

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2, France

NEW YORK OFFICE: World Outlook, P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010

Vol. 4, No. 35

November 11, 1966

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
Special Number	1
Cuba, North Korea Suggest Volunteers to Counter Escalation	1
The "New" Stalinist Version of "Trotskyism" [Full text of an article by N.P. Mikeshin]	3
Translator's Notes on the Mikeshin Article	12
The Political Meaning of Mikeshin's Attack -- by Joseph Hansen	24
Stalin and the Nazi Aggression Against the Soviet Union [Minutes of a discussion between Soviet historians and army representatives]	26
State of Siege Decreed in Guatemala	32

SPECIAL NUMBER

Only three weeks after changing our format, we found it necessary to expand the number of pages. The reason is two documents. One is the minutes of a remarkable discussion that occurred inside the Soviet Union between representatives of the General Staff of the army and historians on the subject of Stalin's course at the opening of World War II. The minutes are highly revealing as to the strength of the pressures that led the regime to initiate the policy of "de-Stalinization." The other document bears witness in a different way to these same pressures -- this time in the form of an attack against "Trotskyism" published in Moscow under the signature of one N.P. Mikeshin. The document itself is well worth studying as an effort to provide a new model in this field. The translator has supplied some critical notes which provide an illuminating background and which should prove educational for students who have had occasion to probe deeply into Stalinist writings.

We thought it would be convenient to present these two documents together, although it meant holding over important material and probably shortening a coming issue to compensate for the added cost involved.

A feature planned for the next issue is an article from Brussels drawing some important lessons concerning the European student demonstration at Liège on October 15 against the war in Vietnam. The article considers some misrepresentations of the march and sets the record straight as well as indicating the importance of the demonstration as an advance in the European movement against the war in Vietnam. It is of special interest to antiwar fighters throughout the world. Next week in World Outlook.

CUBA, NORTH KOREA SUGGEST VOLUNTEERS TO COUNTER ESCALATION

It was not exactly news. In fact it was exactly what most of the world had expected. On November 3, the day after Johnson returned to Washington, the Pentagon casually announced that its "planners are drafting blueprints for an intensification

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station.

New York, N.Y. 10010

a labor press service

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2, France

NEW YORK OFFICE: World Outlook, P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010

Vol. 4, No. 35

November 11, 1966

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
Special Number	1
Cuba, North Korea Suggest Volunteers to Counter Escalation	1
The "New" Stalinist Version of "Trotskyism" [Full text of an article by N.P. Mikeshin]	3
Translator's Notes on the Mikeshin Article	12
The Political Meaning of Mikeshin's Attack -- by Joseph Hansen	24
Stalin and the Nazi Aggression Against the Soviet Union [Minutes of a discussion between Soviet historians and army representatives]	26
State of Siege Decreed in Guatemala	32

SPECIAL NUMBER

Only three weeks after changing our format, we found it necessary to expand the number of pages. The reason is two documents. One is the minutes of a remarkable discussion that occurred inside the Soviet Union between representatives of the General Staff of the army and historians on the subject of Stalin's course at the opening of World War II. The minutes are highly revealing as to the strength of the pressures that led the regime to initiate the policy of "de-Stalinization." The other document bears witness in a different way to these same pressures -- this time in the form of an attack against "Trotskyism" published in Moscow under the signature of one N.P. Mikeshin. The document itself is well worth studying as an effort to provide a new model in this field. The translator has supplied some critical notes which provide an illuminating background and which should prove educational for students who have had occasion to probe deeply into Stalinist writings.

We thought it would be convenient to present these two documents together, although it meant holding over important material and probably shortening a coming issue to compensate for the added cost involved.

A feature planned for the next issue is an article from Brussels drawing some important lessons concerning the European student demonstration at Liège on October 15 against the war in Vietnam. The article considers some misrepresentations of the march and sets the record straight as well as indicating the importance of the demonstration as an advance in the European movement against the war in Vietnam. It is of special interest to antiwar fighters throughout the world. Next week in World Outlook.

CUBA, NORTH KOREA SUGGEST VOLUNTEERS TO COUNTER ESCALATION

It was not exactly news. In fact it was exactly what most of the world had expected. On November 3, the day after Johnson returned to Washington, the Pentagon casually announced that its "planners are drafting blueprints for an intensification

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station.

New York, N.Y. 10010

WORLD OUTLOOK specializes in weekly political analysis and interpretation of events for labor, socialist, colonial independence and Negro freedom publications. Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of WORLD OUTLOOK. Unsigned material expresses, insofar as editorial opinion may appear, the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. To subscribe for 26 issues send \$7.50 or £2/15s. or 37.50 francs to: Reba Hansen, Business Manager, P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N. Y. 10010.

of the bombing in North Vietnam"

As reported from Washington by William Beecher in the November 4 New York Times, "The Pentagon expects an affirmative decision by President Johnson for a step-up." The Pentagon even specified what the targets will be: "The focus of the new assault, it was reported, would be railroad junctions and freight yards, power plants and defense factories, particularly in the vicinity of Hanoi."

For months, again according to the Times, "high military advisers" have urged this course on Johnson. But their "pleas" were rejected because Johnson wanted to stage the Manila show. Also, he was unwilling to take the next big step in escalating the war before the November elections "lest he alienate voters buoyed by gestures of peace."

The U.S. navy even appeared to be jumping the gun. The U.S. military command in Saigon revealed November 3 that two U.S. Seventh Fleet destroyers had "traded gunfire" with north Vietnamese shore batteries north of the so-called "demilitarized zone." The U.S. military command denied reports that the destroyers were part of a task force bombarding military targets on shore.

The American press was virtually unanimous in discounting Johnson's "peace" gestures. The New York Times set the tone in an editorial November 3. "Peace in Vietnam," said the editors, "is certainly no nearer than before he left the country. The prospects are for a long and escalating war." Openly expressing its gloom, the influential newspaper said, "The United States today is more deeply committed than before to a fight to the finish in Vietnam and to what Mr. Johnson called yesterday in Anchorage a firm anti-Communist stand in Asia....The Asian journey has now become history, but the war in Vietnam goes on more dangerously than ever."

In the capitals of the other main capitalist powers, the Manila "peace" confab was similarly discounted. Even the Japanese government, which is very careful about not saying anything that might give offense to the American conquerors, indicated that its impression was that the conferees were prepared for a prolonged war.

Pete Hamill of the liberal New York Post, one of the crowd of reporters who made the tour with Johnson, continued his graphic description of the obscenities. He noted, for instance, the slogans put up by the Seoul government: "We passed brass bands playing 'The Yellow Rose of Texas' and other local favorites, and dozens of posters and drawings of Johnson. The posters must have pleased him. Among the better ones -- 'Welcome the King of Kings,' 'The World Marshal' (with a picture of Johnson with two guns out, wearing a cowboy suit), 'Leader of the Time, Be Long'; 'Texas Bull -- We Like' and 'We Like Big Shot of the World.'"

As for Johnson's speech referring to the Korean war: "That was all that it meant -- a junkpile of empty platitudes and generality. Lyndon Johnson had performed the slickest alchemy: He had transformed the scene of a bitter failure of war into a whistle-stop in Iowa. There was something obscene about it. I can think of no other word. It is obscene to go campaigning in a place where brave men once lay with the lice eating their bodies in summer and their feet rotting and blackening over murderous winters. It is obscene to make a glorious legend out of Korea, when the truth was down in the mud, or in the midst of hammering machine guns in the north, or on those forgotten hills where boys waited for the sound of Chinese bugles at dawn. It is obscene to take the Chosen Reservoir and what happened to young men there and turn it into a throw-away phrase in a hackneyed political speech. Korea was the place where something about America died in the midst of human waves, defectors, prison camps and false promises."

The first answer to Johnson's tour came November 2 in a joint appeal from the governments of Cuba and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to all the socialist countries to send "an international force" to aid the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the freedom fighters. The two countries said they were ready to send volunteers to fight in Vietnam as soon as the Vietnamese people gave the word.

They also advocated "intensification of the revolutionary struggle in face of the escalation of the war of aggression by the Yankee imperialists in Vietnam."

They stressed the need to strengthen "the unity of the Communist world on the basis of the independence of the different parties" and affirmed that they would "fight with determination for the defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism."

The appeal deserves a resounding response among all the workers states. And it will certainly be cheered by the antiwar movement throughout the world.

THE "NEW" STALINIST VERSION OF "TROTSKYISM"

[In the recent period, there has been a certain rise in attacks against "Trotskyism," extending from Moscow to Tirana and including Havana. The North Korean Communist party utilized its official paper Rodong Shinmoon for such an attack in September. It was sent over the wires by Tass, the Moscow news agency, and faithfully reported in various quarters, including The Worker which speaks for the American Communist party. Zeri i Popullit, the newspaper of the Albanian Communist party, dragged in Trotskyism in a pseudoanalysis of the defeat in Indonesia. The article, published last May 11, has been circulated in various languages since then in pamphlet form. The September 16 Pravda carried an article by Doctor of Philosophy S. Kovalyov, who managed to mention Trotskyism in an article ostensibly devoted to "Socialism and the Cultural Legacy." This was given wide circulation, appearing as a reprint in the September 29 issue of Soviet News, distributed in London by the Soviet embassy. In Havana last January, Fidel Castro in a major speech closing the Tricontinental Conference included an attack against Trotskyism.

[Besides such material, an item is occasionally sent out from Moscow, generally in association with the rehabilitation of victims of Stalin's purges, stating that there has been no change in the official attitude toward Leon Trotsky. It is often added that whatever Stalin's errors may have been toward the end of his life, he was correct in his younger days in "defeating" such figures as Trotsky, Bukharin, etc.

[On August 17 Pravda called special attention to an article by one N.P. Mikeshin on the subject of Trotskyism which had been featured in the monthly journal, Problems of the History of the CPSU (Voprosy istorii KPSS). It was clear from the way in which Pravda lauded this article that it was considered somehow to be definitive, a model on how to deal with Trotskyism. Even before Pravda's reference to Mikeshin's article, it appears to have attracted international attention -- at least in some circles. Thus a Spanish translation appeared in Mexico in Nueva Epoca No. 13 (July 1966).

[In view of the importance which Pravda placed on Mikeshin's article, and the likelihood that it will serve as the source and inspiration for a spate of "studies" on Trotskyism for the edification of circles in and around the Communist parties, we feel that serious attention should be paid to it. The first step in this, of course, is to read it. We have therefore sought to do our part in making it available.

[George Saunders has made a translation from the original in Voprosy istorii KPSS, No. 12, December 1965, pp. 42-52, where it appeared under the title, "Trotskyism as a Weapon of Imperialist Propaganda," and has also supplied some critical notes. His translation and notes appear below.

[Mikeshin's footnotes have been kept in numerical order as in the original. To avoid confusion, George Saunders' critical notes have been listed alphabetically and placed at the end of the article. Where parenthetical remarks appear in Mikeshin's article, these have been identified as to authorship in each instance where it was thought necessary.]

* * *

One of the basic trends in anti-Communism is the falsification of the history of the CPSU, organizer and inspirer of the great victories of the Soviet people. Here, as in all bourgeois historiography, the subjective approach to the elucidation of events, based on the rejection of historical laws, holds sway.

In its subjectivism, reactionary historiography reveals its class bias and anti-Communist orientation. "Unless you are a pure philologist, you cannot be politically neutral as a scholar of Russian, or Soviet, things," (1) writes the well-known "Sovietologist" Victor Frank, a careerist in this field in England.

Contemporary bourgeois historiography has grown quite refined in its efforts to cast doubt on the authority of the leader of the October Revolution and founder of the Soviet state, V.I. Lenin. (2) Imperialist propaganda has set itself the task of discred-

(1) Survey. A Journal of Soviet and East European Studies, No. 50, Jan. 1964, p. 93.

(2) The American bourgeois press, for example, calls 1964 a year in which there was "A Bumper Crop" of anti-Lenin works. See Problems of Communism, Jan.-Feb. 1965, p. 53. [Actually p. 48. "A Bumper Crop" is the title of a review by Victor Frank of three biographies of Lenin, all published in 1964. Problems of Communism is a publication of the U.S. Information Agency. -- G.S.]

iting Lenin, as well as other leading figures of the international labor movement, and does not stop at even the pettiest slander in this work. At the same time, it tries to build up renegades of various stripe, perverters of Marxism, presenting them as "the true followers of Marx." Thus, the bourgeoisie execute a flanking maneuver, with the aim, so to speak, of striking at the Communist movement from the rear, the aim of deceiving the masses and diverting them from the revolutionary struggle.

It is precisely in this light that one must view the heightened interest that imperialist propaganda has in recent years displayed in Trotsky. Tons of paper have been used up in reprinting his "works." Thus, in the U.S.A. in 1962, Random House put out The Basic Works of Trotsky. And in recent years they have likewise been published in West Germany, Italy, Greece, France, Denmark, and other capitalist countries.[A]

The "Sovietologists" are continually writing "tracts" both large and small about Trotsky. Outstanding among these is the three-volume biography of Trotsky(3) by Isaac Deutscher, a former Trotskyist who has become one of the West's biggest "Sovietologists."(4) The Biography, first put out in English, was later published in German. It met with a warm response in the reactionary press. The English bourgeois paper The Times [London] wrote of it ecstatically, echoing the reactionary American journal Time, the West German newspaper Deutsche Zeitung, and many other such publications.[B]

A question arises: Why do the imperialist ideologists propagandize so widely the legacy of a man who, according to their words, stands "on the other side of the barricades"? Why do they find his works "irresistible reading" -- as the bourgeois publishing house Doubleday Anchor Books puts it on the jacket blurb of its American edition of Trotsky's little book [knizhka, a derogatory word -- G.S.] The Russian Revolution?

One need not search far for an answer. In Trotsky's potboilers [knizhonka, doubly derogatory -- G.S.] the ideologists of imperialism find what they are looking for -- anti-Soviet and anti-Communist venom with which to poison the minds of people not well versed in history and politics. Behind the mask of "the red dragon" in which Trotskyism vested itself, they long ago discerned its renegade and opportunist essence, its counterrevolutionary and anti-Soviet nature. The bourgeois ideologists understood that Trotskyism, while opposing capitalism in words, in fact brings grist to the latter's mill, that its true sword edge is directed against the ideology and politics of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party. This was understood even by the white emigré party of Milyukov in its day. Its paper, Poslednie novosti [Latest News], published in Paris, without beating around the bush characterized the Trotskyist opposition as the most fearful enemy of Soviet power, "which creeps up on it unnoticed, wraps it round in its tentacles, and liquidates it before it notices it has been liquidated."(5) [C] The hopes of the Russian bourgeoisie, as we know, were not justified: not Soviet power but the Trotskyist opposition was liquidated, together with other tendencies hostile to socialism. But the desire expressed by the Milyukovite paper nearly forty years ago -- to use Trotskyism for the struggle against Communism -- even today operates as one of the fundamental motives of imperialist propaganda. That is why the scribblings of Trotsky, such as The Revolution Betrayed, have become a sort of gospel of anti-Communism. A curious admission concerning this foul concoction [i.e., The Revolution Betrayed -- G.S.] is made by Deutscher: "...in the 1940's and 1950's, many of the intellectually ambitious 'Sovietologists' and propagandists of the cold war drew, directly or indirectly, their arguments and catch phrases from this source."(6)[D]

* * *

In our epoch, when Marxism-Leninism has become the ideology of hundreds of millions of people, when life itself from moment to moment confirms its correctness, Trotskyism has been a saving grace for imperialist propaganda, fighting by every means against proletarian ideology. It would be hard to find a bourgeois "specialist" on the history of the CPSU, who has passed over the "works" of Trotsky in silence. Besides the biography of Trotsky mentioned above, penned by Deutscher, many other anti-Soviet "essays in historical research" have been written according to Trotsky and in the spirit of Trotsky.

(3) Isaac Deutscher. The Prophet Armed. Trotsky (1879-1921); The Prophet Unarmed. Trotsky (1921-1929); The Prophet Outcast. Trotsky (1929-1940). London, 1954-1963.

(4) Deutscher has for more than a quarter century been a correspondent for a number of bourgeois newspapers and magazines in England and several other capitalist countries.

(5) Poslednie novosti, 27 August 1926.

(6) I. Deutscher, Prophet Outcast, London, 1963, p. 322.

When the "Sovietologists" delve deeply into the history of the CPSU's struggle for the overthrow of the autocracy and the capitalist order, Trotsky's knizhonka Lessons of October (1924) regularly serves them as a guide rule. There it is argued that the Bolshevik party before October was supposedly groping in the dark, and attained success at last only because it abandoned the policies it had previously followed and adopted the platform of Trotsky. In short, it was not Lenin or the Communist party, so the argument goes, but Trotsky who was the organizer and inspirer of the October Revolution. The Communist party in the 1920's unmasked this attempt to substitute Trotskyism for Leninism. In well-known party resolutions, as well as in the historical literature of the party, the anti-Bolshevik, petty-bourgeois character of Trotskyism from the moment of its inception was convincingly demonstrated on the basis of broad documentary material.[E]

V.I.Lenin noted, "It is far from sufficiently known as yet abroad that Bolshevism grew up, took shape, and became steeled in long years of struggle against petty-bourgeois revolutionism."(7)[F] Forty-five years have passed since those lines were written, a time that would seem fully sufficient for any foreign investigator of the history of the CPSU to master this truth. But in bourgeois historiography, as ever, the uncompromising, thoroughgoing struggle of Lenin and the Bolsheviks against Trotskyism as one of the most dangerous manifestations of petty-bourgeois revolutionism still finds no place. In his "Letter to the Congress" (1922), a document well known to the foreign reader, V.I.Lenin, in summing up the political activity of Trotsky, pointed to his non-Bolshevism.(8)[G] This fact, like many others, speaks volumes. But what are facts to bourgeois falsifiers?

Leonard Schapiro, in his notorious little book, The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, attempts to show that supposedly the small ideas [ideiki] of Trotsky "coincided" with Leninism and even "fructified" it. The roots of Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution," he asserts, following the author of that theory, "went back to Marx."(9)[H]

Having promised in the introduction to his book to stick to the facts, Schapiro, however, immediately begins to distort them beyond recognition. In an effort to whitewash Trotsky and show the "infallibility" of his so-called theory, Schapiro writes: "Trotsky...had then argued [in 1905-1906 -- Mikeshin] that the task of the social democrats was not to relax their efforts after the bourgeois revolution had been accomplished, but to continue straight on with their attempts to bring about the next phase, the social revolution. This was in fact precisely the policy followed by Lenin after March 1917."(10) Here one is amazed not only at the assertion that Lenin was allegedly a pupil at Trotsky's knee (incidentally, this thesis is borrowed from the above-mentioned little book of Trotsky's Lessons of October). Schapiro here perpetrates another fraud. According to his version, it seems that Trotsky supposedly assumed the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution as a given, needing no comment. In actual fact he "leaped over," or put it another way, denied, this stage and put forward the fallacious slogan "No tsar but a workers' government." As is well known, V.I.Lenin sharply criticized this slogan. "Trotsky's major mistake," he wrote in 1909, "is that he ignores the bourgeois character of the revolution and has no clear conception of the transition from this revolution to the socialist revolution."(11)[I]

Schapiro also tries to show that Lenin supposedly shared the Trotskyist point of view on the peasantry, denying it a revolutionary role.(12) Similar efforts to convict Marxist-Leninists of underestimating the peasantry have long since been undertaken by bourgeois ideologists. One of these, the so-called expert on the agrarian question in socialist countries, David Mitran, in his squib against Marxism writes, "Marxism had always justified its scorn of the peasants on the ground that they were brutish and

(7) V.I.Lenin, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Vol. 41, p. 14. [Complete Works, fifth Russian edition, 1960-1965. -- G.S.]

(8) Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Vol. 45, p. 435.

(9) Schapiro, New York, 1960, p. 288.

(10) Ibid., p. 288.

(11) Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Vol. 17, p. 381. [English wording from Collected Works, Vol. 15, 1963, pp. 370-371. -- G.S.]

(12) Op.cit., p. 288.

could not be organized."(13)[J] Here Mitrany intentionally addressed himself to the wrong party. If "Marxism" is replaced by the word "Trotskyism," then everything falls into place. Trotsky never tried to hide his scorn for the peasantry. He never tired of speaking of what he deemed the "political barbarism," "social formlessness," and "unclear character" of the peasantry, emphasizing by this that, supposedly, the "primitive mass of the peasantry will turn against the proletariat with its hostile side."(14)[K] Here, it turns out, is where Mitrany dug up his characterizations. It is clearly apparent in the excerpts cited from Mitrany and Trotsky that not only is the thought absolutely identical but even the wording is similar.

In contrast to Trotsky, the Communist party viewed the peasantry as the main ally of the working class. The alliance of the working class with the entire peasantry in the bourgeois-democratic revolution and with the poor peasantry in the socialist revolution — under these slogans, put forward by Lenin, the party led the masses to storm the autocracy and capitalism in Russia. Moreover, it untiringly strengthened and developed the alliance of the working class with the toiling masses of the countryside in the course of constructing socialism. This was the unalterable line of its politics, based on the principled positions of Marxist-Leninist teachings.

Marx, Engels, and Lenin had a high opinion of the revolutionary energy of the peasantry. In their works there is not even a hint of underestimation of this ally of the proletariat. On the contrary, they more than once emphasized that the proletariat, once having established its dictatorship, should take measures that would improve the position of the peasants, facilitate their voluntary passing over to collective economy, to socialism. Marx wrote of this in his synopsis of Bakunin's book The State and Anarchy (1874-75).(15) We find similar statements in Engels' work The Peasant Question in France and Germany (1894).(16) The ideas of Marx and Engels were developed by Lenin, who originated the concept of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry as the highest principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the decisive condition for the construction of socialism. "We concluded an alliance with the peasantry," said Lenin at the Third Congress of the Comintern in 1921. "We interpret this alliance in the following way: the proletariat emancipates the peasantry from the exploitation of the bourgeoisie, from its leadership and influence, and wins it over to its own side in order jointly to defeat the exploiters."(17)[L]

All these propositions of the classics of Marxism-Leninism are sufficiently clear-cut. Anyone familiar with them is easily convinced that they stand in radical opposition to the Trotskyist views on the mutual relations of the proletariat and the peasantry. It is for that very reason that the bourgeois falsifiers of history offer their readers only the small ideas of the Trotskyists on the peasant question and try to attribute these views to Lenin, not citing his own statements on this question. In committing such a coarse forgery, they openly count on the lack of knowledge of their readers, on their insufficient acquaintance with Marxist literature. The political purpose of such falsification is easy to see. The attribution to Lenin of the ideas of Trotsky is carried out with the definite aim of discrediting the CPSU, and conjointly the other fraternal parties, in the eyes of the peasants of the world.

Substituting Trotskyism for Bolshevism, the falsifiers of history, with the help of Trotskyism, undermine other fundamental bulwarks of the Leninist theory of socialist revolution. Trotsky, as is well known, denied the possibility of the victory of socialism initially in one country, and especially in such a relatively backward country as Russia. In his steps march the contemporary reactionary historians. Thus, Schapiro declares that the Leninist theory of socialist revolution is, supposedly, nothing more than the "invention" of the heirs of Lenin. Lenin's article, "On the Slogan of the

(13) Marx against the Peasant: A Study in Social Dogmatism. North Carolina University Press, 1952, p. 211. [Mikeshin leaves out three words without indicating any omission. The sentence should read: "Marxism had always justified its scorn of the peasants on the ground among other things that they were brutish and could not be organized." I have italicized the missing words. -- G.S.]

(14) See Trotsky o Lenine i leninizme [Trotsky on Lenin and Leninism], Leningrad, 1925, p. 102.

(15) Marx and Engels, Sochineniya [Works, the Russian edition -- G.S.], Vol. 18, pp. 611-612.

(16) Ibid., Vol. 22, p. 520.

(17) Lenin, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Vol. 44, p. 42. [The wording here follows the English edition, Collected Works, Vol. 32, p. 485. -- G.S.]

United States of Europe." (1915), is known to Schapiro, but picturing himself as an expert on Soviet sources, he fails to see, or more exactly, he does not want to give due significance to Lenin's position in that article on the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country. To him, you see, this position represents merely a phrase dropped by chance, while the theory of socialist revolution itself is insufficiently substantiated. (18) [M] As we shall note, Trotsky said approximately the same thing in the mid-1920's. But the absurdity of these assertions becomes apparent even from a superficial reading of such well-known works of Lenin's as: "The Military Program of the Proletarian Revolution" (1916); "On the Tax in Kind" (1921); "On Our Revolution" (1923); and "On Cooperation" (1923). In these the idea first stated by him in the article "On the Slogan of the United States of Europe," is deeply and roundly substantiated and concretized.

It is no accident that the ideologists of imperialism counterpose the Trotskyist "theory of permanent revolution" to Lenin's position on the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country. Outwardly ultrarevolutionary, Trotskyism proves in fact to be barefaced opportunism and capitulationism. Thus, it is convenient and useful for the bourgeois falsifiers to picture the Trotskyists as partisans of world revolution and the Marxist-Leninists as opponents of it. It is no accident, then, that Siegfried Bahne in his article "Trotsky on Stalinist Russia" gives the reader to understand that the differences between Trotsky and the Communist party supposedly turned on the question of whether the idea of world revolution should or should not be repudiated. Naturally, in Bahne's version the Trotskyists come out as the "internationalists." As for the Leninist idea of the possibility of constructing socialism in one country, quoting Trotsky, he calls this a "reactionary utopia" and "national socialism." (19)

Bahne and, especially, Deutscher and Schapiro try to attribute to Marxist science a subjective, pragmatic approach completely foreign to it, but characteristic of bourgeois methodology. For example, they "explain" the advancement of the idea of building socialism in one country not by the objective conditions of the class struggle but by subjective "tactical considerations." But here they lack originality. The first to utter this false note was Trotsky. Seconding him, Schapiro endeavors to show that the Marxist conception of the revolutionary process was, supposedly, revised by the Communist party of the Soviet Union in the early 1920's, when the revolutionary wave had subsided in Europe. According to Schapiro, this was done out of purely practical considerations (it was necessary, he asserts, to find some form of consolation for the people, who were losing faith in the world revolution and beginning to feel isolated). Isaac Deutscher, too, expresses himself along this line. (20) Here, of course, they completely ignore the later works of V.I. Lenin and the party resolutions of that time, in which the policy line of building socialism in the USSR was worked out on the basis of a profound objective analysis of the conditions within the country and on the world arena. The conjectures of the bourgeois falsifiers about an imaginary retreat by the party in the 1920's from the Marxist conception of revolution are spiced with slanderous arguments about the struggle for power that was going on in that period within the party and the Soviet state. Corrupted by the customs of political life in the capitalist countries, where the struggle of ideas in almost every case serves only as a deceptive cover for the unprincipled struggle of bourgeois parties for power, Schapiro, Deutscher, and other "Sovietologists" attribute similar procedures to the Soviet political system.

The veritable flood of slander which the Trotskyists unleashed upon our party in the mid-1920's and the following period now flows through the channel of imperialist propaganda. "Thermidor," "bureaucratization," "bourgeois revival" -- thus the Trotskyists evaluated the situation in the party and Soviet state at the very time when the entire country was caught up in the enthusiasm of socialist construction, when the advantages of Soviet democracy were revealed for all to see -- advantages that could not be changed and were not changed by the errors and shortcomings accompanying the cult of personality that was gradually taking shape. It was at that time that bourgeois propaganda first seized upon the fabrications of Trotsky, and to this day they constitute its "methodological foundation."

That not unknown ideologist of imperialism and close associate of the American president, Walt Rostow, in his booklet The Dynamics of Soviet Society, in fact adopted the falsifying schema of Trotsky. The tract by the West German "Sovietologist" G. Scheuer

(18) Schapiro, op.cit., pp. 289-290.

(19) Survey, No. 41, April 1962, p. 31.

(20) Schapiro, op.cit., pp. 289-290; Prophet Unarmed, pp. 241-242, 246.

is composed in the same spirit.(21)

What conclusion do the bourgeois ideologists, together with the Trotskyists, draw from the situation created by their fancy in the Soviet land? Briefly and unambiguously: "The revolution has been betrayed. A new political revolution is needed." A revolution against whom? In their words, against the supposed "bureaucratic Bolshevik leadership," but in fact against the workers and peasants power in the USSR.

It is well known what resounding defeats past attempts to restore the capitalist order in our land have met with. A similar fate awaits those who, with this end in mind, continue to pursue the idea of bringing about a "political revolution," whether in the USSR or in other socialist countries.

Imperialist propaganda displayed special diligence in the period when the critique of the personality cult of Stalin was being developed. It tried in every way to make capital out of that event, undertaking a new attempt to rehabilitate Trotskyism and defame the history of the CPSU's struggle against him. But these efforts did not and will not attain their goal. The condemnation of the personality cult by the party by no means signifies the rehabilitation of anti-Leninist tendencies. In the program of the CPSU it is considered a historical service of the party to have defended Leninism in sharp struggle against the Trotskyists, the right opportunists, the national deviationists, and other hostile groups.

Imperialist propaganda tries to use Trotsky's "prophetic utterances" to identify the features of the personality cult with the entire social and state structure in the USSR. It is characteristic that bourgeois historiography should try to put over the idea that Trotsky was "the advocate of democracy." This thesis is repeated in every form in every back alley of reactionary propaganda. And this is said of Trotsky, who during his short stay in the Bolshevik party (1917-1927) fully revealed himself as an oligarch and bureaucrat, the creator of the theory of "tightening the screws" and "shaking up the trade unions," and so forth. Here there is no need to elucidate the whole course of the party's struggle with Trotskyism on these questions. We will call to mind only certain historical facts, which characterize the true attitude of the Trotskyists toward democracy. Trotsky assigned the proletarian state a "special" role. If the relations between the working class and the peasantry inevitably took the form of embittered and irreconcilable class struggle, then it followed, he held, that the workers state should constitute the same kind of harsh apparatus of compulsion and repression in relation to the peasants as it did in relation to other hostile classes. The dictatorship of the working class, according to Trotsky, ought to be realized not in the form of an alliance, a bond, with the peasantry, but in the form of domination over them. If Trotsky thought at all about "economic construction," he proposed to carry it out by robbing and squeezing the peasants, viewing them as objects of exploitation.

To the extent that Trotsky doubted the creative ability of the toilers of the Soviet land and placed his hopes entirely on help from without, on the part of the Western proletariat, to that extent the executive functions of the Soviet state lost all value in his eyes. On the other hand, coercion and administrative pressure became the normal method of administration. "No social organization except the army," Trotsky asserted, "has ever considered itself justified in subordinating citizens to itself in such a measure, and to control them by its will on all sides to such a degree of coercion as the state organization of the working class in the most difficult transitional epoch."(22)[N] The politics of such a state would inevitably become a politics of willful impulses and extreme adventurism. Trotsky assigned to repression an important place in the realization of such policies. "Repression for the attainment of economic ends is a necessary weapon of the Socialist dictatorship."(23)

If the dictatorship of the proletariat, in Trotsky's thinking, was a state of uninterrupted struggle between the proletariat and the peasantry, then it was inevitable, according to this scheme, that the relations of the party toward the working class itself should be molded according to the laws of wartime. Trotsky equated the dictatorship of the proletariat with the dictatorship of the party. "The dictatorship of the proletariat in its very essence," he asserted, "signifies the immediate suprem-

(21) See Georg Scheuer. Von Lenin bis...? Die Geschichte einer Kontrrevolution. Berlin und Hannover, 1957, p. 271.

(22) Leon Trotsky, Sochineniya [Works, the Russian edition of the early 1920's. -- G.S.], Vol. 12, pp. 161-162.

(23) Ibid., p. 143.

acy of the revolutionary vanguard."(24) For him there was not so much a dictatorship of, as a dictatorship over, the proletariat. This idea, by the way, is one that the bourgeois falsifiers often attribute to Lenin. Here again they ignore his countless statements about the democratic essence of the proletarian dictatorship, about the place and role of the party in this system. V.I.Lenin always stressed the point that persuasion is the only correct, the only possible, method for the party's work among the ranks of the workers. He saw the main essence of the proletarian dictatorship not in force but in the organized and disciplined character of the leading detachment of the toilers, its vanguard and only leader -- the proletariat, which is called upon to build socialism.(25) Even in the sharpest and severest moments of the class struggle Lenin never ceased to point to education of the masses as the fundamental method of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"The proletarian dictatorship," he said, "should consist above all, in the advanced, most conscious, and most disciplined section of the urban and industrial workers, training, educating and disciplining the rest of the proletariat, which is often unconscious, and the entire mass of toilers and peasantry."(26) The replacement of the method of persuasion with orders and threats in relation to the proletariat, which follows from the writings of Trotsky, radically contradicts the Leninist conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The thesis of the "internationalism" of Trotsky also fails to stand up under criticism. Deutscher, for example, tries to show that Trotsky was supposedly against carrying "revolution abroad on the point of bayonets."(27) Facts speak otherwise.

Trotsky was an ardent champion of the idea of "revolutionary" war as a means of instigating revolution from without. To be sure, in 1937, with feigned indignation he denied his part in propagandizing this idea. By speculating on the peace-loving aspirations of the toiling masses, he calculated, he could worm his way into their confidence. However, many of his writings speak to the contrary. In them, in one form or another, the theme of war as the only radical means of solving revolutionary problems comes through. Speaking of the European proletariat, Trotsky wrote: "The war stood them on their feet in a revolutionary sense." Further on, he passionately exclaims: "Was the working class, because of its social weight, capable of carrying out the revolution before the war? The war shook up the working class."(28)

In regard to Russia this "philosophy" had a no less warlike appearance. Thus, falsifying the history of 1918, when Soviet power won the life-saving reprieve of a temporary peace, Trotsky asserted that at that time "it was not a new breathing spell that had saved the revolution but an acute new danger that disclosed subterranean springs of revolutionary energy among the proletariat."(29) War is the source of the revolutionary energy of the masses; without war the revolution withers and in the last analysis perishes -- such is the conclusion that flows from these "discoveries." [0]

In contrast to Trotsky, V.I.Lenin pointed out that precisely the successes of the Soviet people in building socialism, the propagandizing of the experience of socialist construction, and the superiorities of the Soviet order over the system of capitalist exploitation would serve as a powerful revolutionizing factor, facilitating the victory of the proletariat in other countries. By strengthening the first state where the dictatorship of the working class had been established, the toilers of the USSR under the leadership of the party firmed up the base of the world socialist revolution. They always rendered fraternal assistance to the revolutionary movements in other countries. In the years of World War II it was none other than the Soviet Union that helped the peoples of Europe and Asia to free themselves from the yoke of Hitlerite fascism

(24) Ibid., p. 107.

(25) Lenin, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Vol. 38, p. 385.

(26) Lenin, op.cit., Vol. 41, p. 147.

(27) Isaac Deutscher, The Prophet Outcast, p. 519. [Actually, the quoted phrase appears on p. 517, and the subject is discussed for several pages. -- G.S.]

(28) L.Trotsky, Pyat let kominterna, p. 541. [Translated into English by J.G.Wright as The First Five Years of the Communist International, 2 vols., Pioneer Publishers, 1945-1953. The quotation is to be found in volume 2, pp. 308-309. An omission in the quotation will be considered separately. -- G.S.]

(29) L.Trotsky, O Lenine, p. 122. [The Russian original of Trotsky's Lenin. The English wording followed here is from the "authorized translation," paperback edition, published by Capricorn Books, New York, 1962. -- G.S.]

and Japanese militarism. Thanks to the crushing of these reactionary forces, with the Soviet Union playing a decisive role, favorable conditions arose for the victory of national-democratic and socialist revolutions, for the overthrow of the power of the landlords and capitalists by the peoples of a whole series of countries of Europe and Asia.

As for the Trotskyists, they hindered the development of the world revolution, striving by their splitting activities to weaken the leading revolutionary forces of our time -- the Communist party of the Soviet Union, the other fraternal parties, and the first socialist state in the world. Trotsky himself in 1927, answering the question of the chairman of the Central Control Commission G.K. Ordjonokidze, on the political line of the opposition in the event of war against the USSR, openly declared that the opposition would remove the leadership of the party even in a case where the enemy was at the gates of Moscow.[P]

Louis Aragon wrote of the Trotskyist opposition: "...the opposition's anti-party activity took on an anti-Soviet nature. Trotsky's directive letter of October 21, 1928, was published simultaneously in Maslow's paper and in Rul, the Kadets' journal in Berlin. It stigmatized the regime in the USSR as 'inside-out Kerenskyism'; it called upon Trotsky's sympathizers to organize strikes [in the USSR! -- Mikeshin]; to bring about the failure of the campaign for the collective contracts; and to prepare the opposition cadres for a possible civil war."(30)[Q]

One can imagine how weighty would have been the consequences for our country had the Communist party not crushed the Trotskyist opposition, both ideologically and organizationally, before the stern years of the war against fascism.

Trotskyism in our country suffered total bankruptcy. Despite the prophecies of the Trotskyists, the Soviet people under the leadership of the Communist party have successfully carried out the legacy of Lenin and will continue to do so. The successes of socialist construction in the Soviet Union assured the eventual political collapse of Trotskyism. It finally turned into a counterrevolutionary tendency, directing the brunt of its efforts against the Soviet Union, the CPSU, and the international Communist movement.

* * *

After his expulsion from the Soviet Union in 1929, Trotsky directed his activities toward splitting the Communist movement. He strived to implant or spread his factions in all the Communist parties and with their aid to break up these parties. He pursued the idea of building an international Trotskyist center as a counterweight to the Third Communist International, the true general staff of the international proletariat. In September 1938, at a conference of Trotskyist groups from 11 countries, the formation of the Fourth (Trotskyist) International was announced with great ceremony. Trotsky on this occasion loudly proclaimed: "In the course of the next ten years the program of the Fourth International will win millions to its side."

And, lo, not ten but almost thirty years have passed. And? It turns out that the Fourth International has failed to gain influence over the masses of even a single country. This bitter admission is contained in the basic resolution of the so-called Reunification Congress of the Fourth International (June 1963).[R]

In order not to pass out of the political picture completely, Trotskyism now tries to change its political coloring, adapt to new conditions, to such real phenomena as the victory of the Soviet Union, together with the freedom-loving peoples of the world, over German fascism and Japanese militarism, the full and complete victory of socialism in the USSR, the unfolding spread of the national liberation movement in the underdeveloped countries, and so forth. In the face of this reality Trotskyism, experiencing a permanent crisis, has begun to hunt feverishly for some means of salvation. Its leaders worked out a tactic of self-preservation which was ultimately christened "entrism" (i.e., "infiltration"). The Trotskyists fastened onto many popular slogans, hoping thus to creep into the confidence of the masses.

Life has forced the Trotskyists themselves to quietly revise the more odious points in "Trotsky's heritage." Today, even they do not speak of the impossibility of the construction of socialism in a single country. Such assertions in our day would be simply laughable. But the Trotskyists have been quick to find a substitute for their bankrupt dogma: and now they have placed in doubt the construction of communism in

(30) Aragon. Histoire parallele. Histoire de l'URSS de 1917 à 1960, tome 1, Paris 1962, p. 284. [English wording from Aragon, Louis, A History of the USSR; from Lenin to Khrushchev, translated by Patrick O'Brian, New York. McKay, 1964, p. 256. -- G.S.]

the USSR.

Life has laughed at the "prophecies" of Trotsky about the inevitability of conflict between the working class and the peasantry, about the collapse of the kolkhoz system, and the unavoidable defeat of Soviet power. Even the biographer of Trotsky was forced to corroborate this fact. "In retrospect," writes Deutscher, "it may appear that Trotsky took too black a view: the collective farms did not collapse, after all." (31) [S]

V.I. Lenin, pointing to the essence of petty-bourgeois deviations in the workers movement, noted that those who express such deviations characteristically vacillate from one extreme to another. Such metamorphosis has indeed taken place among the Trotskyists over the peasant question. While Trotsky, to the end of his days, desperately adhered to the old Social-Democratic dogma of the reactionary nature of the peasantry, his followers have made a 180-degree turn. As though nothing had happened, they have begun to speak of the "radical," or even the "revolutionary," role of the peasantry, above all of the peasantry of the underdeveloped countries. They now cry out about the great historical significance of the national liberation movement, which previously they had ignored.

It is paradoxical but true: The Trotskyists have imperceptibly returned to their starting point. In spite of everything, Trotsky's dogma about the inevitability of a break, of conflict, between the working class and the peasantry has surfaced again, but this time on the international rather than the intrastate level.

Contemporary Trotskyists preach the sundering of bonds between the world proletariat and the national liberation movement, which is basically of peasant character and composition. They oppose the Leninist theory of the hegemony of the proletariat in the international revolutionary process, trying in every way to isolate the popular masses of countries that have won their national independence or are fighting for it from the influence of the revolutionary struggle of the peoples of the socialist states and the working class of the developed capitalist countries. On the one hand, they cry out that the socialist countries, above all the USSR, have supposedly "become bourgeoisified," that the working class of the capitalist countries has become "sullied with opportunism," and on the other, they endeavor to show that the "vanguard," the "main force of the world revolution is the national liberation movement."

In contrast to this fallacious conception of the Trotskyists, the programmatic documents of the world Communist movement affirm the ideas of the unshakable alliance between the international working class, its offspring -- the world socialist system -- and the national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Without in the least belittling the significance of the national liberation movement, the Marxist-Leninists declare that only the hegemony of the working class can direct the liberation movement into the channel of thoroughgoing struggle against imperialism and carry it through to conclusion. Only under this condition will the anti-imperialist liberation movement in the last analysis acquire a truly socialist character.

In the program of contemporary Trotskyists there is one point that is taken whole, without any changes, from the "theory of permanent revolution" -- that is, the denial of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The Trotskyists speak out against the policy of peaceful coexistence, both covertly (hiding behind the formula invented by Trotsky, "Neither war nor peace") and openly (calling the peaceful coexistence policy "opportunist" and a "policy of conciliation with imperialism"). The most brazen of the Trotskyist shouters openly reveal what they would like as a substitute for the policy of peaceful coexistence. "The correct strategy for the workers states," wrote the newspaper Frente Obrero, organ of the Uruguayan Trotskyists, on Jan. 24, 1963, "is as follows: to attack in order to promote the world revolution, so that the masses of the whole world will feel that the promotion of the world revolution, the promotion of the socialist revolution, is the best and only means of breaking down the capitalist countries." War, in their opinion, is the best means for such "promotion" of revolution. In this connection the above-mentioned newspaper emphasized that the Fourth International bases its activity "on the program of taking power, overthrowing capitalism, preparing itself for the atomic war, or preparing a preventive war before imperialism unleashes one." The same line is expressed in several other little papers and journals, published by the Trotskyists of France, Italy, the U.S.A., Brazil, Bolivia, and Chile. [T]

The Fourth International presents a repulsive spectacle. Like spiders in a jar, the Trotskyist grouplets, clinging to its sides, bite at one another. One Trotskyist grouping calls itself the International Secretariat, another the International Commit-

(31) I. Deutscher, The Prophet Outcast, p. 97.

tee, a third the Latin American Bureau. In 1954 the bickering within the Fourth International issued in an open split. Arguments among the Trotskyists centered, above all, on the struggle against the Marxist-Leninist parties. Only a short time ago, in June 1963, the Trotskyist organizations of various stripe were formally united again. This happened at the Seventh (so-called Reunification) Congress of the Fourth International. But, barely having united, the Trotskyists split once again. In England the former Labor Review, organ of the Socialist Labour League began to be published as the journal of the International Committee of the Fourth International, under the name Fourth International. This new journal counterposed itself to the old one of the same name, the organ of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International. The "new-born child" accused its "elder brother" of perverting Marxism by its insufficient "radicalism," of trying to adapt itself to circumstances in violation of Trotskyist doctrine. (32) [U]

Does this not testify to the definitive collapse of Trotskyism -- both ideologically and organizationally?

* * *

Imperialist reaction stops at nothing in its struggle against the USSR and the world Communist movement. It eagerly uses all possible opposition grouplets and tendencies that happen to wander into the ranks of the international proletariat. That is why even bankrupt Trotskyism ends up as a weapon of anti-Communism. The imperialist ideologists are not embarrassed by the ultra-revolutionary phraseology of the Trotskyists. What is important for them is the essence of this tendency, whose edge is directed against the Soviet Union, the world socialist system, and the international Communist movement.

But the ideologists of anti-Communism should remember that the working class in all countries long ago discerned the counterrevolutionary essence of Trotskyism. In this they were aided by the many years' experience of our Leninist party in struggle against Trotskyism, its ideology and practice. This experience testifies to the invincibility of the ideas of creative Marxism-Leninism, to the inevitable collapse of dogmatism and revisionism, no matter how "left" the attire in which they clothe themselves.

(32) See Fourth International. A Journal of the International Committee of the Fourth International, 1964, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 4-21.

Translator's Notes

[A] (p. 4) It is quite true that in recent years there has been growing interest throughout the world in the personality, ideas, and achievements of Leon Trotsky. One of the main sectors where this has occurred is among revolutionary-minded youth. Bourgeois publishing houses have viewed this with mixed emotions. On the one hand, immediate profits are to be gained by bringing out something by or about Trotsky; on the other hand, in the long run, to spread Trotsky's ideas strengthens the revolutionary-socialist movement and thereby undermines capitalism. This is why they always attach forewords or annotations intended as antidotes to "Trotskyism." To be honest, Mikeshin should have noted that besides Trotsky, there has also been a rise in public interest in Marx, Engels and Lenin, not to mention Castro, Guevara, Mao and even such personalities as Stalin and Khrushchev. In publishing books by or about these and other figures, the bourgeois houses handle them much as they do Trotsky's works. Mikeshin, of course, had his own reasons for presenting a distorted picture to his audience, which is not free to check the accuracy of his account.

[B] (p. 4) "Sovietologists" are of two types, most often combined to varying degrees in the same person. The one seeks to provide accurate information about the Soviet Union, which is required by the imperialist strategists in working out their anti-Soviet and counterrevolutionary policies. The other seeks to provide vitriolic propaganda for the bourgeois press. Usually tied closely to their imperialist governments, their financial as well as ideological existence hinges on their display of skill and unscrupulousness.

It is all the more remarkable, then, that contrary to Mikeshin's assertions, the general pack of Sovietologists are completely against Trotsky and everything he stood for. Whatever grudging admiration they may express for Trotsky as an individual, they show little sympathy for his main views on the USSR -- that the Soviet Union preserves

its basic anticapitalist structure; that the Stalinist regime represents a parasitic caste that usurped power but in its own way defends the workers state from imperialism, so that the Soviet workers cannot farm out the job of settling accounts with it; that the Soviet workers must reestablish proletarian democracy in the USSR as part of the general task of advancing socialist revolution on a world scale.

To label Isaac Deutscher as a "Sovietologist" in this sense is a smear. Deutscher defends the social gains of the October 1917 Revolution both within the Soviet Union and against imperialism, as anyone free to read his biography of Trotsky and other books and articles can easily ascertain for himself.

[C] (p. 4) Sensing the weakness of his amalgamation of Trotskyism with rightist reactionaries and capitalist publishing houses, Mikeshin develops a "theoretical" explanation for their "affinity." The capitalists, according to this, long ago saw through the mask of the "red dragon," and so forth. The "anti-Soviet nature" of Trotskyism, says Mikeshin, was understood even by the capitalist politician Milyukov.

In quoting Milyukov's paper, Mikeshin provides us with an instructive example of Stalinist frame-up methods. The statement in Poslednie novosti appears to provide crushing evidence of the correctness of his argument. But on checking the original source, we discover that Poslednie novosti specifically states that it is not referring to the Left Opposition headed by Trotsky but a rightist opposition that existed in the Communist party at the time. Thus Mikeshin lies, and lies deliberately, when he says that Poslednie novosti "without beating around the bush characterized the Trotskyist opposition as the most dangerous enemy of Soviet power."

Polemicizing against another emigré paper, which had advocated calling for an uprising, Poslednie novosti argued that it was shrewder policy to take sides in the intraparty dispute among the Communists. Referring to the situation as a whole, without reference to a particular opposition, Poslednie novosti explained: "There in Russia we see no such outbreaks. The most dangerous enemy for Soviet power now is the one which creeps up on it unnoticed, wraps it round with its tentacles, and liquidates it before it notices it has been liquidated. Precisely this role [the significance of the quotation becomes clearer as we continue -- G.S.], necessary and unavoidable in the preparatory period, from which we have not yet issued, is played by the Soviet opposition. The conjunction within it of the left and right wings is completely fortuitous; this is called for exclusively by the circumstances of the struggle. And it is well known to our readers that while making our choice [i.e., among the Communist disputants -- G.S.], we have never in that choice come out on the side of the left opposition. [Emphasis in the original. -- G.S.] One must of course prefer Stalin to Zinoviev. [Zinoviev had temporarily joined Trotsky and his supporters in the Left Opposition so that Stalin stood to the right of Zinoviev. -- G.S.] But one must prefer Medvedev and Ossovsky to Stalin. It was not for nothing that Zinoviev in the previous phase of the struggle complained that the party had been 'enveloped' by petty bourgeois and Cadetish moods."

Ossovsky, a one-time supporter of the Left Opposition, broke away and shifted to the right, coming out for the inclusion in the government of representatives of parties under the influence of the bourgeoisie -- perhaps something similar to the practice featured decades later in the people's democracies of Eastern Europe and China under Mao. Medvedev, head of the metalworkers union and an influential leader in the Workers Opposition, a distinct tendency headed by Shlyapnikov and Kollontai, advocated forgetting about revolution abroad and granting a vast extension of foreign concessions in order to finance building heavy industry.

It is thus perfectly clear that Mikeshin does have a factual basis for referring to the hopes of the Cadet newspaper Poslednie novosti. It did hope that an opposition would succeed in establishing itself and eventually become strong enough to liquidate the regime. But the facts also show that as between Trotsky and Stalin, this bourgeois emigré group made a perfectly logical and understandable distinction and stated their preference for Stalin. In other words, by applying Mikeshin's own argumentation, we come to the inescapable conclusion that the "affinity" is between the counterrevolutionaries and Stalinism.

Even if we reject Mikeshin's whole methodology as specious, what conclusion must be drawn about a position that can only be "substantiated" through the deliberate concoction of "proofs" and the twisting of quotations into meanings that are the very opposite of the original? Trotsky aptly called this the "Stalinist school of falsification."

[D] (p. 4) Deutscher does discuss the "adventitious use" made of The Revolution Betrayed by anti-Communists, pointing out, though, that such use depends on taking pieces out of context. Much more apropos, however, is the following passage, appearing

on the very same page from which Mikeshin quoted:

"In our time, however, its ideas are already in the air in the U.S.S.R., where Trotsky's writings are still banned. The Soviet Jourdainians who nowadays unknowingly speak his prose are legion: they are to be found in universities, factories, literary clubs, Komsomol cells, and even in the ruling circles."

Deutscher observes that "Trotsky's verdict that the Stalin era 'will go down in the history of artistic creation preeminently as an epoch of mediocrities, laureates, and toadies' has come to be generally accepted." One cannot but marvel at the nature of "historians" like Mikeshin who can read this without blushing.

[E] (p. 5) Mikeshin's attempted sarcasms over Lessons of October becloud the issue, of course. Trotsky did not assert that he rather than Lenin or the Bolsheviks organized and inspired the October Revolution. Quite the contrary. He often acknowledged that only a party led by a Lenin could have accomplished that. What Trotsky pointed to in 1924 was a well-known episode in the Bolshevik party's history -- a very crucial episode. Lenin in April 1917, when he arrived in Russia from exile, had to carry out single-handed a fight to reorient Bolshevik policy.

Under the leadership of Kamenev and Stalin, before Lenin's arrival, the Bolsheviks in Petrograd were following in the train of the bourgeois Provisional Government and its continuation of the imperialist war. The perspective of the working class, the Soviets, taking power was not even whispered. Part of the fault lay with Lenin's formula of a "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry." This general slogan left open the question of the exact nature of the projected state. Trotsky, in contrast, "even before the revolution of 1905," to quote the notes to the Complete Works of Lenin, published while Lenin was still alive, "advanced the original and now especially famous theory of Permanent Revolution, asserting that the bourgeois revolution of 1905 would go directly over into a socialist revolution and prove the first of a series of national revolutions."

The political transformation that occurred among the Bolsheviks in April 1917 under Lenin's blows is fully documented and well known to any serious student of the Russian Revolution. Lenin did quickly win the support of the Bolshevik party to the perspective that the 1917 Russian Revolution should go directly over into a socialist revolution such was the fundamentally revolutionary character of the party which he had constructed.

Trotsky's point in Lessons of October, published seven years later in continuation of the struggle opened by Lenin against the rising danger of bureaucratism, was that even within the most revolutionary party known to history, the Bolsheviks, a definite current had existed that opposed the perspective of a proletarian revolution in Russia in 1917. Kamenev, together with Zinoviev, had even broken ranks in October 1917 and announced to the bourgeoisie the Bolshevik plans to take power. Trotsky's purpose in reminding the party about these episodes was to point to the danger of an internal degeneration of the party, of its falling under petty-bourgeois or bourgeois influences.

But, as Mikeshin says rather needlessly, the CPSU rejected Trotsky's point of view on the questions raised in Lessons of October. Curiously, he mentions only the "well-known party decisions and literature on party history" in which "Trotskyism" was rejected. His tongue proves unwieldy when it comes to mentioning the names of the men who led that fight -- Stalin, Kamenev, Zinoviev. It would be even more embarrassing for Mikeshin to discuss their subsequent political evolution and personal fates.

[F] (p. 5) The English wording of this quotation is from Left-wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder, pp. 21-22, in the Foreign Languages Publishing House edition, Moscow, no date, "Books for Socialism" series. Mikeshin clearly implies that Lenin had in mind Trotsky or Trotskyism. The context of Section IV of that pamphlet, from which the quotation is taken, shows that Lenin was dealing, not with "Trotskyism," but with anarchism and the Socialist Revolutionary party. For example, Lenin writes: "At its inception in 1903, Bolshevism took over the tradition of ruthless struggle against petty-bourgeois, semianarchist (or dilettante-anarchist) revolutionism, the tradition which has always existed in revolutionary Social-Democracy, and [which] became particularly strong in 1900-03, when the foundations for a mass party of the revolutionary proletariat were being laid in Russia. Bolshevism took over and continued the struggle against the party which more than any other expressed the tendencies of petty-bourgeois revolutionism, namely, the 'Socialist-Revolutionary' Party, and waged this struggle on three main points."

Mikeshin's quotation, to be found on page 20 of the above-mentioned edition, is

worded as follows: "It is far from sufficiently known as yet abroad that Bolshevism grew up, took shape, and became steeled in long years of struggle against petty-bourgeois revolutionism [here Mikeshin stopped; Lenin's sentence, though, went on -- G.S.], which smacks of, or borrows something from, anarchism, and which falls short, in anything essential, of the conditions and requirements of a consistently proletarian class struggle."

[G] (p. 5) Mikeshin's reference to Lenin's "Letter to the Congress" constitutes perhaps his most grotesque exhibition in pseudoscholarship. That letter is best known today as "Lenin's Testament." It is the first item in an interesting little collection called Lenin's Last Letters and Articles, which Progress Publishers of Moscow has made widely available in English in pamphlet form.

Here is what Progress Publishers says in a footnote on the fate of the "Testament": "Lenin considered it necessary that after his death the letter should be communicated to the regular Party Congress. In accordance with his wishes the letter was read out to the delegates of the Thirteenth Party Congress, held from May 23 to 31, 1924. The Congress unanimously decided that the letter should not be published just then since it was addressed to the Congress and not intended for publication.

"By a decision of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U.," Progress Publishers goes on, "the above-mentioned letters of Lenin's were communicated to the delegates of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. and distributed to Party organizations. As instructed by the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. these letters were published in 1956 by the journal Communist No. 9, and issued as a separate pamphlet in a large edition."

The most famous part of this well-known document is Lenin's warning that "Comrade Stalin, having become General Secretary, has unlimited authority in his hands, and I am not sure whether he will always be capable of using that authority with sufficient caution." Lenin advised that he should be removed from this important post.

Why did the thirteenth congress and the subsequent ones fail to heed Lenin, going directly against him instead? We can search in vain in the works of Mikeshin or any other luminary of the bureaucratic press in the Soviet Union for enlightenment on this. Instead Mikeshin stresses Lenin's reference to Trotsky's "non-Bolshevism." But Lenin did not just refer to this. He said, again using the English version supplied by Progress Publishers: "...the October episode with Zinoviev and Kamenev was, of course, no accident, but neither can the blame for it be laid upon him* [*Apparently a slip of the pen: the context suggests 'them' for 'him.' -- Footnote in the Progress Publishers edition.] personally, any more than non-Bolshevism can upon Trotsky."

The fact is that a campaign was opened up against Trotsky right after Lenin's death by none other than Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev, in which one of the main aims for the moment was to try to weaken Trotsky's authority and prestige by campaigning on his not having been a member of the Bolshevik party before 1917. Forty years later, Mikeshin merely echoes this campaign -- without mentioning either its authors or Lenin's references to them, nor why it took more than three decades for Lenin's letter to be published in the Soviet Union.

Trotsky's 1934 discussion of the political significance of Lenin's Testament is well worth reading in the light of all that has happened since. It is available in a Pioneer Pocket Library edition. [For a copy send \$.25 to Merit Publishers, 5 East Third St., New York, N.Y. 10003.]

[H] (p. 5) For the concept of "permanent revolution" in germinal form and under that name, see Marx and Engels' "Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League" in their Selected Works (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1955), pp. 106-117.

Curiously, Mikeshin charges Leonard Schapiro with echoing Trotsky's claim that the theory of the permanent revolution goes back to Marx. Schapiro, who likes to proclaim a reformist and Menshevik version of Marxism as the true one, stands on common ground with Mikeshin here. While Schapiro has to be a little more honest (because he can be answered in the press of the bourgeois countries), he too tries to get around the Marxist roots of the theory of permanent revolution. "But these views," Schapiro pleads, "were a temporary aberration from Marx's scientific analysis, formed under the impetus of what he believed was the rising tide of revolution."

[I] (p. 5) We have noted already that Trotsky did not claim to have tutored Lenin. In fact, he acknowledged more than once that Lenin was his teacher, particularly in the field of party building. But Lenin's and Trotsky's views on the nature of the Russian Revolution coincided sufficiently for them to lead the Bolshevik party jointly

in establishing Soviet power; i.e., the dictatorship of the proletariat in a backward country; and under their leadership the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution -- land reform and national independence, for example -- were carried out under forms that were socialist in principle. The heights of the economy were expropriated and made public property, the old capitalist state was destroyed, and the workers in arms became the basis of the new state.

Before the Russian Revolution, Lenin and Trotsky had differences as to the nature of its probable course, but on the main political orientation they agreed. It seems that Lenin did not until after the October Revolution actually read Trotsky's theses on this question, written in 1905; but once he did, he apparently agreed with them. (This question is discussed at length in Trotsky's works: "Two Concepts of the Russian Revolution"; Chapters 15 and 16 of History of the Russian Revolution; of course in Permanent Revolution and My Life, especially Chapter 13, and pp. 203-204 and pp. 332-333; clarifying references are also given in the "explanatory notes 55-57" in The Stalin School of Falsification. See also Deutscher, The Prophet Armed, p. 162.)

Mikeshin's quotation comes from Lenin's "The Aim of the Proletarian Struggle in Our Revolution" (see Collected Works, Vol. 15, 1963, pp. 360-378). It appears in the context of an attack on Martov, the leading Menshevik. The context is as follows:

"As for Trotsky, whom Comrade Martov has involved in the controversy of third parties which he has organized -- a controversy involving everybody except the dissentient -- we positively cannot go into a full examination of his views here. A separate article of considerable length would be needed for this." [Italics mine -- G.S.] Lenin apparently never wrote such an article, and the fact that he rebuts quotations from Trotsky brought in by Martov suggests that he knew these bits and pieces of Trotsky's ideas only secondhand. None of the three points Lenin differs with are fundamental principles, but constitute differences of evaluation or prediction. Lenin argues that the possibility of a well-formed peasant party appearing in the revolution and taking part in the government beside the workers should not be excluded. And he disagrees with the suggestion that Trotsky seems to have made, according to Martov, that the peasantry would respond to a workers regime in the same way as to a bourgeois one.

"By just touching upon Trotsky's mistaken views, and quoting scraps of them," Lenin continues, "Comrade Martov only sows confusion in the mind of the reader, for scraps of quotations do not explain but confuse matters. Trotsky's major mistake is that he ignores the bourgeois character of the revolution and has no clear conception of the transition from this revolution to the socialist revolution. This major mistake leads to those mistakes on side issues which Comrade Martov repeats [my emphasis -- G.S.] when he quotes a couple of them with sympathy and approval." Lenin goes on to deal with these "side issues," but he does not develop the more fundamental charge about Trotsky's "major mistake." It is easy to cite such a quotation, but what does it mean? Life itself proved that Trotsky had seen very clearly that despite the "bourgeois" nature of the revolution it could only be carried out under the leadership of the working class and under a workers government.

As to the slogan "No tsar, but a workers government," it does not appear to have been a big point with Lenin. He mentions it in his "Concluding Remarks in the Debate Concerning the Report on the Present Situation, April 14(27)," found in the Collected Works, Vol. 24 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1964). It isn't particularly "sharp criticism." And the report itself is very much in the spirit of "uninterrupted revolution."

The report was given at the Petrograd city conference of the Bolsheviks, April 14-22 (Old Style), 1917. It was part of Lenin's struggle against the "old" Bolshevism and for the perspective of the April Theses. The "old" Bolsheviks, among other things, said he was advocating Trotskyism. It is in this context that the following "concluding remarks" must be understood:

"Trotskyism: 'No tsar, but a workers' government.' This is wrong. A petty bourgeoisie exists, and it cannot be dismissed. But it is in two parts. The poorer of the two is with the working class." (p. 150)

The following passages in the report itself are illuminating:

"Old Bolshevism should be discarded. The line of the petty bourgeoisie must be separated from that of the wage-earning proletariat." (p. 149)

"The Soviet is the implementation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the soldiers; among the latter the majority are peasants. It is therefore a dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. But this 'dictatorship' has entered into an agreement with the bourgeoisie. And this is where the 'old' Bolshevism needs revising." (p. 142)

"The bourgeois revolution in Russia is completed insofar as power has come into the hands of the bourgeoisie. Here the 'old Bolsheviks' argue: 'It is not completed -- for there is no dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry.' But the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies is that very dictatorship." (p. 143)

[J] (p. 6) The quotation from Mitrany's thoroughly anti-Marxist work is said by Mikeshin to apply only to "Trotskyism" not to Marxism. In other words, he's saying the garbage is good; it was just thrown at the wrong target. Mitrany is a reactionary advocate of "back to the land," whose venom strikes at the whole of modern urban industrial development. Mikeshin's sympathetic appreciation of Mitrany's mud-slinging reveals much about the true nature of the Kremlin's ideologists.

Trotsky put his finger on this kind of development long ago, since "underestimating the peasantry" was one of the chief slanders the rising bureaucracy heaped on his head. "From what does this accusation of Trotsky's wishing to 'rob the peasant' derive -- that formula which the reactionary agrarians, the Christian socialists, and the Fascists always direct against socialists and against communists in particular?" (My Life, pp. 516-517.)

See p. 222 of My Life for Trotsky's actual reply to this charge.

[K] (p. 6) Mikeshin took these phrases from a "collection of materials," edited by one G. Safarov and called "Trotsky on Lenin and Leninism." This was published in Leningrad, February 1925, in a run of 50,000 copies, as part of the smear campaign which Stalin, Zinoviev, and Kamenev quite deliberately opened up against "Trotskyism." Mikeshin relied heavily on such material for his article, it would seem. Here's how Safarov introduced his "anthology":

"This collection of materials is more in need of a postscript than a foreword.

"And for understandable reasons. Wide circles of our party are almost completely unfamiliar with the ferocious fight under the banner of Menshevism that Trotsky carried on against Lenin and Leninism, beginning with 1903, from the moment of origin of the Menshevik tendency, right down to 1917, to the moment of its crushing.

"We set ourselves the task of making Trotskyism speak with its own tongue. We suppose that for a thorough and conclusive cleansing of the party's consciousness from the hypnotic spell cast by the 'left-' sounding phrase, which hides in itself the crassest opportunism, this will be of some use."

[L] (p. 6) On the question of the traditional attitude of Marxists toward the peasantry, while it is true that they have always held it to be wrong to underestimate the peasantry, they have also held that an unqualified "high opinion for its revolutionary energy" is equally wrong. The class evaluation of the peasantry is entirely missing from Mikeshin's exercise in "historical" writing. But Lenin supplied that very analysis in the same work from which Mikeshin quotes ("Report on the Tactics of the Russian Communist Party," Collected Works, Vol. 32, pp. 478-496).

"In addition to this class of exploiters [capitalists and big landowners -- G.S.], there is in nearly all capitalist countries...a class of small producers and small farmers. The main problem of the revolution now is how to fight these two classes. In order to be rid of them we must adopt methods other than those employed against the big landowners and capitalists...other methods of struggle must be adopted in their case...we are now trying to determine the attitude the proletariat in power should adopt towards the last capitalist class -- the rock-bottom of capitalism -- small private property, the small producer." (My emphasis -- G.S.)

There was no disagreement between Lenin and Trotsky on the need for an alliance between the workers and peasants. In fact, defense of this alliance was one of the main points in the program of the Left Opposition; and one of the heaviest charges laid against Stalin by the Left Opposition was that his policies endangered this alliance.

[M] (p. 7) On the theory of building socialism in one country: this of course was the fundamental difference in the Trotsky-Stalin dispute, since it involved attitudes toward the world socialist revolution. Ever since that dispute began, the supporters of Stalin's views have tried to assert that Lenin advocated building socialism in one country. Stalin himself was the first to try to bend Lenin's 1915 article "On the Slogan of the United States of Europe" to this purpose.

The appropriate passage in that article is as follows:

"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 organizing 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 political form of a society wherein the proletariat is victorious in overthrowing the bourgeoisie will be a democratic republic, which will more and more concentrate the forces of the proletariat of a given nation or nations in the struggle against states that have not yet gone over to socialism." [Collected Works, Vol. 21, pp. 342-343.)

First, Lenin means by "victory" a victory "in overthrowing the bourgeoisie" -- not the victorious construction of a socialist economy, starting from an economically backward base. Second, Lenin also had in mind workers' seizure of power in an advanced capitalist country -- so he did not need to refute the idea that the international struggle should be put off until after a backward country has "overtaken and surpassed" the most advanced capitalist country. Certainly his description of the international struggle that would follow a workers' seizure of power in a single country has far more in common with the theory of permanent revolution that Trotsky elaborated, and with the state of affairs that actually arose in the world, than the utopian scheme of peaceful economic competition that the Stalins, Khrushchevs, and now the Kosygin keep trying to promote.

Lenin's "Military Program of the Proletarian Revolution" (1916), which Mikeshin also refers to, carries this theme even further.

"The victory of socialism in one country," says Lenin, "does not at one stroke eliminate all war in general. On the contrary, it presupposes wars.... 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. In such cases a war on our part would be a legitimate and just war. It would be a war for socialism, for the liberation of other nations from the bourgeoisie. Engels was perfectly right when, in his letter to Kautsky of September 12, 1882, he clearly stated that it was possible for already victorious socialism to wage 'defensive wars.' What he had in mind was defense of the victorious proletariat against the bourgeoisie of other countries.

"Only after we have overthrown, finally vanquished and expropriated the bourgeoisie of the whole world, and not merely of one country, will wars be impossible." (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 23, p. 80.)

[N] (p. 8) The quotations cited in Mikeshin's notes 22, 23, and 24, are all from Trotsky's polemic against Kautsky, written in the same spirit as Lenin's The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky. (The English wording of these quotations is from Terrorism and Communism, Ann Arbor Paperback edition, 1961, pp. 141, 149, and 110, in that order. This was not the only case in which the two leaders of the Russian Revolution polemicized against the same foe. Lenin's polemic against the Left Wing Communists in 1920, the very work from which Mikeshin quoted in his footnote 7 above, was complemented by Trotsky's speeches and articles around the second congress of the Third International.)

The following paragraph from Terrorism and Communism, where Trotsky is discussing the Soviets, the trade unions, and the party, should clarify somewhat his alleged position on the "dictatorship of the party":

"We have more than once been accused of having substituted for the dictatorship of the Soviets the dictatorship of our party. Yet it can be said with complete justice that the dictatorship of the Soviets became possible only by means of the dictatorship of the party. It is thanks to the clarity of its theoretical vision and its strong revolutionary organization that the party has afforded to the Soviets the possibility of becoming transformed from shapeless parliaments of labor into the apparatus of the supremacy of labor. In the 'substitution' of the power of the party for the power of the working class there is nothing accidental, and in reality there is no substitution at all. The Communists express the fundamental interests of the working class. It is quite natural that, in the period in which history brings up those interests, in all their magnitude, on to the order of the day, the Communists have become the recognized representatives of the working class as a whole." (p. 109)

As for the quotations from Trotsky on "repression" and the use of force by the Soviet state, these are from section 8 of the book, in which Trotsky's famous pro-

posals for militarization of the unions, and the labor force in general, are laid out. Although this section includes a general (and valuable) discussion of the historical forms of the coercion of labor, the tone and proposals must be understood in the context of the economic crisis in the young Soviet republic toward the end of the Civil War. Trotsky's proposals carried over into the trade-union discussion within the CPSU, which Mikeschin refers to. Lenin opposed Trotsky's views; but the Kronstadt events cut across the whole discussion. Out of this emerged the New Economic Policy. This was aimed at a more general solution of the crisis in place of Trotsky's militarization proposals.

For Mikeschin to base his charge that Trotsky was an autocrat and oligarch on that episode in the midst of a critical, turbulent, and rapidly changing situation is the purest charlatanry. The same charges were leveled at Lenin and have been repeated ad nauseum by the bourgeois ideologists and Sovietologists ever since.

Mikeschin, of course, has only a simple aim in mind. He badly needs a smokescreen to cover up the horrors of Stalin's forced collectivization of the peasantry, the forced labor camps and the monstrous purges that decimated several generations of the Soviet vanguard. Stalin's crimes took place under cover of the "most democratic constitution in the world." A decade after the revelations at the twentieth congress, Mikeschin is still occupied with the chore of maintaining the image of Stalin as a patron of democracy! The method practiced by this "historian" is the hoary one of accusing the victim of the crimes committed against him. By reversing the roles of Stalin and Trotsky in this way, Mikeschin echoes one of the themes of the most vulgar imperialist propaganda; namely, if Trotsky had won, he would have been just as bad as Stalin -- "it's inherent in the Communist system, you see, to produce dictators."

[O] (p. 9) In regard to the charge that Trotsky championed "revolutionary" war, Mikeschin is aware that he is on soft ground -- especially after referring to writings in which Lenin discusses "defensive wars" aimed at "overthrowing, finally vanquishing and expropriating the bourgeoisie of the whole world." That is why he touches the subject lightly and then runs.

At the hearings conducted by the John Dewey Commission, in its investigations that led to the famous verdict in 1937 that the charges leveled against Trotsky and his son Leon Sedov in the Moscow trials were nothing but frame-ups, Trotsky took up this particular charge. Here is what he said:

"The second fantastic theory which is put into circulation by the friends of the G.P.U. declares that in view of my general position I am presumably politically interested in expediting war. The usual line of argument is as follows: Trotsky is for the international revolution. It is well known that war often produces revolution. Ergo, Trotsky must be interested in expediting war.

"People who believe this, or who ascribe such ideas to me, have a very feeble conception of revolution, war, and their interdependence.

"War has in fact often expedited revolution. But precisely for this reason it has often led to abortive results. War sharpens social contradictions and mass discontent. But that is insufficient for the triumph of the proletarian revolution. Without a revolutionary party rooted in the masses, the revolutionary situation leads to the most cruel defeats. The task is not to 'expedite' war -- for this, unfortunately, the imperialists of all countries are working, not unsuccessfully. The task is to utilize the time which the imperialists still leave to the working masses for the building of a revolutionary party and revolutionary trade unions."

Trotsky then lists a number of revolutionary situations in the short period from 1917 to 1937 which were not caused by war, and with which he was nonetheless -- as the record shows -- greatly concerned.

Long before he appeared before the Dewey Commission in Mexico, Trotsky had, of course, dealt with this question. It came up in the theses which he wrote for the Third International at its first four congresses from 1919 to 1922 and which were approved by those authoritative bodies. Mikeschin knows this perfectly well, for the book which he quotes from, Piat let kominterna, contains those very documents written by Trotsky.

The specific passage which Mikeschin seeks to utilize as raw material for his own "historic" aims is taken from that book, occurring in Trotsky's "Report on the Fourth World Congress," which he delivered at the invitation of the Communist fraction of the tenth All-Union Congress of Soviets, December 28, 1922.

Trotsky is summing up the experience of the Comintern in its first five years. This experience has shown, says Trotsky, that three things are necessary prerequisites for a successful revolution. First, conditions of production must exist that make a transition to socialism both desirable and progressive economically and socially -- such conditions were, in fact, expressed in the dead end of economic crisis and world war that modern capitalism had led to. Second, a social class is required that is capable of carrying out such a transformation. The European working class fulfilled that role. Third, the subjective factor -- the will and the organization -- must be present within the class, both sufficiently developed to enable it to carry out the socialist revolution. Now, in summing up the European situation since World War I, Trotsky says the following -- and, buried in this passage, we find the quotations that Mikeshin tore out in his work of smearing Trotsky:

"Two of the three necessary premises are extant. [1] Long before the war the relative advantages of socialism, and since 1913 and all the more so after the war, the absolute necessity of socialism have been established. Failing socialism, Europe is decaying and disintegrating economically. This is a fact. [2] The working class in Europe no longer continues to grow. Its destiny, its class destiny, corresponds and runs parallel to the development of economy. To the extent that European economy, with inevitable fluctuations, suffers stagnation and even disintegration, to that extent the working class, as a class fails to grow socially, ceases to increase numerically but suffers from unemployment, from the terrible swellings of the reserve army of labor, etc., etc. [Thus the first two prerequisites are clearly present. Now for the third -- and here is where Mikeshin's quotation comes in, which I have italicized for purposes of identification and to show better what this "historian" left out. -- G.S.] The war roused the working class to its feet in the revolutionary sense. Was the working class, because of its social weight, capable of carrying out the revolution before the war? What did it lack? It lacked the consciousness of its own strength. Its strength grew in Europe automatically, almost imperceptibly, with the growth of industry. The war shook up the working class. Because of this terrible and bloody upheaval, the entire working class in Europe was imbued with revolutionary moods on the very next day after the war ended. Consequently, one of the subjective factors, the desire to change this world, was at hand. What was lacking? The party was lacking, the party capable of leading the working class to victory."

It needs but little of the context of something written by Trotsky to show why "historians" like Mikeshin are so delicate of touch in lifting something out.

[P] (p. 10) In preparation for the expulsion of the Left Opposition from the party, the Stalin apparatus in June 1927 brought the Opposition leaders -- Trotsky and Zinoviev -- before the Presidium of the Central Control Commission, headed by Stalin's right-hand man, Ordjonokidze. (The texts of two speeches by Trotsky at those hearings, with accompanying interchanges, may be found in the collection entitled The Stalin School of Falsification, Pioneer, 2d.ed., 1962, pp. 125-159. Also in that volume is Trotsky's speech "The War Danger -- Defense Policy and the Opposition," given before the joint plenary session of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission, August 1, 1927 -- a session likewise called to consider expulsion of the Opposition leaders. It was not until the fifteenth congress of the CPSU at the end of the year, after several months of physical violence and administrative measures against the Opposition, that these expulsions were finally pushed through.)

The apparatus tried to whip up a lynch spirit over Trotsky's so-called Clemencau thesis. The thesis, they charged, really called for an uprising inside the Soviet Union in the event of an invasion.

Trotsky's actual position was expressed at the joint plenary session as follows:

"The Stalinist Center will [in the event of war] inevitably melt away. Under these conditions the Opposition will be needed by the party more than ever before, in order to aid the party in rectifying the line, and at the same time preventing the party cadres, its basic capital, from being dismembered. Because the overwhelming majority of the genuinely Bolshevik proletarian cadres -- with a correct policy, with a clear line, and under the compulsion of objective conditions -- will be able to reconstitute the policies, and steer a firm revolutionary course, not out of fear, but from conviction. It is this, and this alone, that we are striving to achieve. The lie of conditional defense, the lie of the two parties, and the most despicable lie of an uprising -- these lies we fling back into the faces of the calumniators." (pp. 173-174)

Further, he clarified his stand even more:

"Do we, the Opposition, cast any doubts on the defense of the socialist fatherland? Not in the slightest degree. It is our hope not only to participate in the

defense, but to be able to teach others a few things. Do we cast doubts on Stalin's ability to sketch a correct line for the defense of the socialist fatherland? We do so and, indeed, to the highest possible degree." (p. 175)

Also, "If we take for granted a priori and forevermore that the given leadership is the only conceivable and born leadership, then every criticism of the incorrect leadership will appear as a denial of the defense of the socialist fatherland, and a call to an uprising. But such a position is a pure and simple denial of the party." (p. 175)

In a document dated September 24, 1927, Trotsky explained his thesis in a similar way: "The Clemenceau example, the example from the political experience of a class inimical to us, was used by me to illustrate a solitary and a very simple idea: the ruling class, in the guise of its leading vanguard, must preserve its capacity to reform its ranks under the most difficult conditions -- without internal convulsions, without the catastrophic splitting of forces" (from "The 'Clemenceau Thesis' and the Party Regime," in The New International, July 1934, page 25).

Before the Dewey Commission in 1937 Trotsky replied to the persistent Stalinist distortion of the "Clemenceau thesis" as expressed by Prosecutor Vyshinsky in the purge trials record. Trotsky quoted Vyshinsky's accusation:

"We must remember that ten years ago Trotsky justified his defeatist position in regard to the U.S.S.R. by referring to the famous Clemenceau thesis. Trotsky then wrote: "We must restore the tactics of Clemenceau, who, as is well known [!!], rose against the French Government at a time when the Germans were 80 kms. from Paris."... [Here Trotsky made a parenthetical remark: "In the English edition these words are placed in quotation marks, which might lead the members of the Commission to mistake them for a quotation. In reality, the sentence is invented out of whole cloth by the Prosecutor. Vyshinsky's judicial 'citations' have the same authenticity as Stalin's literary 'citations'; in this school there is uniformity of style."]

"It was not an accident," the Vyshinsky quote went on, "'that Trotsky and his accomplices advanced the Clemenceau thesis. They reverted to this thesis once again, but this time advancing it not as a theoretical proposition, but as practical preparation, real preparation, in alliance with foreign intelligence services, for the defeat of the U.S.S.R. in war.'"

"It is hard to believe," Trotsky commented, "that the text of this speech was printed in foreign languages, including the French. One would imagine that the French were not unastonished to learn that Clemenceau, during the war, 'rose against the French Government.' The French never suspected that Clemenceau was a defeatist and an ally of 'foreign intelligence services.' On the contrary, they call him the 'father of victory.' Exactly what is meant by the gibberish of the Prosecutor?"

"The fact is that the Stalinist bureaucracy, to justify violence against the Soviets and the party, has, since 1926, appealed to the war danger -- classic subterfuge of Bonapartism! In opposing this, I always expressed myself in the sense that freedom of criticism is indispensable for us not only in time of peace but also in time of war. I referred to the fact that even in bourgeois countries, France in particular, the ruling class did not dare, despite all its fear of the masses, completely to suppress criticism during the war. In this connection I adduced the example of Clemenceau, who, despite the proximity of the war front to Paris -- or rather, precisely because of it -- denounced in his paper the worthlessness of the military policy of the French Government. In the end, Clemenceau, as is well known, convinced Parliament, took over the leadership of the Government, and assured victory. Where is the 'uprising' here? Where is the 'defeatism'? Where is the connection with foreign intelligence services? I repeat: The reference to Clemenceau was made by me at a time when I judged it still possible to accomplish by peaceful means the transformation of the governmental system of the U.S.S.R. Today I can no longer invoke Clemenceau, because the Bonapartism of Stalin has barred the road to legal reform. But even today I stand completely for the defense of the U.S.S.R. -- that is to say, for the defense of its social bases, both against foreign imperialism and domestic Bonapartism." (Stalin's Frame-up System, pp. 117-118.)

Trotsky's grave warnings were confirmed by the events around the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union. Not only Khrushchev in his secret speech but many Soviet military and political leaders writing in the Soviet press in the past ten years sound like voices confirming how correct Trotsky was in expressing the "highest possible degree" of doubt about "Stalin's ability to sketch a correct line for the defense of the socialist fatherland."

A worthy task for Soviet historians, in contrast to exercises in mud-slinging such as this effort by Mikeschin, would be to investigate the contributions of victims of Stalin's purges, especially Red Army men, who came out of the labor camps to direct the stubborn defense at places like Moscow, Leningrad, and Stalingrad, finally turning the defense against the German imperialist invasion into an offensive that rolled Hitler's legions all the way back to Berlin. Along with this work they might also engage in a historical estimate of how costly it was to the Soviet Union in its hour of greatest peril to have an irremovable figure like Stalin at the helm.

[Q] (p. 10) Arkadii Maslow was co-leader with Ruth Fischer of the left wing in the German Communist party, which took the leadership of that party in 1924. But because he sided with Zinoviev, Stalin eventually had him expelled from the Comintern. Maslow, briefly flirted with the international Opposition; it was during this period, perhaps, that he published the above-mentioned letter of Trotsky's.

Aragon's book is hardly to be taken as an authoritative historical source; written very much in the spirit of the Khrushchevites, and incorporating the fresh revelations of the twenty-second congress, it nevertheless distorts events and, of course, the significance of the pre-1934 tendency struggles within the CPSU. The letter Aragon refers to was used by the Stalin regime as the pretext for Trotsky's expulsion from the USSR -- Aragon unquestioningly accepts Stalin's political judgment in this matter.

The civil war referred to in the letter was not a call for Oppositionists to prepare war against Stalin and company, an implication Aragon intentionally leaves open. Trotsky was discussing the danger of a Bonapartist uprising within the army, representing a restorationist current and reflecting the mood of the kulaks and neo-NEP bourgeoisie then flourishing. In the event of such a development, Trotsky said, the Opposition should be ready to fight in-civil war for defense of the workers regime and in a bloc with the Stalin apparatus. Deutscher's discussion of this letter is pertinent (see The Prophet Unarmed, pp. 458-459 ff.).

[R] (p. 10) Trotsky's statement was in essence a generalization. If in ten years, he reasoned, the Comintern could be transformed from the world party of revolution into the sponsor of popular fronts and facilitator of the victory of fascism, if such was the rapid evolution of parties in the stormy period of capitalism's death agony, then the small cadres of the Fourth International theoretically could, and should, attract millions to their side within such a short time span.

The paragraph in which Trotsky's optimistic statement appears is worth quoting:

"Ten years were necessary for the Kremlin clique in order to strangle the Bolshevik party and to transform the first Workers' State into a sinister caricature. Ten years were necessary for the Third International in order to stamp into the mire their own program and to transform themselves into a stinking cadaver. Ten years! Only ten years! Permit me to finish with a prediction: During the next ten years the program of the Fourth International will become the guide to millions and these revolutionary millions will know how to storm heaven and earth." (Speech "On the Founding of the Fourth International," played by electrical transcription on October 28, 1938, to a New York mass meeting celebrating the founding of the world-wide organization and the tenth anniversary of the Trotskyist movement in the United States.)

The basic resolution of the Reunification Congress to which Mikeschin refers is available as a pamphlet entitled "Dynamics of World Revolution Today" (Workers Vanguard Publishing Co., 81 Queen St. West, Toronto, 1964). Far from a "bitter admission" in a tone of defeat and despair, the concluding section of the resolution, that on the Fourth International, provides a historical and dialectical evaluation analyzing both the strong and weak sides of the evolution of the world party and their relation to the general international struggle for socialism.

The pamphlet demonstrates that programmatically, in the field of ideas, the Trotskyist positions have been and are being confirmed with increasing sharpness in the world today. The great difficulties involved in building an international party are considered in comparison with the achievements of the previous internationals -- not least being the third, "shamefully dissolved as a wartime gift from the Kremlin to Roosevelt, the political chief of Allied imperialism" (p. 37). The main (though, of course, not the only) block to the organizational growth of Trotskyism has been the Stalinist remnants. But "polycentrism" among the Stalinist regimes and parties, although it has reached the point, in the case of the Sino-Soviet dispute, of dangerous and destructively hostile measures on the state level, is steadily removing this block. It is peculiarly inappropriate for Mikeschin to point disdainfully to splits and disputes within the Trotskyist movement or among former Trotskyists in the light of the rapid splintering and differentiation in recent years among the formerly monolithic Communist

parties. On this the "Dynamics of World Revolution" says:

"The break-up of the Stalinist monolith has been accompanied by an increasing necessity for discussion among the Communist parties, and an increasing need to deal with real issues in a reasoned way instead of in Stalin's way of substituting false issues and replacing reason by epithets, slander and frame-ups. It is instructive for instance to see that one of the major points under world-wide debate today is the necessity of extending the proletarian revolution as the only realistic way to end the threat of imperialist war. Clearly the disputants are nearing what up to now has been considered exclusively the realm of Trotskyist discourse. The victory of the Soviet Union in the war, the victory of the Yugoslav and Chinese Revolutions and most recently the Cuban Revolution, as well as the destruction of the Stalin cult, cannot help but strengthen Trotskyism. As I.F.Stone, the acute American radical journalist, observed after a trip to Cuba, the revolutionists there are 'unconscious' Trotskyists. With the coming of full consciousness among these and related currents, Trotskyism will become a powerful current" (pp. 38-39).

[S] (p. 11) Mikeshin ended his quotation from Deutscher with a judicious eye for what followed. While the collective farms have not collapsed, they are not altogether models of socialist economy -- which is something Deutscher went on to point out.

"Yet Stalin's rural policy throughout the nineteen-thirties, with its whimsical combination of massive terror and petty concessions, was dictated precisely by the fear of a collapse: only with iron bands could he hold together the collective farm. The decline and subsequent stagnation in farm output were all too real, and became the great theme of official policy twenty-five and thirty years later." (The Prophet Out-cast, p. 97.)

The dismal heritage left by Stalin in the field of agriculture remains a matter of concern to the Soviet Union to this very day.

[T] (p. 11) These quotations, which serve Mikeshin's purpose so admirably, are from a small group headed by one J.Posadas. The group split from the Fourth International in 1962 but has created some confusion by claiming that they are the Fourth International. The old Cuban Stalinist leader Blas Roca has frequently quoted absurdities uttered by Posadas in order to facilitate his occasional smears of the Fourth International.

As can be judged merely from the few citations in previous notes, the slogan calling for a "preventive war" by the Soviet Union is in absolute opposition to Trotsky's views. The slogan is also in absolute opposition to everything the Fourth International stands for. Mikeshin, who is obviously very well read and quite up to date on developments in the world Trotskyist movement, of course knows all this perfectly well. Here, in support of his case, he is simply bringing out a new "proof," up to traditional standards of the school he belongs to; and at the same time he is doing his bit to increase and spread the confusion created by Posadas.

[U] (p. 12) For some obscure reason, Mikeshin fails to name the leading body of the Fourth International -- which is the United Secretariat. By way of compensation, the Posadas group gets double mention, since it utilizes the stolen names of "International Secretariat" and "Latin American Bureau" virtually interchangeably. Mention is also given to Gerry Healy's "International Committee."

As a "historian," Mikeshin fails lamentably, although probably not unintentionally, in discussing the reunification of the world Trotskyist movement in 1963 after a split of some ten years.

On the basis of a clearly stated revolutionary Marxist program, the majority of the groups adhering to the International Secretariat participated with those adhering to the International Committee in a joint congress. An International Executive Committee was elected by the delegates, and it in turn elected the "United Secretariat," which today represents the overwhelming majority of the world Trotskyist movement.

The British group around the magazine Labour Review, the group headed by Gerry Healy, refused to join with the majority of the International Committee in participating in the Reunification Congress, choosing instead to maintain the name of "International Committee." An insular, ultraleft, sectarian formation, the Healy group remains bitterly hostile to the united world Trotskyist movement and engages in tactics like those of the Posadas group, such as mimicking publications of the Fourth International, at least in name, the better to add to the confusion.

Mikeshin and his stripe are much interested in furthering splits in the Trotsky-

ist movement and doing what they can to disrupt it. Throughout the years they have repeatedly sent agents into the Trotskyist movement to carry out this kind of work. The assignments of these agents, in Stalin's time, included assassinations, the most prominent one being the assassination of Trotsky himself.

This background lends piquancy to Mikeshin's fulminations about the "infiltration" of "Trotskyists" into Communist parties. What is really involved is the penetration of Trotskyist ideas. The concern of the Soviet bureaucracy and the bureaucracies of satellite Communist parties about this is perfectly understandable. Not even murder has been able to stop Trotskyist ideas from "infiltrating" into the minds of workers who join the Communist movement because they think it represents revolutionary Marxism. The Trotskyists, of course, are proud of whatever successes they may have registered in helping along this perfectly natural process. How the program of Trotskyism finally succeeded in winning despite the enormous financial and technical means employed by the Stalinist bureaucracy to "definitively" crush it again and again will make a glorious chapter in the true history of the Soviet Union that will eventually be written after the restoration of proletarian democracy in the state founded by Lenin and Trotsky.

THE POLITICAL MEANING OF MIKESHIN'S ATTACK

By Joseph Hansen

Ever since Khrushchev's 1956 revelations at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, the ruling bureaucratic caste has faced a difficult problem with regard to Trotskyism. "De-Stalinization" was intended as a concession to the masses, but a concession to be kept under strict control, since the logical development of the mood among the masses would be the crystallization of a political opposition aimed at ending the rule of the bureaucracy and restoring proletarian democracy. Khrushchev's revelations concerning Stalin's crimes confirmed what was long known among all knowledgeable people in the West; i.e., that the notorious trials in the thirties were nothing but gigantic frame-ups. The revelations and subsequent rehabilitation of many of Stalin's victims increased the pressure to rehabilitate Trotsky. But Trotskyism is synonymous with the program of proletarian democracy. Stalin's heirs are against that. From their viewpoint, Trotskyism offers a deadly political threat.

But on what basis could the pressure for Trotsky's rehabilitation be met? To try to restore Stalin's prestige as a counterbalance could alarm the masses. Besides, who in the Soviet Union today would believe the frame-up charges leveled against Trotsky in the Moscow Trials?

For a time the issue could be evaded or simply postponed. But that, too, has become more and more difficult. The nagging question keeps coming up.

The bureaucratic reasoning behind Mikeshin's attack stems from political considerations of this nature. Stalin's cruder frame-up charges cannot be repeated; a more plausible approach, one that appears closer to reality is needed. In short, the "de-Stalinization" process must be applied to the propaganda against Trotskyism. The worst excesses must be buried, but without conceding anything essential.

Mikeshin's attempted solution to the problem is to roll the film backward to the twenties -- to present the world with the arguments concocted by Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev when they constituted the famous "Troika." Mikeshin adds to this truly stale hash some flavorsome morsels about current Trotskyism; and thus the Soviet public has been presented with a "new" model in attacking Trotskyism, a "new" line of argument for refusing to rehabilitate Trotsky.

Besides domestic considerations, the Kremlin's political specialists also have in mind certain international needs.

The postwar upsurge in the colonial world broke the monolithic grip of the Stalinist bureaucracy over freedom-seeking and socialist-minded movements. New forces moved to the fore. These ranged from the Titoist and Maoist groupings, which were formed under Stalinism, to the July 26 Movement of Cuba which was shaped independently in the course of struggle. Castroism in particular, with its emphasis on uncompromising revolutionary action and its insistence on presenting the socialist example of Cuba as a model for all of Latin America, foreshadows a whole new stage in the international class struggle in which Trotskyism will emerge from its long eclipse to become a massive movement with millions of followers. This is the real source of Mikeshin's alarm over the growing influence of "Trotskyist" ideas.

Because of its socialist pretensions, the Soviet bureaucracy had little choice but to come to Cuba's aid in the face of the aggression of American imperialism. At the same time, in line with its conservative interests, the bureaucracy has sought in its own way and through its own methods to keep the Cuban revolution from being repeated. Thus under the surface of the alliance between the Soviet Union and Cuba lies a contradiction which at times becomes clearly manifest. As against the zeal of the Castro movement in pursuing and developing the class struggle on a continental scale, the Stalinists seek to impose restraints. This conflict takes place in part on the ideological field but in an unclear way.

Experts in this area, such as the old Stalinist functionary Blas Roca, label pursuit of the socialist revolution as "adventurism," "ultrarevolutionary phrasemongering" and "Trotskyism." Against this, they advance such "reasonable" slogans as "peaceful coexistence" and due consideration for the "bourgeois democratic stage" of the revolution in industrially backward countries. In practice this means collaborating with U.S. imperialism internationally and handing leadership in revolutionary movements to the treacherous national bourgeoisie. It is to serve such class-collaborationist policies, with their catastrophic consequences, that Mikeshin includes these themes in his article, attempting to create prejudice in the minds of his readers against revolutionary Marxist policies by dubbing them "Trotskyist."

Mikeshin has still another objective in writing up "history" in this way. As is "well known," to borrow one of the favorite phrases of this school, the worst epithet in the entire lexicon of Stalinism is "Trotskyism." It has been bandied back and forth by Moscow and Peking in the Sino-Soviet conflict. To give it a semblance of plausibility, however, it must be attached to one or another of the issues in dispute and then it must be "proved" that the adversary is repeating something advocated by Trotsky or his followers.

In this instance the issue is Peking's charge that the Soviet Union has gone capitalist. The grain of truth in this is Stalin's usurpation of power and the bureaucratic degeneration of the workers state. Since Mao is an ardent admirer of Stalin, he blames everything on Khrushchev and then exaggerates to such a degree as to end in a gross error -- the Soviet Union is not capitalist; it remains a workers state, despite Peking's propaganda. Mao's view that the "class struggle" continues uninterruptedly and indefinitely after the overthrow of capitalism is utilized by Mikeshin as his peg. We learn from him that no one less than Trotsky maintained that the dictatorship of the proletariat consists of "a state of uninterrupted struggle between the proletariat and the peasantry." He also pictures Trotsky as an "ardent champion of the idea of 'revolutionary' war as a means of instigating revolution from without" -- a belligerent pose which Mikeshin evidently intends as suggestive of Mao's attitude, although he leaves it to others to draw the obvious parallel.

Mikeshin does his best to depreciate and denigrate the world Trotskyist movement. All he succeeds in doing, however, is to make more impressive the concern displayed by the Kremlin over the progress of the Fourth International. He crows over the fact that almost thirty years after Stalin exiled Trotsky from the Soviet Union, "the Fourth International has failed to gain influence over the masses of even a single country." Yet a few paragraphs further on, in relation to a new alleged split in the movement, he says: "Does this not testify to the definitive collapse of Trotskyism -- both ideologically and organizationally?"

How many times does this make in the twenty-six years since Stalin's agent drove a pickax into Trotsky's brain that the Kremlin has celebrated the "definitive collapse of Trotskyism"? Obviously a specter is haunting the Soviet bureaucracy.

Will the "new" answer to Trotskyism hold up very long? This pale replica of what Stalin's secret political police turned out in the thirties stands little chance of enduring. In fact as an echo of the past it is easily turned into fresh proof of the reactionary nature of Stalinism. The critical notes supplied by George Saunders, who translated the article, are convincing proof of this.

Still worse for Mikeshin and the figures behind him, the lessons he draws from "history" offer absolutely nothing concrete to revolutionary-minded fighters. In Stalin's time, a would-be revolutionist might swallow doubts about the validity of such arguments with the thought that this was the line handed down by great leaders who must know best. But the days of the cult and Stalinist monolithism are gone forever. Today's revolutionists demand better answers and they no longer feel inhibited in looking for them outside of "official" channels. Mikeshin and the others like him will soon discover to their discomfort that it is much more difficult to put across lies and falsifications -- even "new" ones -- than in the good old days when Stalin was boss.

Besides that, the world Trotskyist movement is growing in strength. Its voice is standing out more perceptibly and it is harder to sweep it out of the way with mere Trotsky-baiting. A good indication can be found in the current antiwar movement. The Trotskyists are actively pressing a number of revolutionary-socialist slogans, four of the main ones being, "Withdraw U.S. Troops from Vietnam Now!" "For a United Front of All the Workers States in Defense of the Vietnamese Revolution!" "For Effective Counter-measures Against the Escalation of the War!" "Help the Vietnamese Freedom Fighters with Bigger and Bigger Demonstrations of Solidarity!"

These slogans are being pressed and echoed on an international scale by much broader forces than those acknowledging the political leadership of the Fourth International. Where do the followers of the Kremlin stand in this? In some cases they have had no choice but to participate or to go along. In other instances, they have been able to remain passive. But in no case, as yet, have they dared to engage in witch-hunting this combination of slogans as "Trotskyism." Perhaps Mikeshin's superiors will assign him the task of providing some choice material from the archives to help rectify this state of affairs. Like his current achievement, what he writes will no doubt really make history.

STALIN AND THE NAZI AGGRESSION AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION

[In its first issue, the new Italian political magazine La Sinistra (The Left) published the minutes of a discussion held at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism between historians and members of the General Staff of the army. The discussion, which was held behind closed doors, concerned a book entitled simply June 22, 1941 (the day Hitler launched his invasion of the Soviet Union.)

[The editors of La Sinistra explain the importance of this document: "In the months preceding the Twenty-third Congress of the CPSU, a furious political struggle developed around an attempt to undertake at least partial rehabilitation of Stalin. News of the struggle eventually reached the West; and a letter which a group of Soviet intellectuals sent to the Central Committee of the CPSU, expressing their concern over the feared rehabilitation, received considerable publicity. The book by Nekrich, which was published in the spring of 1965, and which had become a significant element in the struggle of these tendencies, was subjected to violent attack because of its anti-Stalinist position. It became the topic of a debate that served as a testing ground in the attempt to move toward a condemnation of the views contained in it, and thereby to a reversal of the position taken by the Twentieth Congress. This attempt at rehabilitation failed because of the opposition not only of broad groups of intellectuals but also of high-ranking representatives of the army. As the reader will see, the discussion published below, besides involving Stalin, touched on the policy of the USSR in the period of the nonaggression pact with Germany, as well as the repressions to which the Polish Communists fell victim and the policy of the Comintern in the so-called Third Period. This is the first time we have heard -- even by way of rumor -- that Soviet historians were engaged in revising with such breadth and daring the official theses about Soviet policy."

[The text below was translated by World Outlook from the Italian version in the October issue of La Sinistra. The footnotes are those supplied by the editors of La Sinistra.]

* * *

Agenda: discussion on A.M. Nekrich's book "June 22, 1941." Present: Major General E.A. Boltin, Major General B.S. Telpuchovsky, Professor G.A. Deborin, and A.M. Nekrich, academician in the historical sciences. Chairman: Boltin.

Deborin: The central question is the research into the causes of our failures in the first period of the war. In his section, "The Warnings that Were Disregarded," the basis of Nekrich's thesis is incorrect. He reduces everything to Stalin's stupid pig-headedness. This is superficial. This means that with Stalin's death the problem ceased to exist. But this is not accurate. It was not only a question of Stalin. In one instance the author bases himself on a statement by Marshal Golikov, who, in those years was the head of the Intelligence Service of the General Staff of the Red Army [he cites that part of the book]. Golikov did not inform the government as much as he deceived it. Altogether his reports were a complete deception. These reports are divided into two parts: the first consists of the reports that Golikov considered reliable; these include information about the German preparations to invade England. The second part consists of reports which he considered unfounded; for example, the report from R. Sorge on the dates bracketed for the German attack on the USSR. It is neces-

sary to go more deeply into the criticism of the cult of the personality. There were persons who altered intelligence reports to please Stalin, to the disadvantage of the truth.

The Tass communiqué of June 14, 1941, was a normal diplomatic maneuver. It was necessary to test the reaction of the German government. But because of the situation that had been created in our country this was taken to be true.(1)

In evaluating Stalin's behavior, it is not necessary to base ourselves on Khrushchev's statements, which are often not objective. Thus, for example, it is difficult to agree with the statement that Stalin feared the war. Since he received incorrect intelligence, he reached incorrect conclusions. Stalin placed too much hope in the pact, while the Germans, under cover of the pact, were preparing to attack. And Stalin's judgment was confirmed by all those who surrounded him. We cannot blame everything on Stalin.

There is a series of errors of fact in Nekrich's book. Among other things, 45-millimeter cannon were useless against the German tanks and because of this the government decided to stop producing them.

A Voice in the Hall: That's not true! the 45's were used throughout the war and worked splendidly against tanks. It was a crime to stop production of the 45's. We fought the German tanks with our fists. At the beginning of the war we didn't have any antitank weapons at all.

Deborin: Besides Blucher and others knew that the Tukhachevsky-Yakir group were innocent and still they condemned them.

A Voice in the Hall: Of course they knew it.

Deborin: But, comrades, I do not believe that it can be doubted that Voroshilov and Budienny, who were there at the time, were men of conscience and honor!(2)

Outraged Voices in the Hall: Voroshilov was not at the trial. What honor and conscience did these persons have? Cowards and bootlickers! (Deborin leaves the podium amid tumult in the hall.)

Anfilov, of the General Staff: First of all, on the honor of Budienny and Voroshilov. These persons neither had nor have any honor. Considerable material in our archives, which is barred for the time being from being made public, compels us to draw decidedly negative conclusions concerning their activities. I will cite only one minor episode. Toward the middle of 1937, at a very representative gathering, Stalin said: "And Voroshilov and I arrived at Tsaritsyn in 1918 and in a week we unmasked the enemies of the people." And he said this about many ex-officials of the General Staff and front-line forces who served the Soviet government with honor.

A Voice in the Hall: And he drowned them all in the river without a trial!

Anfilov: "While you," Stalin continued, "are not even able to unmask your neighbors." After Stalin, Voroshilov joined in, declaring he was in complete agreement with Stalin and he called on us to denounce our own friends and colleagues. My heart beats with anger when I see Voroshilov on the mausoleum during parades.(3)

(1) The communiqué referred to was written, according to A. Tasca (Due anni di alleanza germano-sovietica) [The Two Years of the German-Soviet Alliance], by Stalin himself. In it the British ambassador, who had tried to warn Stalin of the imminent German attack, is accused of spreading false rumors, the product of propaganda emanating from powers hostile to Germany and the USSR.

(2) The tribunal which condemned the Tukhachevsky-Yakir group was presided over by Ulrich and was composed of Alksnis, Budienny, Shaposhnikov, Belov, Dybenkov, Kashirin, Goryachev and Blucher. Voroshilov, who supported Stalin in the decapitation of the General Staff, did not take part in the tribunal. However, it was he who announced Jun 12, 1937 that the Soviet generals had been shot on charges of having been in contact with an enemy power.

(3) Voroshilov, who was commander of the Tenth Army on the Tsaritsyn front, was the chief opponent of the kind of military organization projected by Trotsky.

And now, as regards the beginning of the war. If all our forces had been prepared for battle, something that depended completely on Stalin, we would not have suffered such a disastrous defeat in the first period of the war and, in general, the war would not have been so long, so bloody or so costly.

Of course, it is necessary to take into account also the degree of responsibility of our most important military leaders. In their speeches, Golikov and Kuznetsov seemed to be heroes. In reality, Golikov passed on to Stalin a report in which the entire Barbarossa Plan was outlined, writing, however, that it was a provocation emanating from those who wanted to see us go to war against the Germans. Kuznetsov writes that when he received the communication from the naval attaché in Berlin, Vorontsov, on the dates and plans of the German attack, he immediately referred everything to Stalin. It is true. But in which way did he refer it? You should read his story! He writes that Vorontsov's report was a provocation sent us by counterespionage.

Stalin is still the main culprit in the tragedy. Not long ago, I spoke with Zhukov. He told me that Golikov was directly responsible to Stalin and did not report at all either to the head of the General Staff (Marshal Zhukov), or to the People's Commissar of Defense (Timoshenko). They did not know the plans and dates of the attack. I wasn't able to talk with Timoshenko -- he doesn't speak with any of us.

Zastavenko, from the Institute of Marxism-Leninism: The people around Stalin did not help to evaluate the situation properly. In the beginning of June (June 5, 1941) Kalinin gave a speech at the Political-Military Academy. He said: "The Germans are preparing to attack us but we are ready. And the sooner they do it the better. We will wring their necks."

A Voice in the Hall; The old windbag!

Zavstavenko: That was the way the Politburo judged the situation; they underestimated the power of the Germans. Stalin was not the only one responsible for what happened. (Murmurs in the hall.)

Dashichev, of the General Staff: Deborin has said some incorrect things concerning the 45 cannons. At the beginning of the war this cannon shot clear through all kinds of German armor. To stop production amounted to disarming the army, since the other type of cannon (the 82 millimeter) was not yet ready for production. The army found itself without antitank artillery and without ammunition.

As for our sources. The worst thing is that the Soviet sources have not yet been published. For example, to consider the communication of the Soviet attaché on the fact that the war would be begun on June 22, it is necessary to quote from the book by the English historian Ericson. When will all the sources finally be opened and made available? Berezhkov records the meeting of Ambassador Schulenburg with Dekanozov during which Schulenburg told him that Hitler would attack the USSR. But there must be data in the Foreign Ministry archives on the meeting between Schulenburg and Molotov in the presence of Pavlov when Schulenburg betrayed his country by revealing that Germany would attack the USSR on June 22. Schulenburg wept and begged him to mobilize the Soviet armed forces in the hope that Hitler would be frightened. But they did not want to believe Schulenburg.(4)

On the trials of our military leaders (the Tukhachevsky-Yakir group). The false evidence was prepared by the Gestapo but the idea came from Stalin, who caused it to be suggested to the fascist leaders through General Skoblin. Our misfortune is that these documents are inaccessible. Golikov committed crimes, not only because he doctored intelligence to please Stalin, but because he had the best agents of our counterespionage abroad arrested.

Voice in the Hall: Including Sorge!

Dashichev: Are the causes of the tragedy of June 1941 completely clarified in this book? It is necessary to explain them still more profoundly. Stalin was the one chiefly responsible for this tragedy. He was the one who created such a situation in our country. Stalin's greatest crime was to usurp power, to destroy our best cadres in the army and the party. None of our leaders, although they understood the international situation, had the courage to fight for the measures needed to defend the country. This is their terrible guilt before the party and the people. There are still

(4) Schulenburg, German ambassador to Moscow at the time, later became involved in the plot to assassinate Hitler and was executed in 1944.

people today who say that we must not speak ill of Stalin, that Stalin was not the only one. This is wrong. For a driver of a bus, any accident that happens is his fault. Stalin took the responsibility of leading the country on himself alone. And his guilt is enormous.

It is necessary to define with more precision the positions of Churchill, Schulenburg, Räder, Halder (the latter two in Hitler's staff were opposed to a war with the USSR). It is necessary to explain the motives for their actions; they were not exactly lovers of our country. Hitler strongly influenced the decision of the military. During a meeting at the highest level, Hitler said: "The Red Army has been decapitated; eighty percent of its commanders have been liquidated. The Red Army has been weakened as never before; this is the fundamental factor which leads me to make this decision. It is necessary to go to war to prevent the formation of new cadres." Every historian must have the courage to speak the truth.

Roshchin, of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism: Some hold that we must speak only of the victories and that it is better to remain silent with regard to defeats, but we must not do this. Such a procedure damages not only the science of history but causes enormous harm to our state. It is necessary to analyze and to understand the causes of the defeats in order to prevent mistakes in the future. Stalin was the one chiefly responsible for the defeat. I do not agree with Deborin with regard to the Tass communiqué -- it was not a diplomatic maneuver but a crime. This communiqué disarmed the people morally. Stalin and those around him did everything to prevent the Soviet people from readying themselves for war. When Kuznetsov informed Malenkov that some defensive measures had been carried out by the fleet -- it was June 17, 1941 -- Malenkov laughed at him and said: "You act as if the war was going to start tomorrow." Zhdanov was present at this meeting; his attitude was more serious, but even he did nothing. Malenkov revoked all the measures taken. But even our military leaders cannot avoid responsibility.

Melnikov, of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR: According to Deborin, it would seem that Nekrich overrated the negative role of Stalin in his book. This is not true. The role of Stalin is underrated in fact.

Let's speak about a problem that still can't be raised today because it is tabooed, that is the negotiations between Molotov and Hitler in Berlin in November 1940. Let's examine the situation. The Barbarossa Plan was nearing completion, the movement of German troops towards the frontier of the USSR was beginning. The Hitlerite diplomats were stepping up their activities in the Balkans and Finland. To hide these preparations from the Soviet government, Hitler proposed a top level meeting. The chairman of the Council of People's Commissars Molotov goes to Berlin. Hitler conveys to him a plan for partitioning a good deal of territory in general. Molotov asks concretely for the Dardanelles, Bulgaria, Rumania and Finland. Hitler did not want to initiate a discussion of this type because he feared that the news would leak out to his future allies. In response to Molotov's requests, he proposed that the Soviet Union should join the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis.(5) This demonstrates his principles of action.

Vasilenko, of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism: Deborin's concern that the book puts too much emphasis on Stalin's role is without foundation. Objectively we had every possibility of resisting the Germans. But Stalin ruined everything. When it was too late to justify his shameful defeat, he put forward the commonplace notion that the aggressor is always better prepared for war.

Kulish: We are witnessing the birth of a "new" understanding of the causes of the defeat at the beginning of the war, proposed by Deborin. It was not only and not so much Stalin, he says. This is in the line of the cult of the personality. That Stalin is guilty or not too guilty, is a typical notion of the cult of the personality -- it is always Stalin alone. It is necessary to study the problem more deeply. Why did such a situation develop? How did our government, ruled by Stalin, rule the country? How did it defend our people against the danger? Was the government fit for the position it occupied? No, it was not fit. It is necessary to analyze the process that produced Stalin, who was not fit for his position as head of the party and of the state, with unlimited powers.

(5) Molotov remained in Berlin the twelfth and thirteenth of November 1940. Hitler tried to convince Molotov that the Soviet Union's natural sphere of interest was in Asia, while Molotov asked instead for European territories. On Hitler's offer to join the Axis, Molotov replied, according to the testimony of the interpreter Schmidt (Statist auf diplomatischer Bühne 1923-45) that this was acceptable in general but only on the basis of equality.

Still another very obvious error: in all our historical literature, the reunification with the western Ukraine and western Belorussia is always held to be a factor that improved the defensive capacity of the country. Still we know that things were different. These areas, for a series of well-known reasons, weakened the frontier defensive capacity. Therefore in judging the reunification of the western regions, it is better to speak of the liberating and internationalist functions of the Red Army.

Gnedin: It is a good book. I did not want to speak but the discussion has forced me to take the platform. For two years I gave intelligence reports to Stalin and Molotov. All these reports passed through my hands. Golikov, of course, was a deceiver, but that is not the question. All the "reliable" parts of the reports, were usually reflected in one way or another in our official press but Stalin paid attention fundamentally to the things considered "dubious." He knew everything and his policy was to do nothing. Golikov was responsible for the repressions among the cadres of the GPU, but it is not his fault that defensive measures were not taken. In our historical literature it is claimed that Stalin became head of government on May 5, 1941 to prepare the country for defense. But we do not have a single fact to confirm this evaluation. And Stalin, in fact, did nothing to strengthen the defensive capacity of the USSR. We have every reason to believe that Stalin became head of government not to prepare the country for war but to make a deal with Hitler.(6)

Slezkin, of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR: I was at the front and when I was nineteen years old, I participated in the battles at the frontier in 1941.

Stalin acted in a way that can easily be described as criminal. The situation of the cult of the personality -- provocations, repressions -- created a vicious circle. Everyone strove to please his own boss, giving him only such information as would please him, or adding a negative commentary on information which would not please him. Everyone tried to avoid expressing his own ideas. All this brought immeasurable harm to the country. Everyone is guilty, although in differing degrees. Some are guilty for not having decided to say what they thought. The more important the officials, the higher you go, the greater the responsibility. At a certain level the renunciation of truth in the name of one's own privileges is a crime, and the higher the level, the greater the crime. The chief culprit was Stalin. The 1939 pact was perhaps necessary. It was a crime to base one's hopes on this pact, and above all to cease, as a result of it, to fight against fascism (and this was done on orders from Stalin).

Yakir, of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR:(7) The book is very good. Some speakers have dealt with the Tukhachevsky-Yakir affair. I believe that the speeches on the fascist provocation, on the "red fascicle" and the documents contained in it are useless and even harmful, in that they draw the discussion away from the central point. There was no red fascicle at the trial and the red fascicle was not brought up. All of the accused were found guilty on the basis of accusations inspired by Stalin which were made to the War Council on June 1-4, 1937 and of the desire openly expressed by Stalin to be rid of them. Some among the preceding speakers have spoken of Stalin as "Comrade Stalin." This is improper. Stalin is no one's comrade and still less ours.

Stalin impeded the development of our armaments by liquidating many eminent technicians, among others the founders of missile science, Ikomirov, Langeman (the inventor of the katusha, a multiple rocket launcher used as ground artillery) Kurchevsky, Bekaury. It is necessary to study the problem of the concentration camps. Study it from the economic point of view. It was wartime and in the concentration camps were imprisoned millions of healthy men, who were specialists in all sectors of the economic and military life of the country. Furthermore considerable forces were required to guard them.

Telegin: The author has a noncritical attitude toward foreign sources, in particular toward memoirs which contain few elements of truth...

(6) Before May 5, 1941 Stalin had no official responsibilities in the government of the USSR. Shortly after that date, the Belgian, Norwegian and Greek diplomats, representing countries occupied by the Germans, were expelled from the USSR. At the same time, Bogomolov was sent as ambassador to the pro-Nazi Petain government.

(7) The son of the Yakir mentioned in the proceedings.

Voice from the Hall: And in our memoirs?

Telegin: In our memoirs, too, there are many outrageous lies. (Laughter.)

It is necessary to remember that there are obvious traces of the exaggerations of the Khrushchev period in these memoirs. (Murmurs in the hall.)

Telpukovsky: The political leaders of all countries underestimated Hitler. However after the fall of France, these evaluations were reconsidered, except those of Stalin. Stalin relied on the hope that Hitler, if he did not break his neck, would become entangled in the war in the West. Clearly, when the war began, Stalin was still making attempts to avoid the conflict. Otherwise it is difficult to explain the three separate strategic directives of the high command of the Red Army in the first days of the war. Stalin is the main culprit, but there were others too, each in his own sphere.

Petrovsky, of the Institute of Historic Archives: It is necessary to keep in mind that fascism emerged while Lenin was still alive. Mussolini took power in Italy, the Kapp putsch, etc. Lenin pointed out that fascism was the main enemy. Stalin did not pay any heed to Lenin's warning and declared that the social democracy was the main enemy. This "theory" was widely disseminated and divided millions of workers throughout the world. Stalin is a criminal.

Boltin: Comrade Petrovsky, in this hall, on this platform, it is necessary to choose your words. Are you a Communist?

Petrovsky: Yes.

Boltin: I have not read in any document, in any directive of our party, obligatory for both of us, that Stalin was a criminal.

Petrovsky: The Twenty-third Congress of the party voted to remove Stalin from the Mausoleum for his crimes against the party. Therefore, he is a criminal.

Snegov. Nekrich's book is an honest and useful book. When there is disorder in a military unit, when the breechblocks are in one place and the guns in another, when the patrols and sentries are asleep, the unit is defeated. When headquarters orders it, the commander of a detachment of this kind is shot. And none of us has anything to laugh about. Stalin was in the same position as this commander, but his detachment was our entire country. Stalin ought to have been shot and instead they are now trying to justify him.

Why is Nekrich's book, where Stalin is attacked, submitted so quickly to discussion and even condemned, while the book of the notorious falsifier of the history of the party I. Petrov, which attributes positive acts to Stalin which he never did, has awaited discussion for some years already? Why did Deborin attempt to justify Stalin? When Hitler was preparing to attack Poland, Stalin helped him.(8) He shot all the Polish Communists in the USSR and outlawed the Polish Communist party. Why is the fourth partition of Poland defined as a liberating expedition? How can you be a Communist and speak calmly about Stalin who betrayed and sold out Communists, who liquidated almost all the delegates to the Seventeenth Congress and almost all the members of the Central Committee elected at that Congress, who betrayed the Spanish Republic, Poland, all the Communists in all countries?

Deborin (in conclusion): I have not created any new theory and I have not taken on the task of defending or justifying Stalin. It is necessary to examine all the aspects of the cult in greater depth. As for Snegov's remarks, we have heard what Snegov said about Poland more than once. And these claims came from the enemy camp. It is strange that Snegov also shares this point of view. Comrade Snegov, you must tell us to which camp you belong.

Snegov: I am from Kolyma.(9)

Deborin: All these things have to be verified.

(8) It is evident that it is considered that the existence has been confirmed of the secret August 23 protocol which granted Germany a free hand in attacking Poland (the partition of which was provided in the protocol) and which promised to furnish Soviet supplies for the war against France and England.

(9) Kolyma was a famous concentration camp in the Stalinist period.

Voices in the Hall: Do you want his telephone number? Like the old days? (They do not permit Deborin to continue.)

Nekrich: Thank you for your observations. There's no doubt that Deborin does not hold the ideas that have been attributed to him. One often exaggerates in the heat of discussion. The main one responsible for the grave defeats and the whole tragedy of the first period in the war is Stalin. However, one should not give his own chief incorrect information just to please him. Stalinism begins with us, with the little people. Stalin wanted to outwit Hitler and instead deceived himself and the whole business ended in a catastrophe. He knew better than anyone about the liquidation of the leading cadres and about the weaknesses of the army.

Snegov (three minutes on a point of personal privilege): I thought that I was participating in a scientific discussion. Deborin, instead of scientific proofs, has introduced "arguments" vintage 1937. But it is not easy to frighten us with concentration camps! Times have changed and the past will not return. (Applause.)

Boltin (in conclusion): This meeting has produced many new and interesting things on the entire problem in its complete context. The remarks of comrades Snegov and Petrovsky were very impassioned. I can agree with much of Comrades Snegov's remarks but not all. Our country cannot be accused of desiring to deprive the Polish state of its independence or of partitioning it. This is the point of view of the bourgeois historians and the White emigrants. It was up to us to defend the independence of Poland. Some comrades have described criticism of the cult of the personality as an exaggeration of the Khrushchev period. This is fundamentally wrong. The resolutions of the twentieth and twenty-second congresses on the cult of the personality are not exaggerations of the Khrushchev period but are of vital importance for every honest Communist. (He thanks the author and all those present.)

The sessions lasted from 10:15 to 4:45 with an intermission of one hour.

STATE OF SIEGE DECREED IN GUATEMALA

The Guatemalan government headed by President Julio César Méndez Montenegro declared a state of siege November 3. According to bulletins on radio and television, the move was taken to cope with violence being waged by extremists of "both left and right." The state of siege, which was set for thirty days, bars meetings of more than four persons and legalizes arrests without warrants. The Belaúnde government in Peru opened its antiguerrilla campaign with a similar measure last year.

The police said they had seized an arsenal of weapons and high explosives in the home of a former right-wing deputy, Rudy Cifuentes Sandoval, and nine members of the right-wing National Liberation Movement were arrested.

However, the major blows seemed to be directed against the left. The student weekly El Estudiante was closed down by police. An unrevealed number of leftists were said to have been arrested.

An American company may have inspired the government's sudden move. The day before the state of siege was announced, eight men armed with machine guns attacked the Empresa Eléctrica de Guatemala, a subsidiary of American and Foreign Power. They bombed the electric plant and set fire to two tanks containing 90,000 gallons of diesel oil. The guerrillas identified themselves as members of the Rebel Armed Forces. This is the group headed by Turcios who was recently killed in an automobile accident that was not without its suspicious circumstances.

On October 31 guerrillas wearing army uniforms held up the cashier's office of a rum distillery. They took \$32,000 and issued a leaflet a few hours later identifying themselves as authors of the expropriation.

Although the Méndez government has sought to represent itself as liberal, it recently mounted a military campaign in the northeast mountain region against the guerrilla forces who have long been entrenched there. Méndez may be hoping to match Belaúnde's success in utilizing American armaments and dollars against fighters seeking national liberation and socialism.