, which is a semi-colonial revolution.' The only meaning that these senseless words can have is that the imperialist yoke will be overthrown by some sort of non-proletarian dictatorship. But this means that the 'most important national peculiarity' has been dragged in at the last moment in order to paint the Chinese national bourgeoisie or the Chinese petty-bourgeois 'democracy' in bright colors."(27)

According to Trotsky, even what he considers the most backward countries are capitalist:

"All these bespeak the unconditional predominance, the direct domination of capitalist relations in China. The social relations of serfdom and semi-serfdom are undeniably very strong. They stem in part from the days of feudalism . . . However, it is capitalist relations that *dominate* and not 'feudal' (more correctly, serf and, generally, pre-capitalist) relations. Only thanks to this dominant role of capitalist relations can we speak seriously of the prospects of proletarian hegemony in the national revolution."(28)

Bob Avakian:

"There is a tendency toward a kind of absolute, mechanical, metaphysical view that there are two types of countries in the world and one of them has one-stage revolutions and the other has two-stage revolutions and the way you make revolution in a country that has a two-stage revolution is the way they did it in China, more or less, with *some* concrete application to conditions in your country. . . . I'm not saying that there's not a lot to that. . . . But as Lenin said, these boundary lines are conditional and relative, not absolute; and, despite the general distinction, whether the revolutions there proceed in one stage or two is also relative and conditional, not absolute, and overall it is more determined by what's happening in the world as a whole than it is by what's happening in one country."(29)

VI. THE LABOR ARISTOCRACY

Trotsky accused Stalin and the Comintern of having a line on the Euro-American working class that is not unlike MIM's (except that in 1994 the role of the farmer in North America is considerably reduced.)

Trotsky:

"Pepper's theory was that the super-profit of American capitalism converts the American proletariat into a world labor aristocracy while the agrarian crisis ruins the farmers and drives them onto the path of social revolution. According to Pepper's conception, a party of a few thousand members, consisting chiefly of immigrants, had to fuse with the farmers through the medium of a bourgeois party and by thus founding a 'two-class' [farmers and workers —MC5] party, insure the socialist revolution in the face of the passivity or neutrality of the proletariat corrupted by super-profits. This

insane idea found supporters and half-supporters among the upper leadership of the Comintern.”(30)

Trotskyist leader Ernest Mandel: “Far from being a minority, the proletariat as we have defined it is a social class that represents 70-90% of the active population of the Western imperialist countries.”(31)

As MIM described in the first section of this article, the RCP is on record opposing MIM’s line on the labor aristocracy in favor of the Trotskyist line.

VII. REVOLUTION IN THE IMPERIALIST COUNTRIES

Trotsky addressing a U.S. audience:

“The American soviets would not need to resort to the drastic measures which circumstances have often imposed upon the Russians. In the United States, through the science of publicity and advertising, you have means for winning the support of your middle class, which were beyond the reach of the soviets of backward Russia with its vast majority of pauperized and illiterate peasants. This, in addition to your technical equipment and your wealth, is the greatest asset of your coming Communist Revolution. Your revolution will be smoother in character than ours; you will not waste your energies and resources in costly social conflicts after the main issues have been decided; and you will move ahead so much the more rapidly in consequence.”(32)

Bob Avakian:

“Lenin was not, however, being one-sided about this or adopting a ‘third worldist’ position, that is, writing off revolution in the West or seeing the only possible thrust of revolution coming from the East or suggesting that revolution in the West would only be possible after the flame of revolution had lit up the entire East (and then perhaps things would develop in the West to where a proletarian revolution could become possible. This was *not* Lenin’s view and when it is attributed to him represents a vulgarization of his actual view, although he did correctly recognize the developments which were really only beginning to assert themselves, that is, the shift of the revolutionary center more and more toward the East.”(33)

Flatterer of the middle-class, Bob Avakian:

“In the experience of the Soviet Union (and of socialism generally so far), it has not proved possible to fully implement the policies adopted by the Paris Commune. . . it has not been possible to abolish the standing army as an institution and to replace it with the armed masses themselves. This is largely owing to what has been spoken to before: the fact that revolutions leading to socialism have taken place not in industrially developed capitalist countries where the proletariat is the majority of the population (or at least is the largest class), as Marx and Engels had foreseen, but in technologically backward countries with large peasant popula-

tions where the proletariat is a small minority; these revolutions have occurred not in a number of countries all at once [unless you count Africa, Asia] but more or less in one country at a time (leaving aside the experience of the Eastern European countries in the aftermath of World War II), where there was some transformation in aspects of social relations but there was never a real socialist transformation of society; and socialist states have existed in a world still dominated by imperialism.”(34)

We’re glad Avakian noticed that revolutions have not occurred all at once; however, he is pointing this out to damn these revolutions compared with the ones that could happen in the West. When it comes down to it, Avakian still sees the labor aristocracy and other middle classes of the imperialist countries as a better social basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat than the peasantry and urban working classes of the Third World. The decades of corruption of the imperialist working class receive no weight in the RCP’s calculations (except when prompted by MIM) and Avakian continues to speak of the issue of the militia as if the bourgeoisie were amongst the masses in general and not specifically in the party. Ironically this is more true in the imperialist countries than in the historical experiences to which Avakian refers. (See MIM Theory 5 “Diet for a Small Red Planet,” for MIM’s review of the RCP on the “majority” of imperialist country workers.(47))

The issue here is not militia versus standing army, but what Avakian sees as the best basis for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Contradicting Stalin and Mao, Avakian continues to hold the Trotskyist line that the imperialist country working class is the best vehicle of revolution.

VIII. WORLD WAR II

Trotsky:

“Stalin and his clique, for the sake of an alliance with the imperialist governments, have completely renounced the revolutionary program for the emancipation of the colonies. This was openly avowed at the last Congress of Stalin’s party in Moscow, in March of the current year, by Manuilski one of the leaders of the Comintern, who declared:

“‘The Communists advance to the forefront the struggle for the realization of the right of self-determination of nationalities enslaved by *fascist* governments. They demand free self-determination for Austria. . . the Sudetan regions. . . Korea, Formosa, Abyssinia. . .’ And what about India, Indochina, Algeria, and other colonies of England and France? The Comintern representative answers this question as follows: ‘The Communists. . . demand of the governments of the so-called bourgeois democratic states the immediate [sic] drastic [!] improvement in the living standards of the toiling masses in the colonies and the granting of broad democratic rights and liberties to the colonies.’”(35)

Open Trotskyist Ernest Mandel: "By turning the Communist International away from its initial objectives and watering it down into a docile instrument of Soviet diplomatic manoeuvres and particularist privileges, the Stalinist bureaucracy dealt a death blow to proletarian internationalism in the ranks of the movement it controlled on a world scale."(36)

Crypto-Trotskyist Bob Avakian:

"All these policies were frankly a rationalization for and an attempt to make the communist movement's policy an extension of the international policy and line of the Soviet Union. . . . To put it in a nutshell, World War 2 on the part of the Soviet Union, was fought on a patriotic — that is bourgeois-democratic—basis. . . . For example, whatever the Soviet Union did that turned more revolutionary elements away from it when it was carrying out the collective security in the late '30s (or, for that matter, turned more bourgeois-democratic elements away from it when it made the pact with Germany) — all of it is justified on the most contradictory bases which can only be reduced to 'it was good for the Soviet Union.'"(37)

"For example, to move that from the abstract realm and make it very concrete, almost everybody who was around at the time knows the Soviet Union carried out a policy putting its national interests above everything else in and around World War 2, and only some communists are the ones who won't accept it, can't face up to it and will go for any sort of rationalization to try to justify not having to come to terms with a basic simple fact."(38)

Here MIM must comment on the absolutely vile amnesia regarding history that Trotskyists and Avakian are promoting on World War II. The Russian people and disproportionately its communists in particular gave up 20 million dead fighting to defeat the Nazis in the imperialist war — far more than any other nation — and Avakian doesn't even mention it.

Instead, he claims the Soviet Union was promoting its "national interests." Apparently sacrificing 20 million in a war is not enough internationalism for Avakian. Being just the only country that did not capitulate and join in with Hitler after being occupied, that's not internationalism says Avakian. Here we must make it clear that Stalin and the Comintern did make urgent calls for support of the Soviet Union and they deserved every bit of support they got. It was clear to everyone at the time and anyone who followed Lenin's theory of imperialism that the Soviet Union was going to be the object of imperialist attack in a world war. The only question was when. As such, communists internationally were correct to make support for the Soviet Union a cardinal question. Anyone who couldn't apply communist principles in practice and support the Soviet Union didn't deserve the name "communist" no matter how much rhetoric to the contrary.

Anarchists, Trotskyists and crypto-Trotskyists who have lived too long in a parasitic environment easily lose sight of

the basic facts and get lost in idealist mistrust of all national and state interests. Given the particular role of U.S. imperialism and its passive working class in not stopping Hitler and the other imperialists much earlier, Avakian in particular should be ashamed to make such statements even in passing, never mind in print in a magazine still distributed over a decade later. Like it or not, the Russian people as the first to make socialist revolution were going to pay a heavy international price in World War II, regardless of the policies of Stalin. Despite all the "maneuvers" that Trotsky and Avakian complain about, the Russians still gave their fair share in creating some space free from one of the major imperialist blocs.

IX. THE IDEALIST VIEW OF DEFEAT AND SOVIET AID

Time and again, Trotsky blamed Stalin for the defeat of revolutions. At the same time, Trotsky accepted no responsibility for the defeat of international revolution. In other words, Stalinists everywhere betrayed revolution when they failed, but the failures of Trotskyists to make revolution anywhere in the world were not even mentioned — a double standard possible to maintain only through perfect idealism. Very strangely overlooked by the Trotskyists, it was the U.S.S.R. and the People's Republic of China that supplied troops and material supplies for revolutions abroad including in Spain, Korea (including Chinese troops) and Vietnam, but the Trotskyists have never provided any such support. Instead, what they provide is historical amnesia in thousands of pages at a time.

Somehow it is the Stalinists guilty of not supporting armed struggle abroad according to the Trotskyists — who never led a successful one themselves.

Likewise in the case of Bob Avakian, he criticizes Mao for supposedly raising not giving armed aid "to a principle." Nowhere in Revolution No. 50, where he makes this criticism repeatedly, and even on the final page in an effort to sound tougher than Mao, nowhere does he make historical references to the actual sacrifices in armed struggle the Chinese under Mao made. That includes sacrificing hundreds of thousands dead in the Korean War, something that the masses revere Mao for to this day, because his own son died in combat there and demonstrated that Mao wasn't the kind of ruler that brought his family special privileges. Instead of making the facts known and undoing the bourgeois superstructure's brainwashing, Avakian caters to this historical amnesia with tough Trotarchist rhetoric. When Mao said he would not attack countries outside his borders, he did not rule out being invited in by those countries to defeat imperialist aggression! There's nothing wrong with that principle, and more importantly, there was nothing wrong with China's practice, except for the historically ignorant.

Trotsky:

"We have today a 'theory' which teaches that it is possible to build socialism completely in one country and that the correlations of that country with the capitalist world can be established on the basis of 'neutralizing' the world bour-

geoisie (Stalin). . . . It will be most vitally necessary to spread the revolution to the neighboring countries and to support insurrections there with arms in hand, not out of any abstract considerations of international solidarity, which in themselves cannot set the classes in motion, but because of those vital considerations which Lenin formulated hundreds of times—namely, that without *timely* aid from the international revolution, we will be unable to hold out.”(39)

Likewise, Bob Avakian:

“The victory of the Spanish revolution could have opened up an era of revolutionary overturns throughout Europe and so forestalled the present war. But that heroic revolution, which contained within itself every possibility of victory, was smothered in the embrace of the Second and Third Internationals, with the active cooperation of the anarchists. The world proletariat became poorer in its loss of another great hope and richer in the lessons of another monstrous betrayal.”

Trotsky:

“The mighty movement of the French proletariat in June, 1936, revealed exceptionally favorable conditions for the revolutionary conquest of power. A French soviet republic would immediately have gained revolutionary hegemony of Europe, created revolutionary repercussions in every country, rocked the totalitarian regimes and in this way saved humanity from the present imperialist slaughter with its countless victims. But the thoroughly debased, cowardly and treacherous policies of Leon Blum and Leon Jouhaux with the active support of the French section of the Comintern, led to the collapse of one of the most promising movements of the last decade.”(40)

“Because of the lag of the world revolution, and the fatigue, and, to a large measure, the backwardness of the Russian workers and especially the Russian peasants, there raised itself over the Soviet Republic and against its peoples a new oppressive and parasitic caste whose leader is Stalin.”(41)

X. FORMULATING STRATEGY

Trotsky: “The Soviet proletariat has achieved grandiose successes, if we take into consideration the conditions under which they have been attained and the low cultural level inherited from the past. But these achievements constitute an extremely small magnitude on the scales of the socialist ideal.”(42)

Trotskyist leader Ernest Mandel: “The notion that all the living forces of society can gradually be assembled for a long, perhaps even permanent, siege of the ‘capitalist fortress’ is an idle dream. Capitalism commands innumerable machine-gun nests stationed around its ‘fortress’, within the very social body that is supposed to be besieging it. These defences permit no lasting assemblies or sieges of long duration.”(43)

Bob Avakian:

“And the political point that I want to draw in particular, besides correcting that point in *Mao Tsetung’s Immortal Contributions*, is refocusing attention on the question of what is there in the military strategy Mao fought for that might, spontaneously at least, lead him away from understanding that in the context of a world war it might be correct to in fact strike out in different directions, viewing the world as a whole; that is, to oppose the imperialists in general and to attempt to overthrow them wherever possible in *both* camps, of course taking into the account the particular situation in different countries.”(44)

“Making use of the contradictions among the enemy, defeating our enemies one by one, etc., was precisely a correct policy in those concrete conditions and it can be, under many different conditions, a correct policy. But it is wrong to elevate this to the level of a general principle.

“Just to give a simple example, if everybody in this room but me is a counter-revolutionary and you constitute the main pillars of reaction in the world and I’m capable of whipping up on everybody all at once, why should I defeat you one by one? There’s no principle that says I should defeat you one by one; if I’m capable of defeating you all at one time, I should just take you all on and wipe you out and so much the better for the international proletariat.”(45)

Even if Avakian discovers the Elliptontrotacious Bomb (RCP synthesized hot air?), everyone in the room is going to die at a different time. Dialectics is the nature of life. It’s not likely our imperialist enemies are going to die “all at once.”

Ernest Mandel: “The working class must fight for a *proletarian* international policy, which means an independent class policy opposed to any alliance with one faction of imperialism against another. Today this can be expressed in two formulas: Against armament (especially nuclear armament) and against the war preparations of any imperialist bourgeoisie! For the Socialist United States of Europe!”(46)

Order MIM Theory 6, “The Stalin Issue” and MIM Theory 7, “Proletarian Feminist Revolutionary Nationalism on the Communist Road” to read about why it is necessary to have unholy alliances — contrary to Avakian, Mandel and post-Lenin Trotsky.

Notes:

1. Ernest Mandel, “The Bitter Fruits of Socialism in One Country,” *From Stalinism to Eurocommunism* London: NLB, 1978.
2. Pravda, No. 262, Nov. 12, 1926
3. Leon Trotsky, *The Third International After Lenin* New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970, p. 62.
4. Ibid, pp. 3-4.
5. Ibid, p. 212.
6. Ibid, p. 65.
7. Revolution No. 50, pp. 34-5.
8. A World to Win, #17, p. 47.
9. Trotsky, *The Third International After Lenin*, p. 70.
10. Ibid, p. 42.
11. Revolution No. 50, p. 38.

12. Trotsky, *The Third International After Lenin*, p. 71.
13. Ibid, p. 66.
14. Revolution No. 50, p. 35.
15. Ibid, p. 41.
16. Ibid, p. 44.
17. Ibid, p. 34.
18. Trotsky, *The Third International After Lenin*, p. 256.
19. Ibid, p. 5
20. Mandel, "The Bitter Fruits of Socialism in One Country," op cit. p. 39.
21. Revolutionary Worker, Jan. 16, 1994, p. 3.
22. Trotsky, *The Third International After Lenin*, p. 171.
23. Ibid, pp. 175.
24. Ibid, p. 191.
25. Mao Zedong, *Selected Works, Vol. 1*, "Win the Masses in Their Millions..." pp. 290-1.
26. Trotsky, *The Third International After Lenin*, pp. 184-5.
27. Ibid, pp. 190.
28. Ibid, p. 209.
29. Revolution No. 50, p. 35.
30. Trotsky, *The Third International After Lenin*, p. 219.
31. Mandel, op cit. p. 210.
32. Leon Trotsky, "If America Should Go Communist," *The Permanent Revolution: A Trotsky Anthology* Isaac Deutscher, ed. New York: Dell, 1964, p. 215.
33. Revolution No. 50, p. 11.
34. A World to Win, #17, p. 38.
35. Pravda, issue No. 70, March 12, 1939.)" (Trotsky, *The Permanent Revolution: A Trotsky Anthology* op cit. p. 250.)
36. Mandel, op cit. p. 37.
37. Revolution No. 50, p. 22.
38. Revolution No. 50, p. 23.
39. Trotsky, *The Third International After Lenin*, p. 16.
40. Trotsky, "The Second World War," *The Permanent Revolution: A Trotsky Anthology* op cit, p. 250.
41. Ibid, p. 282.
42. Leon Trotsky, *The Third International After Lenin*, p. 66.
43. Mandel, op cit. pp. 192-3.
44. Revolution No. 50, p. 34.
45. Ibid, p. 31.
46. Mandel, op cit. p. 32.
47. MIM Theory 5, "Diet for a Small Red Planet." p. 99.

Maoist Sojourner

*A monthly publication by and for
Third World Maoist exiles led by MIM.*

Maoist Sojourner publishes reports on the International Communist Movement, news from Peru, the Philippines, other Third World and European countries. Subscribe, send articles or art, distribute bulk copies — now.

Individual

1 yr. domestic \$12
2 yrs. domestic \$20
1 yr. overseas \$36

Institution

1 yr. domestic \$46
2 yrs. domestic \$90
1 yr. overseas \$60

Special offer! A one-year sub to Maoist Sojourner, with a one-year sub to MIM Theory — just \$25! (individual/domestic)

Cash or checks made out "MIM Distributors."
PO Box 3576, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576 or
PO Box 29670, Los Angeles, CA 90029-0670