

Revista internacional publicada por el CoReP y el PRS para la
construcción de una Internacional obrera revolucionaria

debate comunista 1

febrero 2012

Contenido / Contents:

Editorial

To Solve the Crisis of Leadership of the Revolutionary Class	3
Para resolver la crisis de dirección de la clase revolucionaria	4

Debate sobre Libia / Debate on Lybia

PRS: Cayó el régimen de Kadafi ¿Un primer triunfo parcial de los trabajadores y el pueblo libio o un triunfo del imperialismo? (2011)	6
PRS: Polémica sobre Libia, 2ª Parte: ¿Un programa para la Revolución Democrática o el programa de la Revolución Permanente? (2011)	14
CoReP: Open Letter to Socialist Fight Supporters / Great Britain (2011)	19
CoReP: Open Letter to RMG / South Africa and LC / Brazil (2011)	42

Frente unico antiimperialista / Anti-imperialist united front

CoReP: Anti-imperialist United Front versus Permanent Revolution (2006)	43
CoReP: ¿Frente único antiimperialista o revolución permanente? (2006)	52

Archivos del comunismo / Archives of communism

ILO: Manifiesto on China (1930)	61
OII: Manifiesto sobre China (1930)	66

february, 2012

communist debate 1

International review, published by the CoReP and the PRS, for
the construction of a Revolutionary Workers International



editorial

To Solve the Crisis of Leadership of the Revolutionary Class



Without its own party, the working class is unable to lead the youth and the other workers in the cities and in the country side, and to overthrow the bourgeoisie.

Without a workers' revolutionary party, the workers in Greece and in other European countries are misdirected by the union bureaucracies and by the "reformist" parties into "days of action" as pressures on the bourgeois governments, into the dead-end of protectionism.

Without a workers' revolutionary party, the students and the young unemployed in Portugal, in Britain, in Spain, in the United States... have been misdirected by the "Indignants" into pacifism, into non-political stand and into the illusion of capitalism without finance.

Without a workers' revolutionary party the young unemployed and the ethnic minorities in Britain have headed straight for disaster.

Without a workers' revolutionary party, the women, the youth and the waged workers in Tunisia, in Libya, in Egypt are left powerless against the Islamist counter-revolution and the masses in Syria are militarily and politically disarmed by the bourgeois opposition who wants to protect their bourgeois army and who counts on the United Nations or on the Arab League.

Without a workers' revolutionary party, the workers and the youth in Israel are prevented by the "Indignants" from joining the fight against the Zionist colonial state.

Without a workers' revolutionary party, the workers and the youth in Russia who stand up against Putin will be fooled by any of the fractions of the ruling class.

Without a workers' revolutionary party, capitalist restoration will be achieved in Cuba by the Castroist bureaucracy.

Yet the objective conditions of the world socialist revolution are mature.

• On the one hand, the working class has never been so large on a world scale, the development of the science, of the techniques and of the means of production allows the

perspective of a society which satisfies the needs of the world population, without private property, exploitation, national borders, an economy under the control of the associate producers.

• On the other hand, capitalism has evidenced that it fetters progress, through the recurrent world economic crisis, through the helplessness of all the bourgeois "economic policies" (whether they are "liberal" or "Keynesian") and through the mass unemployment. It appears more and more as a threat for humanity through militarism (including the increasing number of "nuclear powers"), the destruction of environment, the imperialist interventions and the ethnical conflicts, the inter-imperialist rivalries (aggravated by the crisis of the European Union, the rise of China and the decline of the United States), the strengthening of the fascist or clerical parties (that point the ethnic or religious minorities as target), the restrictions of democratic liberties...

To be sure, some of the subjective obstacles to the socialist world revolution have been weakened

• Stalinism collapsed. After having stolen the workers' power in USSR, facilitated the victory of fascism in Germany and in Spain, destroyed the 3rd International, saved the world capitalism after the Second world war, prevented the workers' power in Central Europe, China, Vietnam, Cuba..., crushed the workers' revolutions that tried to oust the ruling privileged bureaucracies, it finally restored capitalism in Central Europe, Russia and China. Now, what is left from Stalinism carries on its reactionary role within unions. Some have generated bourgeois parties and even fascistic parties. In most cases, there is no more difference between the former Stalinist parties and the classical social-democracy.

• The influence of the social-democracy over the world working class has substantially declined. After having destroyed the 2nd International in joining the "Holy alliance", saved capitalism after the First World War and isolated the successful revolution in Russia, failed before fascism, built up -with the help of Stalinism- states which have collapsed in Italy and France, led colonialist wars, social-democracy initiated bourgeois governments which apply austerity, cuts, privatizations and destroy formal social gains. Till their fall, despots of Tunisia, Egypt and Ivory Coast

were members of the "Socialist International". Most of Labor, Socialist and former Stalinist parties have discarded Socialism since capitalist restoration in most former workers' states.

- The so-called socialist petit-bourgeois and bourgeois nationalist movements have proved their failure on a large scale. Due to the betrayals of the social-democracy and Stalinism, some of them were able to trick the masses in the dominated countries or mislead the oppressed national minorities. In places where they could not get to power, they miserably gave up their socialist and anti-imperialist demands. When the nationalists got to power, they defended the exploiting class without being able to defeat imperialism. Last examples include Venezuela and Bolivia.

But no international center leads the construction of revolutionary workers' parties, because of the destruction of the 4th International 60 years ago, when it was destroyed

through adaptation of its own leadership to Stalinism and to bourgeois nationalism. The centrist organizations which come from the liquidation of the 4th International behave as supports for the bourgeois workers' parties and for the union bureaucracies, they apply for the construction of "large parties" at the service of their bourgeoisie for replacing Stalinism and social-democracy, or they capitulate before bourgeois nationalism, Islamism included.

The PRS (Argentina) and the Collective Permanent Revolution (Austria, France, Peru) intend to contribute to the perspective of a Communist International based on Marxism, through joint publication of this journal. Our aim is to gather the revolutionaries who are now dispersed, in order to demarcate them from the agents of the bourgeoisie, to stand up in all countries the flag of the proletarian dictatorship (the destruction of the bourgeois state, the expropriation of the capitalists and the soviets' power) as a means to build the classless society, world socialism.



Para resolver la crisis de dirección de la clase revolucionaria



editorial

Sin partido propio, la clase obrera es incapaz de ponerse a la cabeza de los demás trabajadores de las ciudades y del campo, y de la juventud, para derribar a la burguesía.

Sin partido obrero revolucionario, los trabajadores de Grecia y de otros países de Europa son desorientados por los "días de acción", paros de un día convocados por las burocracias sindicales y los partidos reformistas para presionar a los gobiernos burgueses desde el interior del callejón sin salida del proteccionismo capitalista.

Sin partido obrero revolucionario, los estudiantes y los jóvenes desocupados de Portugal, de Gran Bretaña, de España, de los Estados Unidos, son desviados por los líderes de los "Indignados" hacia el pacifismo, el apoliticismo y la ilusión de un capitalismo sin finanzas.

Sin partido obrero revolucionario, la rebelión de los jóvenes desocupados y las minorías étnicas de Gran Bretaña se agota en acciones impotentes.

Sin partido obrero revolucionario, las mujeres, los jóvenes, los trabajadores asalariados de Túnez, Libia y Egipto se encuentran impotentes frente al islamismo contrarrevolucionario y las masas de Siria son desarmadas

política y militarmente por la oposición burguesa que quiere preservar sus Fuerzas Armadas y apuesta a la ONU o a la Liga Árabe.

Sin partido obrero revolucionario, los trabajadores y los jóvenes de Israel están impedidos de unirse a la lucha contra el Estado sionista colonial.

Sin partido obrero revolucionario, los trabajadores y jóvenes de Rusia que se levantan contra Putin serán engañados por tal o cual fracción de la clase dominante.

Sin partido obrero revolucionario, el capitalismo será completamente restablecido en Cuba por la burocracia castrista.

Sin embargo, las condiciones objetivas para la revolución socialista mundial están maduras hace mucho.

- De un lado, la clase obrera jamás fue más numerosa a escala mundial y el desarrollo de las ciencias, la técnica y los medios de producción permiten avizorar una sociedad que satisfaga las necesidades de la población mundial, liberada de la propiedad privada, la explotación, las fronteras nacionales, cuya economía esté colocada bajo el control de los

productores asociados.

- Del otro, el capitalismo continúa probando que constituye una traba al progreso, mediante la crisis económica mundial recurrente, la impotencia de todas las "políticas económicas" burguesas (tanto "liberales" como "keynesianas") y la desocupación en masa. El capitalismo aparece cada vez más como una amenaza para la humanidad a través del militarismo (y la multiplicación de "potencias nucleares"), la destrucción del entorno natural, las intervenciones imperialistas y los conflictos étnicos, las rivalidades inter-imperialistas (exacerbadas por la crisis de la Unión Europea y la decadencia de los Estados Unidos, el fortalecimiento de los partidos clericales o fascistas (que ponen el blanco en las minorías étnicas o religiosas), las restricciones a las libertades democráticas...

Por cierto, algunos obstáculos subjetivos a la revolución socialista mundial se han debilitado históricamente.

- El estalinismo se hundió. Después de haber usurpado el poder de los trabajadores en la URSS, facilitado la victoria del fascismo en Alemania y España, destruido la III Internacional, salvado al capitalismo mundial luego de la Segunda Guerra Mundial, impedido el poder de los trabajadores en Europa Central, en China, en Vietnam, en Cuba, y haber aplastado las revoluciones obreras que intentaron eliminar a las burocracias privilegiadas en el poder, restableció finalmente el capitalismo en Europa Central, Rusia y China. Hoy, los despojos del estalinismo prosiguen su papel reaccionario en el seno de los sindicatos. A veces fueron engendrando partidos burgueses, incluso algunos con fuertes rasgos fascistas. En general nada diferencia ya a los antiguos partidos estalinistas de la socialdemocracia tradicional.

- La autoridad de la socialdemocracia tradicional sobre la clase obrera mundial se debilitó considerablemente. Después de haber destruido la I Internacional integrándose a "la unión sagrada", de haber salvado al capitalismo al final de la Primera Guerra Mundial y aislado a la revolución victoriosa en Rusia, luego de haberse quebrado frente al fascismo, de reconstruir con el estalinismo los estados burgueses en Italia y Francia, y

haber sostenido guerras colonialistas, conformaron gobiernos capitalistas que aplicaron austeridad, privatizaron y atacaron las conquistas sociales. Hasta su caída, los déspotas de Túnez, Egipto y Costa de Marfil, fueron miembros de la "Internacional Socialista". Una gran parte de los partidos de origen laborista, socialdemócrata o estalinista renunciaron formalmente al socialismo desde la restauración del capitalismo en casi todos los antiguos estados obreros.

- Las corrientes nacionalistas pequeño-burguesas y burguesas falsamente socialistas, revelaron su quiebra a gran escala. Algunas pudieron, gracias a las traiciones de la socialdemocracia y del estalinismo, engañar a algunas masas en los países dominados o engañar a minorías nacionales oprimidas. Allí donde no pudieron tomar el poder, desistieron patéticamente de sus pretensiones socialistas y antiimperialistas. Cuando los nacionalistas accedieron al poder, defendieron a la clase explotadora sin deshacerse del imperialismo. Entre los ejemplos tardíos figuran Venezuela y Bolivia.

Hoy en día ningún centro internacional impulsa la construcción de partidos obreros revolucionarios, a causa de la destrucción de la IV Internacional hace 60 años, cuando fue víctima de la adaptación de su propia dirección al estalinismo y al nacionalismo burgués. Las corrientes centristas nacidas de la liquidación de la IV Internacional se comportan como muletas de los partidos reformistas y de las burocracias sindicales, convocan a edificar "partidos amplios" al servicio de su burguesía para remplazar al estalinismo y a la socialdemocracia, e incluso capitulan ante el nacionalismo burgués (incluido el islamismo).

Es a la perspectiva de una internacional proletaria marxista que el PRS (Argentina) y el Colectivo Revolución Permanente (Austria, Francia, Perú) piensan contribuir publicando en común esta revista, para reunir a los revolucionarios hoy dispersos delimitándose de todos los agentes de la burguesía y levantar en todos los países la bandera de la dictadura del proletariado (destrucción del Estado burgués, expropiación de los capitalistas y poder de los soviets) como medio para edificar la sociedad sin clases, el socialismo mundial.



Cayó el régimen de Kadafi ¿Un primer triunfo parcial de los trabajadores y el pueblo libio o un triunfo del imperialismo?

Como sucede con cada acontecimiento importante de la lucha de clases de repercusión internacional, la guerra civil y la intervención imperialista en Libia han generado una polémica entre los partidos y/o corrientes que se reivindican trotskistas. Si en relación a los alzamientos de masas en Túnez y Egipto las diferencias se circunscribieron al grado de importancia de los procesos de movilización (¿revuelta o revolución?) y al programa para intervenir en ellos, en el caso de Libia las diferencias afectan además a cuestiones todavía más básicas y elementales, dando como resultado posiciones opuestas acerca del carácter de los bandos en lucha en la guerra civil, y por ende del primer resultado importante de la lucha: la caída de Kadafi. ¿Se trata de un primer triunfo parcial de una revolución o del triunfo de la contrarrevolución?

La polémica acerca del carácter del proceso en curso -que ya se había abierto con la intervención militar imperialista- resurge tras la caída de Kadafi y la entrada de las tropas “rebeldes” en Trípoli.

Mientras los partidos y movimientos “nacionalistas” burgueses y gobiernos -como el encabezado por Chávez y Evo Morales- apoyaban a Kadafi ubicándolo en el bando “antiimperialista”, la mayoría de las corrientes trotskistas coincidió en definir que Kadafi hacía ya tiempo que se había integrado por completo al orden imperialista.

Otra coincidencia fundamental fue reconocer que el levantamiento de masas de Bengazi y Trípoli fue la manifestación en Libia de los mismos procesos revolucionarios protagonizados por las masas tunecinas y egipcias, y no complots armados artificialmente por la CIA como alegaban los Chávez, Evo Morales y Ortega.

La primera diferencia clave surge alrededor de si la intervención militar del imperialismo, disfrazada de ayuda humanitaria para defender la vida de la población de Bengazi atacada por Kadafi, y aceptada con condiciones por el CNT, cambió el carácter del proceso en curso iniciado con el levantamiento popular.

En este artículo polemizaremos con la posición del Partido de Trabajadores Socialistas (PTS) sección fundacional de la Fracción Trotskista-Cuarta Internacional (FT-CI), que opina que la intervención de la OTAN cambió el carácter del movimiento de masas libio y que la caída de Kadafi fue un triunfo de la política imperialista.

En LVO(*) 415, el PTS caracterizaba al levantamiento de masas en Libia como una expresión más radicalizada y poderosa de la “primavera árabe”, y en LVO 417 del 10 de marzo, Claudia Cinatti describía a las fuerzas enfrentadas en la guerra civil, y las contradicciones internas del bando “rebelde”:

*“En estos combates se enfrentan las fuerzas que permanecen leales a Kadafi, principalmente el **aparato de seguridad del estado, sectores del ejército y mercenarios** traídos desde países vecinos, y las milicias de la oposición compuestas por sectores del ejército que han desertado y se pasaron del lado de la rebelión, y sobre todo, **por decenas de miles de jóvenes pobres y de las clases medias, de tendencias islamistas y laicas, que voluntariamente y de manera espontánea se unen a la defensa de las ciudades ante el avance de los tropas oficialistas. Según la revista The Economist sólo en Bengasi se han alistado 17.000 jóvenes, que portan desde armas automáticas y granadas tomadas en los cuarteles hasta cuchillos domésticos y que se lanzan al combate a pesar de carecer de toda experiencia militar.**”*

La existencia de estas milicias irregulares confirma que, a pesar de sus esfuerzos iniciales, el Consejo Nacional con sede en Bengasi que actúa como gobierno provisorio de la oposición, no ha podido llevar adelante su política de desarmar a la población y disciplinar una fuerza regular dirigida por los ex oficiales del régimen. Este elemento muestra el grado de radicalidad que alcanzó la lucha

contra Kadafi pero también expresa su debilidad: que la dirección política del proceso está hegemonizada por los sectores de “notables”, que incluyen las clases medias ilustradas, empresarios y los elementos que desertaron del antiguo régimen que buscan reemplazar la dictadura de Kadafi con otro régimen confiable para los intereses de las potencias imperialistas. Esto explica que miembros prominentes del gobierno provisional hayan pedido la intervención “humanitaria” de las potencias occidentales, **mientras que en las calles de Bengasi y otras ciudades se rechaza todo tipo de injerencia imperialista.**”

En cambio, en el periódico LVO 420 (31 de marzo), el PTS, polemizando con Gilbert Achcar, quien, según los autores, es la expresión de “un sector amplio de la izquierda francesa -desde el PS al PG, los “Verdes” y otros sectores de la izquierda- que han avalado la política intervencionista del gobierno Sarkozy”, dicen:

“A diferencia de las fuerzas que se oponían a Milosevic en Kosovo, los insurgentes libios no pedían la ocupación de su país por tropas extranjeras”, afirma Achcar. Pero la **dirección del Concejo Nacional de Transición Libio (CNTL)**, que desde Bengasi se arroga la representación del levantamiento, se subordina cada vez más a los aliados en el mismo camino del ELK kosovar, invocando la protección imperialista y transformándose en la **“infantería de la OTAN”**, cuyos cazabombarderos le abren el camino en los enfrentamientos con las fuerzas gubernamentales. No es casual que: **“EE UU y Reino Unido estudian armar a los rebeldes en su combate contra Gadafi.** Cameron y Clinton creen que el suministro de armamento es compatible con el embargo y estaría amparado por la resolución de Naciones Unidas” (El País, 29/03). **Si a diferencia del ELK no piden participación terrestre es porque el propio imperialismo no quiere correr mayores riesgos**, a la luz de las costosas experiencias en las guerras contra Irak y Afganistán y resultaría difícil legitimarla entre los pueblos árabes. La dirección del CNTL, dominada por arribistas, ex kadafistas y jefes tribales, se montó sobre la rebelión buscando desde el principio impedir que se extendiera el armamento popular y presentándose como “moderados”. En realidad, dejándose cooptar como agentes de la intervención imperialista, se disponen a servir de “Karzai” libios (Karzai encabeza el corrupto gobierno títere impuesto por EE.UU. en Afganistán tras su invasión).”

(Libia: Una polémica en la izquierda - Frente a la intervención “humanitaria” de la OTAN, LVO 420, Eduardo Molina y Graciela López Erguía)

El cambio que se produjo en la apreciación de los hechos por parte del PTS es notable. Mientras que el 10 de marzo señalaban que el CNT no había podido ni desarmar ni disciplinar totalmente las milicias, y que la presencia de tropas terrestres era rechazada por el pueblo en las manifestaciones callejeras, el 31 de marzo ya **no distingue** entre la dirección del CNT y las milicias, las que ahora sin contradicciones y de manera homogénea serían en conjunto la **“infantería de la OTAN”**.

Es decir, para el PTS, desde la intervención de los bombardeos imperialistas, las milicias “rebeldes” se transformaron a en la “infantería de la OTAN”. Esta caracterización es reafirmada en LVO 441 (del 25 de agosto, después de la caída de Trípoli):

“Aunque las imágenes de televisión muestren milicias locales en lugar de soldados norteamericanos ingresando en el complejo de Bab al Aziziya y derribando las estatuas de Kadafi, las fuerzas “rebeldes” que tomaron Trípoli actuaron como “tropa terrestre” de los bombardeos de la OTAN, con una dirección completamente colaboracionista con las grandes potencias.”

Entonces, según el análisis que hace el PTS, con la intervención imperialista se habría consolidado el control político y militar del CNT sobre las masas, el cual está hegemonizado por los “notables” pequeñoburgueses y burgueses, los ex ministros y oficiales del régimen de Kadafi. Los comités y las milicias populares y sus contradicciones con el CNT, en particular con los ministros que desertaron del gobierno de Kadafi, desaparecen con la intervención imperialista. Y, en base a ese análisis, caracterizan la caída de Kadafi como un acontecimiento contrarrevolucionario:

“Indudablemente, el odio hacia la dictadura de Kadafi y su sistema de prebendas surgidas del control estatal de la importante renta petrolera motorizó el levantamiento popular de febrero en Bengasi y otras ciudades, como parte de la “primavera árabe”. Sin embargo, a diferencia de Túnez o Egipto, la caída de Kadafi en las condiciones que se produjo no es la primera conquista de un proceso revolucionario, sino un triunfo de la política de las potencias imperialistas –en particular Estados Unidos, Francia y Gran Bretaña– que con la excusa “humanitaria” de “proteger a los civiles” llevaron adelante una intervención militar para garantizar que surja un gobierno aún más proimperialista que el de Kadafi y religitimarse poniéndose del bando “rebelde” para poder intervenir y frenar los procesos abiertos por la primavera árabe.”

En cambio creemos que el Partido Obrero (PO) hace una descripción más cercana a la realidad (**), afirmando que el CNT no controla a las milicias y que es más bien la coordinadora de un frente único por el derrocamiento del régimen de Kadafi. En el Prensa Obrera 1194 / del 15-9, en la nota titulada “La insurrección del pueblo libio unificó en un frente contra el régimen de Kadafi a fuerzas diversas” dicen:

“El Consejo Nacional de Transición, compuesto por varias decenas de delegados que representan formalmente a los ‘comités’ de las diferentes ciudades y regiones del país, está hegemonizado por los dirigentes del movimiento de Bengasi. Según el corresponsal de El País (8/9), ‘liberales, abogados, tecnócratas y exiliados principalmente en Estados Unidos nutren el Ejecutivo’, en el cual tienen escasa representación muchos otros grupos que participaron del movimiento rebelde y ven con recelo el liderazgo de los dirigentes del CNT. ‘Para el CNT es clave integrar las múltiples milicias en un nuevo ejército y una nueva policía. Por el momento, cada consejo local administra sus asuntos militares y nombra su propio jefe de seguridad: en Trípoli, por ejemplo, se rechazó el nombramiento impulsado por Bengasi y se insistió en poner al mando a Abdelhakim Belhaj, un ex jihadista, a cargo de la ciudad’ (The Economist, 10/9). Belhaj fue detenido en 2004 por fuerzas norteamericanas, las que lo entregaron al régimen de Gaddafi, acusándolo de terrorismo y vínculos con Al Qaeda. Aunque ahora ha negado estas acusaciones y planteado que pretende ‘un estado civil que respete las leyes y los derechos y haga justicia, no un régimen al estilo talibán’, lo cierto es que las diferencias del mando rebelde en Trípoli con el CNT ya han alcanzado un nivel muy serio. En los últimos días, ‘aparecieron voces de dirigentes islámicos moderados demandando la renuncia completa del Comité de Transición: rechazan que esta conducción administre los miles de millones de dólares pirateados por Gaddafi y que los bancos del mundo devolvan al país’ (Clarín, 8/9).”

Como dato ilustrativo de las contradicciones que afectan las fuerzas organizadas tras el CNT hay que mencionar el asesinato del ex ministro del Interior Mohammed Fatah Younis, que fundó las fuerzas especiales de Kadafi y controlaba la seguridad en la zona liberada, en una acción militar atribuida a milicias independientes.

Lógica formal e incoherencias en el análisis del PTS

El PTS había caracterizado las caídas de los gobiernos en Túnez y en Egipto, como primeros triunfos del movimiento de masas. En cambio dice que la caída de Kadafi fue un triunfo del imperialismo. La diferencia en

Libia sería que la intervención militar del imperialismo impondría un régimen títere comparable al de Karzai en Afganistán. Pero, tanto la guerra contra el gobierno talibán de Afganistán, como contra Saddam Hussein en Irak, fueron guerras imperialistas contra gobiernos que mantenían cierta independencia política y económica. Para imponer sus gobiernos títeres tuvieron que invadir y ocupar esos países con tropas terrestres. En Libia el factor fundamental fue el levantamiento armado de las masas contra el régimen de Kadafi, sobre el cual se monta la intervención militar imperialista, pero limitada a los bombardeos, sin ocupación del territorio con tropas terrestres. Es innegable que esa intervención le da al imperialismo una gran influencia en la constitución del gobierno y el régimen que asumirá en Libia. Pero será una influencia política y no militar, porque no dominan militarmente el territorio, cuyo control sigue en manos de las milicias populares.

La caída de Mubarak, en el último momento –luego de los fracasados intentos de doblegar el alzamiento por la represión–, fue forzada por la política imperialista, que le soltó la mano y dio luz verde para que el ejército asumiera el poder. ¿El alto mando del ejército egipcio es menos proimperialista que Mubarak? ¿Las direcciones del movimiento de masas que voltearon a Mubarak (Los Hermanos musulmanes y El Baradei) son menos burguesas y proimperialistas que las del CNTL? Evidentemente, no.

La intervención imperialista en Egipto fue de carácter político, para asegurar una transición ordenada que permitiera frenar al movimiento de masas una vez que “sacrificaron” a Mubarak. En cambio en Libia, la intervención no se podía limitar al terreno político por la simple y sencilla razón de que ante la brutal represión desatada por Kadafi, las masas de Bengazi tomaron las armas y comenzó una guerra civil.

¿La guerra es o no la continuación de la política por otros medios? ¿Por qué la caída de Mubarak, facilitada por la política del imperialismo, es para el PTS un triunfo de las masas árabes, pero en cambio la caída de Kadafi, facilitada por la intervención militar de la OTAN, es un triunfo de la política imperialista?

Las masas libias están en mejores condiciones para conquistar un margen muy superior de libertades democráticas que las egipcias y tunecinas, ya que en estos últimos países gobiernan juntas militares, mientras que en Libia las masas populares todavía están armadas y el ejército de Kadafi fue derrotado. El CNTL será un gobierno mucho más débil que el de las juntas militares de Egipto y Túnez, ya que si por arriba estará sostenido por el imperialismo, por abajo está asentado en la ebullición revolucionaria potenciada con el triunfo, de los comités populares y las milicias.

Si la asunción del gobierno militar, institución muchísimo más sólida y respetada por el pueblo, no cerró el proceso de movilización de masas en Egipto, ¿por qué habría que dar por terminado el proceso de movilización de masas y caracterizar como triunfo del imperialismo la caída de Kadafi, cuando el CNTL todavía no ha podido formar gobierno, y se asienta sobre una base más endeble e inestable por provenir de una guerra civil?

Para nosotros, al contrario que de lo que dice el PTS, tanto la caída de Mubarak como la de Kadafi son triunfos de la movilización revolucionaria de las masas obreras y populares, son sus primeros triunfos democráticos. Por la ausencia de dirección revolucionaria, el imperialismo y la burguesía, caído Mubarak, lograron que el poder pasara a la junta militar, con lo cual, obtuvieron su primer triunfo reaccionario, y tendrá el mismo contenido la instalación de un gobierno del CNTL en Libia. Pero la movilización de las masas se sigue desarrollando, no ha sido derrotada, ni el proceso revolucionario ha terminado, por el contrario se retroalimenta. Basta con ver Siria, Yemen, Bahrein, etc.

La intervención imperialista y la guerra civil

Cuando la represión no logra contener al movimiento de masas, la política del imperialismo ha sido intervenir para garantizar la asunción de gobiernos de transición que permitan salvaguardar sus intereses. En Túnez y Egipto esta política se canalizó a través de las fuerzas armadas, las que al no participar en la represión y mantener su unidad, son el baluarte para contener la movilización, mientras dosifican las concesiones democráticas y se fortalecen los partidos burgueses “moderados” proimperialistas. En Siria, a través de Turquía se busca implementar una transición a partir de que Al Assad ceda el poder. La misma línea se intenta en Yemen.

Por supuesto que si la insurrección en Libia estuviera dirigida por un partido obrero revolucionario el imperialismo se hubiera unido para apoyar a Kadafi. Pero Kadafi, siendo un aliado del imperialismo, era un aliado inestable e imprevisible que de ninguna manera estaba dispuesto a aceptar ninguna transición que lo desplazara, incluso parcialmente, del poder. La intervención militar les permitía a las potencias imperialistas reubicarse en la región, luego de venir mal paradas por el apoyo a los gobiernos dictatoriales de Túnez y Egipto. Permitir que Kadafi masacrara a la población de Bengazi los hubiera dejado sin autoridad para implementar sus planes en la región. El pasaje a la oposición de figuras importantes del régimen y los síntomas de división en las fuerzas armadas, la ausencia de una clase obrera con direcciones independientes, terminaron de convencer al imperialismo que la

intervención a favor del CNTL era la mejor opción, aunque hubo bastantes vacilaciones antes de definir esta posición, la que incluso fue rechazada por Alemania (además de China y Rusia).

Obviamente que el CNTL reclamó la intervención imperialista. Pero las masas, aun cuando las tropas de Kadafi amenazaban con destruir Bengazi, pusieron un límite a esa intervención negándose a aceptar el ingreso de tropas terrestres.

La cuestión reside en caracterizar correctamente el proceso en curso. La intervención imperialista no fue para asegurar el carácter semicolonial del Estado libio que Kadafi ya había sometido al imperialismo, sino para tener un punto de apoyo para controlar el movimiento de masas revolucionario. El alzamiento del pueblo libio y la consecuente guerra civil con las tropas de Kadafi es un movimiento revolucionario. La intervención de la OTAN no modificó el carácter fundamental de la lucha en desarrollo, determinado por la guerra civil, sino que, justamente, el objetivo de la intervención fue incidir en el resultado de esa guerra civil. La intervención de la OTAN no transformó la guerra civil en una guerra de colonización imperialista contra una nación oprimida sino que fue secundaria en relación al movimiento revolucionario. No cambió el carácter del proceso transformando a las masas insurreccionadas en tropas terrestres del imperialismo y a Kadafi en dirigente de una nación oprimida contra una guerra de colonización imperialista. Nuestro razonamiento encuentra puntos de apoyo en el de Trotsky durante la guerra civil española:

*"Se nos puede objetar que durante una guerra entre dos estados burgueses el proletariado, cualquiera que sea el régimen político de su país, debe adoptar la postura según la cual «la derrota de nuestro propio gobierno es un mal menor». ¿Esta regla no es igualmente aplicable a la guerra civil en la que se enfrentan dos gobiernos burgueses? De ninguna forma. En una guerra entre dos Estados burgueses, el objetivo es una conquista imperialista, no la lucha entre la democracia y el fascismo. **En la guerra civil española, la cuestión es: democracia o fascismo.***

*Para la clase capitalista, la diferencia entre democracia y fascismo no es decisiva. Según las circunstancias utiliza una u otro para sus propios fines. Pero, para los agentes pequeño burgueses del capital -los dirigentes de la socialdemocracia, los estalinistas y los anarquistas- la democracia es la propia fuente de su existencia y de su influencia. El fascismo significa para ellos desastre y exterminio. **El proletariado revolucionario no puede colocar los dos campos en lucha en un mismo saco: debe utilizar este combate para sus propios intereses. No puede alcanzar el éxito***

con una política neutral, sino por el contrario, golpeando militarmente a su enemigo número uno: el fascismo. (...)

Se puede objetar que los dos campos imperialistas (Italia y Alemania por una parte, Inglaterra, Francia y la U.R.S.S. por otra) luchan en la península Ibérica y que la guerra de España no es más que un episodio de esta lucha. En el sentido de la posibilidad histórica, es cierto. Pero no es lícito identificar la posibilidad histórica, con el curso real, concreto, de la guerra civil hoy día. Los intereses de los países imperialistas indudablemente tienen influencia sobre el desarrollo de los acontecimientos en España. Pero, hasta ahora, no se ha conseguido modificar su carácter fundamental, en tanto que lucha entre el campo de la democracia burguesa española y el campo del fascismo. (...)

Tomemos un ejemplo: Dos barcos con armas y municiones salen de Francia o de los Estados Unidos, uno para Franco y otro para Negrín. ¿Qué actitud deberían tomar los trabajadores? ¿Sabotear el transporte de los dos o sólo el de Franco? No somos neutrales. Dejaríamos pasar el barco con municiones para Negrín. Sin ilusiones, sabemos que de estas balas, nueve de cada diez serán dirigidas contra los fascistas, pero al menos una contra nuestros camaradas. Pero de las municiones destinadas a Franco, diez de diez serán dirigidas contra nuestros camaradas. No somos neutrales. No dejaríamos pasar el barco con municiones para Franco. Entiéndase bien, si se produjese en España una insurrección obrera armada, intentaríamos hacer llegar las armas y las municiones hasta las masas de obreros insurrectos. Pero mientras no tengan suficiente fuerza para esto, escogeríamos el mal menor. "(León Trotsky, Respuesta a preguntas relativas a la situación española 14 de septiembre de 1937)

Como se ha dicho tantas veces, toda analogía “cojea”. Pero lo fundamental es extraer de estas citas el método. La insurrección del pueblo libio contra el régimen de Kadafi está en la fase “democrática”, es decir, su objetivo inmediato es la derrota de un régimen “fascista”, aunque las reivindicaciones de los obreros y el pueblo sublevado no se limitan a las cuestiones exclusivamente democráticas formales, sino que están determinadas por su situación social, igual que ocurría con los obreros y campesinos españoles. El frente popular español –al igual que el CNTL- también reclamaba el apoyo militar de potencias imperialistas. De hecho la burocracia stalinista intervino en España para frenar la revolución obrera al servicio del imperialismo europeo. La burocracia de la URSS y el PC español actuaron como los agentes del imperialismo.

Trotsky plantea que era lícito recibir armas de Francia o Estados Unidos. En tanto el factor fundamental fuera todavía la guerra civil, el proletariado no podía ser neutral y debía luchar militarmente en el bando republicano y **“aprovechar” la lucha entre los dos campos dirigidos por sectores de la burguesía para sus propios intereses. Para ganar debía golpear militarmente a su enemigo número uno: el fascismo.**

Los bombardeos imperialistas ayudan objetivamente a las milicias y al CNT. ¿Es comparable esto a recibir armamento? No, no es lo mismo, porque la aviación y los bombardeos no están en manos del pueblo insurrecto, y por eso había que denunciar la intervención imperialista, poniendo el énfasis en el programa y el llamado internacional a proveer de armamento y voluntarios a la revolución. Pero por sí mismos no son un factor decisivo que cambie el carácter de la lucha. El imperialismo actuó contra Kadafi para apuntalar la defensa de Bengazi primero, y luego la ofensiva de las milicias hacia el oeste, es decir impulsó la derrota de Kadafi por intermedio de las milicias del CNT, esperando capitalizar a su favor un triunfo conquistado con su ayuda. Pero las vacilaciones que desde antes de la intervención militar mantienen acerca del carácter y la composición de las fuerzas que coexisten con los dirigentes del CNT revelan que ese triunfo no sería directo. El imperialismo no quisiera que se repita la situación de Afganistán en 1980 cuando armaron a los talibanes y a Bin Laden para expulsar a las tropas de la URSS, y estos luego se volvieron en su contra. Pero evidentemente, la situación en todo el norte de Africa y el Medio Oriente los apremia y no tienen mucho margen de maniobra. Por eso están actuando con esta política de “emergencia”, pero sabiendo que sólo con una ocupación militar podría el imperialismo consolidar un triunfo directo contra Kadafi y por ese medio conquistar un bastión contrarrevolucionario sólido en la región.

El ejemplo de Afganistán de los 80 fue permanente citado por quienes querían asegurarse que el apoyo aéreo y eventualmente la entrega de armas que se estaba discutiendo no cayeran en manos inseguras o no confiables. Es sabido que los talibanes (con armas y entrenamiento de la CIA) –Bin Laden incluido- derrotaron al ejército de la burocracia soviética, para luego resistirse y hasta volverse en contra de los EE-UU.

En aquel momento el CI-CI (Comité Internacional por la Cuarta Internacional) en el cual estaban intentando fusionarse la LIT (corriente internacional de Moreno) y el lambertismo, caracterizaron que en Afganistán estaba en curso un proceso revolucionario que había derrocado un gobierno que era títere de la URSS, y que la burocracia stalinista ordenó la ocupación militar para derrotar esa revolución y por el temor a que ésta se extendiera a los otros países musulmanes oprimidos del

sur de la URSS. A pesar de esa caracterización, el CI-CI no exigió el retiro del ejército de la burocracia stalinista, ni quiso apoyar a las milicias talibanes y otras –caracterizadas como “feudales”- armadas por la CIA, y especuló con la posibilidad de que la burocracia stalinista podía llegar a expropiar a los capitalistas en Afganistán, cuando desde hacía más de 30 años que el stalinismo no impulsaba ninguna expropiación en ningún lugar del mundo. O sea, la política de Moreno-Lambert fue capitularle a la burocracia stalinista y a su ejército cuando éste actuaba reflejando no el carácter social de la URSS, sino el interés de la burocracia de aplastar la revolución. Allí ni la intervención de la CIA, ni la abundante provisión de armamento por parte de EE-UU cambió el factor fundamental de la guerra: de liberación nacional por parte de las milicias afganas, contra la opresión y ocupación de Afganistán por el ejército de la burocracia stalinista.

Para tomar posición ante situaciones que son complejas, Trotsky partía siempre de analizar en donde están los puntos de apoyo para desarrollar la revolución, en donde está el movimiento que se desarrolla en dirección del avance de la revolución. Podemos citar otros ejemplos, siempre con la idea de extraer las lecciones metodológicas y no para compararlos esquemáticamente.

La autodeterminación de los pueblos es un derecho democrático, mientras que la defensa del estado obrero un principio socialista. Sin embargo, aunque se argumentaba –y en un sentido era cierto- que la independencia de Ucrania debilitaba la URSS, Trotsky defendió la independencia de Ucrania, levantando la consigna “*Por una Ucrania Soviética de obreros y campesinos, unida, libre e independiente*” porque consideraba que más debilitaba la defensa del estado obrero la política de opresión de los pueblos de la burocracia stalinista. Y esto a pesar de que caracterizaba que “*Las masas obreras y campesinas de la Ucrania Occidental, de Bukovina, de los Cárpatos ucranianos están confundidas: ¿a quién recurrir? ¿qué pedir? Esta situación desvía naturalmente el liderazgo hacia las camarillas ucranianas más reaccionarias, que expresan su “nacionalismo” tratando de vender el pueblo ucraniano a uno u otro imperialismo en pago de una promesa de independencia ficticia. Sobre esta trágica confusión, basa Hitler su política en la cuestión ucraniana.*”

Este ejemplo es solo para ilustrar que no se puede hacer política marxista basados en esquemas de lógica formal.

Cuando todavía las potencias imperialistas estaban discutiendo su intervención militar, en Libia se desarrollaba una revolución que se había transformado, por la represión de Kadafi, en guerra civil. La dirección proimperialista del CNT trataba de controlar a las

milicias y a las bases movilizadas para llevarlas a aceptar la intervención militar del imperialismo, pero había un sector (liderado por Ghoga) que reflejando el sentimiento de la población se pronunciaba en contra. En ese momento planteábamos que la clave era levantar un programa revolucionario: Lo que hace falta para ganar la guerra civil es levantar un programa revolucionario:

*“Total rechazo a la intervención imperialistas en Libia. Un fervoroso llamado a los trabajadores y los pueblos árabes –fundamentalmente a los de Egipto y Túnez-, a apoyar su revolución con armas y voluntarios. Declarar la nacionalización bajo control obrero de toda la industria petrolera, no sólo los pozos y las reservas que ya están nacionalizadas, sino de toda la infraestructura extractiva y de comercialización en manos de empresas imperialistas; y que el dinero proveniente de la exportación petrolera será destinado a las necesidades populares según un plan económico obrero y popular aprobado en un consejo nacional de delegados democráticamente elegido por los obreros y los barrios populares. Amnistía total para los soldados y sub-oficiales que se pasen al lado de la revolución. Elección de abajo hacia arriba de todos los mandos militares de las milicias. Ninguna de las alas del Consejo Nacional de Bengazi, por su carácter burgués es capaz de levantar un programa revolucionario semejante para ganar a su favor las fuerzas en las que se apoya Kadafi. Por el contrario, su política es convencer al imperialismo que son dignos de su confianza. Completa ruptura con todos los elementos burgueses del CNL de transición y creación de un **Gobierno de delegados obreros, populares y de soldados de las milicias.***

Organizar en el curso de la lucha un partido de obreros y sectores del pueblo revolucionarios que levante este programa es decisivo para definir el triunfo de la guerra civil.

¡Abajo Kadafi! ¡Por el triunfo de las milicias revolucionarias! ¡Ninguna intervención imperialista!”

Posteriormente, cuando Bengazi se hallaba completamente rodeada por las tropas de Kadafi –superiores en armamento- y a punto de sucumbir, el sector de Ghoga aceptó la intervención imperialista, poniendo como límite que se rechazara expresamente la intervención con tropas terrestres. ¿Qué hubiera debido hacer un grupo trotskista en esas circunstancias? Habiendo planteando la ruptura política con el CNT, denunciando que la intervención imperialista se hace en función de sus intereses políticos y económicos y que lo que buscan las potencias imperialistas no es el “bien humanitario”, ni establecer una democracia, sino

controlar el proceso revolucionario, debería haber aceptado ese “compromiso”, que era **obligado por la situación**, de permitir que los aviones del imperialismo salven a Bengazi, y con ello le den una oportunidad a la revolución. Sin embargo, había que seguir insistiendo en la denuncia del imperialismo y poniendo el acento en reclamar armas y voluntarios, en particular, de los pueblos árabes, para que la revolución no dependa de la intervención militar imperialista. Pero mientras el ataque imperialista aéreo se siguiera centrando en las tropas de Kadafi, se debería mantener la unidad de acción militar con el CNT, es decir continuar la lucha contra Kadafi. Tales “compromisos” obligatorios encuentran antecedentes en la política de Lenin, por ejemplo, en relación a la paz de Brest-Litovsk, o la expresada en el artículo ¿Ningún compromiso? del “Izquierdismo...”.

Cuando el poder soviético, en guerra contra Alemania, aceptaba armas de Inglaterra y Francia, Lenin escribía: *"Supongamos que para matar al tirano y verdugo, Kaliáiev* consigue que un canalla, pillito y bandido le entregue un revólver, bajo la promesa de pagar ese favor con pan, dinero y vodka. ¿Podemos reprochar a Kaliáiev por haber hecho la “transacción con un bandido” a fin de conseguir el arma mortífera? Cualquiera persona sensata responderá que no. Si Kaliáiev no podía conseguir el revólver en otra parte, y su causa era realmente honrada (el móvil era el asesinato del tirano, y no el robo), entonces la acción no merece reproches, sino elogios."*

** (Kaliáiev fue un eserista que en febrero de 1905 mató con una bomba al gobernador de Moscú, el duque Romanov, tío del Zar Nicolás II)*

Y Lenin agrega una posdata:

"P.S.: En la lucha de liberación contra Inglaterra, a fines del siglo XVIII, los norteamericanos recurrieron a la ayuda de los competidores de Inglaterra, bandidos colonialistas al igual que ésta, los Estados español y francés. Se dice que por ahí andan “bolcheviques de izquierda” que se sentaron a escribir una “obra erudita” sobre las “indecorosas transacciones” de aquellos americanos...". (Acercas de la sarna, OC tomo XXVII)

En Trotsky también encontramos razonamientos similares. El primero, contra el izquierdismo stalinista del tercer período, que ponía un signo igual entre la socialdemocracia y el fascismo:

“Nosotros como marxistas, consideramos tanto a Brüning y a Hitler como a Braun como los representantes de un único mismo sistema. El problema de saber cuál de entre ellos es un “mal

menor” carece de sentido, porque su sistema, contra el cual luchamos nosotros, necesita de todos sus elementos. Pero hoy estos elementos están en conflicto, y el partido del proletariado debe utilizar absolutamente este conflicto en interés de la revolución. En una gama hay siete notas. Preguntarse cuál de las notas es la mejor, si do, re o sol, no tiene sentido. Sin embargo, el músico debe saber cuándo y qué tecla golpear. Preguntarse quién es el mal menor, si Brüning o Hitler, carece de sentido. Pero hay que saber cuál de estas teclas golpear. ¿Está claro? Para los que no lo comprendan, tomemos un ejemplo más. Si uno de mis enemigos me envenena cada día con pequeñas dosis de veneno y otro quiere darme un tiro por detrás, yo arrancaré primero el revólver de las manos del segundo, lo que me dará la posibilidad de terminar con el primero” (La lucha contra el fascismo en Alemania)

Y el segundo, contra el pensamiento antidialéctico de la oposición pequeñoburguesa del SWP de EE-UU:

*"Si mañana Hitler se viera obligado a enviar armas a los hindúes insurreccionados, ¿deben oponerse los obreros revolucionarios alemanes a esta acción concreta? De ninguna manera. Deben esforzarse porque los insurrectos reciban las armas lo más pronto posible. Esperamos que esto sea claro para Stanley. Pero el ejemplo es puramente hipotético. Lo usamos para demostrar que **hasta un gobierno fascista del capital financiero puede en ciertas condiciones, verse obligado a apoyar un movimiento nacional revolucionario (que tratará de estrangular al día siguiente).**" (En defensa del marxismo)*

El PTS, utilizando un razonamiento esquemático cree que si el imperialismo apoya a un movimiento revolucionario, este **automáticamente** se transforma en proimperialista, sin más consideraciones. Según el PTS, a partir de la intervención de la OTAN, las milicias “rebeldes” integradas **“por decenas de miles de jóvenes pobres y de las clases medias, de tendencias islamistas y laicas, que voluntariamente y de manera espontánea se unen a la defensa de las ciudades ante el avance de los tropas oficialistas”**, milicias irregulares, **“no disciplinadas”** por el CNT, **pasaron automáticamente a convertirse en la tropa terrestre del imperialismo. Desaparecieron las contradicciones internas entre los jóvenes rebeldes, los ex ministros del régimen y el imperialismo. A partir de entonces se enfrentaron dos bandos: el de Kadafi, proimperialista, contra el del CNT (más proimperialista que Kadafi) y la OTAN.**

El PTS hace estos análisis y comentarios **pero no explica qué posición había que tener en la guerra civil**. Cuando estalla una guerra civil, un partido marxista revolucionario, manteniendo su política independiente, debe saber en qué lado combatir.

Cabe preguntarse: si la FTCl tuviera una sección en Libia ¿qué política hubiera tenido en relación a la guerra civil? Hubiera armado milicias para luchar en frente único con Kadafi contra las “tropas terrestres del imperialismo” que buscaban instaurar un gobierno más proimperialista que el de Kadafi? De su caracterización se desprende que no hubieran luchado junto con las milicias rebeldes. De su programa (¡Abajo Kadafi!), que tampoco hubieran combatido en el bando del gobierno libio. ¿Se hubieran cruzado de brazos en medio de la guerra civil esperando que aparezcan las “condiciones” ideales para aplicar su política? La falta de una correcta interpretación dialéctica de los acontecimientos los lleva al camino del abstencionismo político.

El análisis del PTS da por terminado el proceso más inestable de todo el norte de Africa. La caída de Kadafi es **“un triunfo de la política de las potencias imperialistas”**, se lamentan. Es verdad que la ausencia de una clase obrera organizada, y la inexistencia de un partido marxista revolucionario, va a facilitar las maniobras de los ex funcionarios kadafistas y del imperialismo. Pero todavía tienen que desarmar a las masas, como ha reclamado con énfasis, Hilary Clinton en su reciente visita a Libia: “unificar las distintas milicias en un único Ejército”, es algo que “tiene que ocurrir”, “conseguir un Ejército nacional bajo un mando civil es esencial”, dijo. Mientras tanto la caída de Kadafi ha dado

impulso adicional a las manifestaciones en Yemen y en Siria, y sin ninguna duda habrán impactado también en Túnez, Egipto y en todo el medio oriente. El CNT –tal como estaba constituido- todavía no ha podido asumir, por el contrario el principal referente del imperialismo, el ex ministro de justicia de Kadafi, Mustafa Abdul Jalil, tuvo que renunciar para dar lugar a la formación de un gobierno provisorio. El movimiento de masas libio se siente victorioso, mucho más todavía luego de capturar y ejecutar a Kadafi, cobrándole de esa manera el precio por haber “desaparecido” y ejecutado a miles de activistas opositores. No, el movimiento revolucionario de las masas obreras y populares libias todavía no ha sido derrotado, al contrario están festejando su primera gran victoria. Por supuesto que los objetivistas, que creen que el movimiento es todo y la dirección nada, terminan desbarrancando al oportunismo. Para impulsar el movimiento revolucionario hacia adelante y conquistar el triunfo de una revolución obrera y socialista, es necesaria la dirección de un partido obrero revolucionario. Pero también se puede caer en el fatalismo subjetivista de creer que como no hay tal partido, los levantamientos revolucionarios de las masas no son nada. Esa vía lleva al sectarismo abstencionista, y esa concepción estéril impide basarse en el movimiento revolucionario de las masas para poder construir el partido revolucionario.

5/11/2011

(*)LVO: *La Verdad Obrera*, periódico del PTS.

(**) *Esto no quiere decir que coincidamos con la posición del PO sobre Libia, sobre la cual haremos nuestra crítica en un próximo artículo.*



Polémica sobre Libia, 2ª Parte: ¿Un programa para la Revolución Democrática o el programa de la Revolución Permanente?

En el marco de la polémica que se desarrolla entre varias organizaciones y corrientes internacionales que se reivindican trotskistas, el PTS (FTCI) se cruzó en una discusión directa con la LIT-CI (PSTU-Brasil) y la UIT (Izquierda Socialista-Argentina).

En relación a como caracterizar la caída del régimen de Kadhafi, tenemos más acuerdo con la LITCI y la UIT, ya que lo consideran un triunfo del pueblo libio, en contraposición al PTS (FTCI) que dice que se produjo, **no una primera conquista de un proceso revolucionario en curso, sino “un triunfo de la política de las potencias imperialistas”,** dando lugar a **“un gobierno aún más proimperialista que el de Kadhafi”.**

Sin embargo, aquí terminan nuestras coincidencias con la LIT y la UIT. Nuestras diferencias de fondo con las posiciones de estas dos corrientes que se reivindican trotskistas, surgen a partir de la concepción etapista que tanto la LIT como la UIT sostienen. Es que tanto la LIT como la UIT se basan en las elaboraciones teóricas del fallecido dirigente Nahuel Moreno –fundador de la corriente de la que ambas eran parte-, según las cuales la revolución tiene dos etapas diferenciadas, con programas independientes: una etapa de revolución democrática y otra etapa posterior de revolución socialista.

Como podremos apreciar en los fragmentos de los siguientes artículos, tanto la LIT como la UIT coinciden en que lo que se desarrolla en Libia son “revoluciones democráticas”:

*“Un ejemplo político de un proceso distinto puede ayudar en la comprensión del fenómeno contradictorio. Durante las grandes **revoluciones democráticas** que derrumbaron dictaduras en la América Latina en los años 1980, el imperialismo también “cambió de trinchera”, pasando a apoyar esas luchas para poder frenarlas. No por eso, la izquierda dejó de ser parte de esas revoluciones. Era necesario participar de ellas, inclusive para poder*

disputar su dirección. (...)

*Existen grandes diferencias entre aquellas movilizaciones y la revolución árabe en curso. Las actuales son más profundas y se transforman en lucha armada. Kadhafi tuvo un pasado distinto de Videla o Figueredo. Pero las diferencias no cambian lo esencial: son **revoluciones democráticas** en curso, pues así como Videla y Figueredo, Kadhafi también se convirtió en dictador.” (Libia: ¿Revolución o golpe del imperialismo? Américo Gomes-Ilaese 19/9/2011; Opinión Socialista 431).*

Con la misma lógica, Izquierda Socialista (miembro de la UIT) afirma que se produjo el **“triunfo de una revolución democrática”** (“La revolución árabe y el final de Kadhafi”, Miguel Sorans, 22/10/2011).

No sería un problema si con esa denominación lo que quisieran decir es que la revolución en Libia se halla en su fase o etapa democrática, entendido esto como una descripción o caracterización del proceso por el que transcurre la movilización de las masas debido a sus direcciones burguesas o pequeñoburguesas. Trotsky ha utilizado esa expresión, por ejemplo, en la revolución española.

Pero no se trata de eso, sino de una concepción teórica, que divide la revolución en etapas, en las cuales el partido revolucionario debe levantar programas diferentes: en la primera etapa un programa mínimo democrático, dejando el programa socialista como un “norte estratégico” o una “perspectiva”, que sólo podría levantarse, en el mejor de los casos, luego de la caída del régimen dictatorial.

Coherente con esta ubicación teórica, según la cual hay dos etapas en la revolución, la LIT levantó durante esta primera etapa de revolución democrática, como único programa: la **“unidad de acción con todos los sectores, incluidos los burgueses desplazados por el régimen, para terminar con esta dictadura genocida atrincherada.”** (...) “la tarea

decisiva de la revolución ahora es derrotar las fuerzas de la dictadura en Trípoli y derrocar a Kadafi. Y para ello es fundamental unificar sólidamente a todas las fuerzas sociales, políticas y militares que sostienen la lucha.”

La LIT presenta como una unidad de acción militar lo que en realidad es un frente “popular” político, ya que no plantea ninguna diferencia programática con las **“fuerzas sociales, políticas y militares que sostienen la lucha” “incluidos los burgueses desplazados por el régimen”**.

Efectivamente, aunque reconoce que entre los que participan en la lucha hay diferentes intereses y diferencias políticas, **estas diferencias serían importantes sólo “para cuando, después del derrocamiento de Kadafi, haya que construir el nuevo poder para la nueva Libia”**. En el marco de la lucha común contra Kadafi, la única recomendación de la LIT es que **“los trabajadores necesitan una organización independiente de los burgueses y su propia dirección”**. Se trataría de una “independencia” desde el punto de vista sólo organizativo, ya que políticamente no se debería plantear ninguna diferencia, ningún programa independiente hasta después de la caída de Kadafi. O en todo caso, ese programa debería consistir en un “norte estratégico”, sin ningún valor práctico para la lucha inmediata que debía consistir en la unidad “sólida” con las fuerzas burguesas y proimperialistas para el derrocamiento de Kadafi.

La UIT, por su parte, sigue el mismo criterio:

*“El pueblo se levantó en Libia por los mismos motivos que en Túnez y Egipto: contra la dictadura y contra su política económica neoliberal y entreguista a las multinacionales y al FMI que provocó un aumento desbocado de los alimentos y desocupación masiva. El 33% de la población está por debajo de la línea de pobreza. Este es también el motivo de la rebelión del conjunto de los pueblos árabes. **El primer objetivo es democrático, acabar con los gobiernos dictatoriales y conquistar libertades políticas, dismantelar el aparato represivo y conquistar elecciones libres, que deberían ser para una Asamblea Constituyente soberana. Pero esto está unido a la necesidad de terminar con la miseria y desocupación.**”*

*Derrocar a la dictadura significa **abrir la posibilidad** de organización y lucha por recuperar el petróleo y otras riquezas, que hoy se llevan las multinacionales, para el pueblo libio, y también expropiar a la corrupta burguesía ligada a los negocios con el imperialismo y al saqueo del Estado*

que encabeza el propio Kadafi y su familia, pasos necesarios para acabar con el hambre y la desocupación. Este proceso revolucionario está derribando a los gobiernos serviles del imperialismo, un gran paso en dirección a expulsar al imperialismo y a su gendarme Israel de tierras árabes. (El Socialista, Miguel Lamas 2/3/2011).

Como puede apreciarse, la UIT también considera que **hay una primera etapa, “un primer objetivo que es democrático”, para la cual levanta un programa de libertades políticas y democráticas, coronadas por la Asamblea Constituyente, en el marco de un régimen burgués. Sólo después de derrocar la dictadura se podría abrir la posibilidad de luchar por reivindicaciones de transición al socialismo y “por un gobierno de las organizaciones obreras y populares”**.

En cambio para Trotsky:

“Según las concepciones de los socialistas y de los estalinistas, es decir, de los mencheviques de la primera y segunda hornada, la revolución española no iba a resolver más que tareas democráticas; ésta era la razón por la que era necesario construir un frente único con la burguesía «democrática». Desde este punto de vista, toda tentativa del proletariado de salir de los cauces de la democracia burguesa, era, no sólo prematura, sino incluso funesta. Por otra parte, lo que estaba al orden del día no era la revolución, sino la lucha contra Franco.[4] El fascismo es la reacción, no feudal, sino burguesa, y contra esta reacción no se puede luchar con éxito más que con los métodos de la revolución proletaria, y esta tesis es algo que el menchevismo -ramificación de la ideología burguesa- no quiere ni puede hacer suya.

(...)

Las condiciones de la victoria:

En el fondo, las condiciones de la victoria de las masas en la guerra civil contra los opresores eran muy sencillas:

- 1. Los combatientes del ejército revolucionario deben tener plena conciencia de que están luchando por su completa emancipación, y no por el restablecimiento de la antigua forma (democrática) de explotación.*
- 2. Lo mismo debe hacerse comprender a los obreros y campesinos, tanto en la retaguardia del ejército revolucionario como en la retaguardia del ejército enemigo.*
- 3. La propaganda sobre su propio frente, sobre el*

frente enemigo y sobre las dos retaguardias debe estar impregnada del espíritu de la revolución social. La consigna «Primero la victoria, después las reformas» es la consigna de todos los opresores y explotadores, empezando por los reyes bíblicos y acabando por Stalin.

4. La victoria viene determinada por las clases y las capas que intervienen en la lucha. Las masas deben poseer un aparato de estado que exprese directa e indirectamente su voluntad. Semejante aparato no puede ser construido más que por los soviets de obreros, soldados y campesinos.

5. El ejército revolucionario debe, no sólo proclamar, sino realizar inmediatamente, en las provincias conquistadas, las más urgentes medidas de la revolución social: expropiación y entrega a los más necesitados de las reservas alimenticias existentes, redistribución de los alojamientos en beneficio de los trabajadores, y sobre todo de las familias de los combatientes, expropiación de la tierra y de los instrumentos agrícolas en beneficio de los campesinos, establecimiento del control obrero sobre la producción, y del poder soviético en lugar de la antigua burocracia.

6. Deben ser expulsados sin piedad del ejército revolucionario los enemigos de la revolución socialista, es decir, los explotadores y sus agentes, incluso si se cubren con la máscara de «demócrata», «republicano» «socialista» o «anarquista».

7. A la cabeza de cada división debe encontrarse un comisario de irreprochable autoridad, como revolucionario y como soldado.

8. En cada división militar debe haber un núcleo homogéneo de los combatientes más abnegados, recomendados por las organizaciones obreras. Este núcleo sólo tiene un privilegio: ir el primero a la lucha.

9. En los primeros tiempos, el cuadro de mando incluye necesariamente muchos elementos extraños y poco seguros. Su comprobación y selección debe hacerse en base a la experiencia militar, por medio de testimonios de los comisarios y de notas de los combatientes de línea. Al mismo tiempo deben emprenderse grandes esfuerzos en vista a la preparación de mandos provenientes de las filas de los obreros revolucionarios.

10. La estrategia de la guerra civil debe combinar las reglas del arte militar con las tareas de la revolución social. No sólo en la propaganda, sino incluso en las operaciones militares, es necesario contar con la composición social de las diferentes partes del ejército adversario (voluntarios burgueses, "campesinos movilizados., o como en el caso de Franco, esclavos coloniales) y, al escoger la línea de

operación, tener escrupulosamente en cuenta la cultura social de las correspondientes regiones del país (regiones industriales, campesinas, revolucionarias o reaccionarias, regiones de nacionalidades oprimidas, etc.). En otras palabras: la política revolucionaria domina a la estrategia.

11. El gobierno revolucionario, en tanto que comité ejecutivo de los obreros y campesinos, debe saber conquistar la confianza del ejército y de toda la población trabajadora.

12. La política exterior debe tener como principal objetivo despertar la conciencia revolucionaria de los obreros, de los campesinos y de las nacionalidades oprimidas del mundo entero.

(España: última advertencia)

“Participamos en la lucha contra Franco como los mejores soldados, y al mismo tiempo, en interés de la victoria sobre el fascismo, agitamos la revolución social y preparamos el derrocamiento del gobierno derrotista de Negrín. Sólo una actitud semejante puede acercarnos a las masas.”

(Contra el “derrotismo” en España)

BEALS. - Una de las razones por las que le pregunto sobre ello es porque se acusa a la fracción trotskista de sabotear el movimiento leal en España.

TROTSKY. - ... se pretende que sabotemos el movimiento leal en España. Pienso haber dicho en numerosas entrevistas y artículos que la única vía para asegurar la victoria en España consiste en decir a los campesinos: «La tierra española es vuestra»; decir a los obreros: «Las fábricas españolas son vuestras.» Ésta es la única posibilidad de asegurar la victoria. Stalin, para no asustar a la burguesía francesa se ha convertido en guardián de la propiedad privada de España. El campesino español no está demasiado interesado en bellas definiciones. Dice: «Con Franco y con Caballero es lo mismo.» Porque el campesino es muy realista. Durante nuestra guerra civil, no creo que venciéramos principalmente debido a nuestra ciencia militar. Esto es falso. Ganamos a causa de nuestro programa revolucionario. Decíamos a los campesinos: «La tierra es vuestra.» Y el campesino, que en un primer momento había preferido a los blancos, comparaba a los bolcheviques con los blancos y decía: «Los bolcheviques son mejores.» Entonces, cuando los campesinos, centenares de miles y de millones de campesinos, se convencieron de que éramos mejores, vencimos.

BEALS. - ¿Puede usted desarrollar un poco más su afirmación de que Stalin es el guardián de la

propiedad privada en España?

TROTSKY. - *Dice, y la Komintern lo ha declarado, que en lo que respecta a España, las reformas sociales llegarán después de la victoria.[5] «Ahora es la guerra, nuestra tarea ahora es la guerra, las reformas sociales llegarán después de la victoria.» El campesino se vuelve indiferente: «Ésta no es mi guerra. No tengo ningún interés en la victoria de los generales. Los generales luchan entre ellos.» Ésta es su opinión. Con su manera tosca, tiene razón. Yo estoy con este tosco campesino español, en contra de los sutiles diplomáticos.*

(Este texto está sacado de las minutas de la comisión de investigación de los Procesos de Moscú, The Case of Leon Trotsky, pp. 294-299)

Las diferencias entre la posición de la LIT-UIT con la de Trotsky son evidentes. Para la LIT-UIT había sólo dos campos enfrentados, tanto en el plano político como militar: en una primera etapa hasta el derrocamiento de Kadafi, había que impulsar un frente único tanto militar como político de todo el pueblo incluyendo la burguesía, con un programa democrático burgués. Primero la lucha contra Kadafi para conquistar “la democracia”, después vendría la lucha por la revolución socialista.

Para Trotsky estas son “las concepciones de los socialistas y de los estalinistas, es decir, de los mencheviques de la primera y segunda hornada”... “La consigna «Primero la victoria, después las reformas» sociales es la consigna de todos los opresores y explotadores...”

Desde el punto de vista político había no dos, sino tres campos, el de Kadafi, el de la burguesía proimperialista del CNT y el campo de la clase obrera y el pueblo pobre y oprimido. Siguiendo a Trotsky debíamos participar en la lucha contra Kadafi como los mejores soldados, **pero al mismo tiempo**, en interés de la victoria sobre las tropas contrarrevolucionarias de Kadafi, debíamos agitar la revolución social y llamar a realizar inmediatamente, en los territorios que fueran conquistados por las milicias, las más urgentes medidas de la revolución social, con lo cual no sólo afirmábamos las condiciones para la victoria militar en la guerra civil, sino que también preparábamos la lucha por la conquista del poder por la clase obrera y el pueblo pobre y oprimido.

El PTS critica correctamente el carácter “semi” (?) etapista de la LIT y la UIT. Pero la posición del PTS tampoco es trotskista:

Desde el punto de vista militar había dos campos, el de Kadafi y el del CNT con el apoyo de los bombardeos de la OTAN.

El PTS reconoce al pasar, como si fuera de muy poca importancia, que hay que definir en qué campo militar hay que luchar: “No sólo hay que tener una definición precisa del “campo militar” en que ubicarse”, dicen. Pero el PTS nunca dio esa definición precisa, sino que por el contrario sostiene la política abstencionista de no estar ni con uno, ni con otro de los bandos militares enfrentados.

A lo que Trotsky podría responder:

“Los trabajadores se preguntan: «¿Qué debemos hacer, no en el Bronx o en Manhattan, sino en España? Somos demasiado débiles y además estamos desarmados.» El grupo Salemme responderá con nuestras propias palabras: «Hay que preparar políticamente a las masas para el futuro derrocamiento del gobierno Negrin.» Bien. Pero para esto hace falta tiempo, y durante este tiempo, Franco se acerca. ¿No vamos a intentar vencerlo?

La consigna de «Ni victoria ni derrota» o «No somos ni defensasistas ni derrotistas» es errónea desde el punto de vista de los principios y políticamente pernicioso. Está desprovista de todo valor agitativo. Imaginaros a un revolucionario en medio de los dos campos de la guerra civil con su bandera: «Ni victoria ni derrota.» Esta consigna es válida para Poncio Pilato, no para un revolucionario. Estamos por la defensa de las organizaciones obreras. Participamos en la lucha contra Franco Somos «defensasistas». Los «derrotistas» son Negrin, Stalin y compañía. Participamos en la lucha contra Franco como los mejores soldados, y al mismo tiempo, en interés de la victoria sobre el fascismo, agitamos la revolución social y preparamos el derrocamiento del gobierno derrotista de Negrin. Sólo una actitud semejante puede acercarnos a las masas.”

(Contra “el derrotismo” en España)

El PO, comentarista de la revolución

La posición del Partido Obrero a través de los artículos publicados en Prensa Obrera sobre la revolución en Libia se caracteriza por la ambigüedad y la indefinición. Abunda en descripciones y en pronósticos acerca del curso de la guerra civil, pero es imposible distinguir un programa para orientar la lucha revolucionaria.

El PO reconoce la existencia de comités populares y milicias armadas, pero no propone su unificación en un organismo de carácter soviético, no propone nada. Reconoce que la dirección del CNT está en manos de elementos ex kadafistas agentes del imperialismo y dice que “hay que poner fin a este gobierno” y reemplazarlo por “un gobierno realmente revolucionario” que

desarrolle “una amplia agitación nacional para producir nuevos levantamientos populares”. Cuál sería el contenido político de esa agitación no se sabe.

El PO proclama que “Nuestra consigna es: fuera la Otan de Libia; armas para los revolucionarios libios; por la extensión y profundización de la revolución árabe. Deseamos que el Medio Oriente se convierta en la tumba del imperialismo mundial”. Pero no dice a quién hay que exigirle las armas, ni qué significa en concreto la “profundización” de la revolución, más allá de un par de esporádicos y abstractas menciones a la revolución socialista. Por otra parte llamar “árabe” a la revolución es considerar que se trata de una revolución de carácter “nacional” antiimperialista y eso es coherente con “desear” que se convierta en la tumba sólo del imperialismo mundial, sin mencionar a las reaccionarias burguesías árabes. Pero esto se contrapone con caracterizar que <<“su contenido político es en esencia la ruptura de la “unidad nacional” árabe entre los explotados, de un lado, y los regímenes feudal-capitalistas, burgueses y pequeño burgueses reaccionarios, del otro. En la historia de la lucha de clases de las naciones o pseudonaciones árabes, la crisis

actual representa, más que su momento ‘nacional’, su momento ‘social’>>. Sobre cómo ayudar a esa ruptura y con qué programa luchar contra la política burguesa e imperialista para subordinar a los explotados, el PO no dice nada.

El PO nunca tomó una definición clara acerca de si había o no que seguir combatiendo en el frente militar del CNT a pesar de los bombardeos de la OTAN.

Por último, el PO se lamenta de que la “rebelión” fue copada por el imperialismo, pero nunca planteó un programa para evitar que ello ocurriera.

El desinterés del PO por levantar un programa revolucionario para Libia revela su nacional trotskismo, mucho más ocupado por la propaganda electoralista que por educar a la vanguardia obrera en las cuestiones estratégicas fundamentales de la revolución socialista.

23/12/2011



Open Letter to Socialist Fight Supporters

Dear comrades,

The last editorial of *Socialist Fight* concludes by a moving story about old friendship that sadly torn apart and new friendship that fortunately blossoms up:

The degeneration of the left is apparent in its failure to fight the TU bureaucracy on the cuts and the attack on Libya. We need a new internationalist revolutionary party to fight this crisis. Socialist Fight is dedicated to this fight. We have lost many friends and allies because this crisis has forced their politics into the open. However we are pleased to say that we have found new and better comrades in Britain, South Africa and Brazil who we are confident will not buckle under the current ideological assault of neo-liberal Imperialism. (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 2)

Every adult knows that “new friends” are always supposed to be “better”; who would change for worse? Anyway, despite a lack of political clarity (what does mean “the neo-liberal Imperialism”? “the left”?) and its rather cryptic indictment (who are the “many friends and allies... the crisis has forced their politics in the open?”), every communist in the world should enjoy that there is at least some gathering, in front of world events, to build a “new revolutionary party”.

Unfortunately, the same issue disregards the “revolutionary party” of the editorial when it deals with Libya. Besides, the tale is not reliable: there was a crisis among SF Mark I supporters long before “the attack on Libya”; this split led, as a matter of fact, to the end of relations with the Permanent Revolution Collective (CoReP), three months before “the attack on Libya”.

How “hard left” Gerry Downing unmasked the “soft left” CoReP

The ITC-SF / Great Britain was launched in spring 2009 by a fistful of militants who participated in the Campaign for a Marxist Party (2006-2008), some coming from the former WIL (1987-1997), an outfit of the WRP explosion of 1985.

SF Mark I appeared in a rather contradictory way:

- on the one hand, the first SF leaflet was a positive illustration of internationalism and a vigorous defense of migrant workers against British jingoism;

- on the other hand, ITC-SF political platform was defective.

So, before the first issue of the journal, there was already a split: two left to WP / Great Britain and the L5I. Another result of the weakness of ITC-SF Platform was that *Socialist Fight* n° 1 was published in solidarity with the FLT. The COTP-FTI-FLT-FLTI (this current changes its name very often) is a hysterical brand of the centrist swamp that usurps today the name of Trotskyism. It is run in an undemocratic way the LOI -DO/ Argentine, a sect unable to overcome the Pabloite legacy of its origin, especially the confusion between Marxism and radical nationalism of dominated countries. The LOI itself is led in an undemocratic way by a guru called “Munzer”.

As the Groupe Bolchevik / France approached SF because of its sharp position in front of the campaign “British jobs to British workers”, the leadership of the FLT made the CWG / New Zealand and the HWRS / United States to launch a public campaign against the GB, accused of capitulation to its imperialism and support of the NPA. As SF resisted, Munzer, declared -in a letter signed “Secretariat” but full of “I”- that SF too has capitulated to imperialism. The ITC-SF refused to self-criticize and broke with the FLT.

In December 2009, a formal political relationship began between SF Mark I and the Permanent Revolution Collective (CoReP). *Socialist Fight* was henceforth published as “sympathizer of the Collective”. SF published *China, deformed workers state or rising imperialist power?* a rather good polemic to the “Spart Family”. There were travels from both sides and some political collaboration with the European groups of the CoReP, the GKK / Austria or the GB / France.

All along, the Collective Bureau has tried to reach a programmatic agreement necessary to a full merging: it criticized frankly the ITC-SF platform. It submitted to

ITC-SF all CoReP drafts (Iran, Palestine, etc.). Gerry Downing, a prolific writer and an active militant, was associated to the Bureau. Unfortunately, comrade Downing never plainly collaborated in writing international documents. To be fair, he used to send the Bureau a copy of each of his numerous international discussions (among them, the RCG-RWG / South Africa, not a so “*new friend*”).

All along summer 2010, the Bureau of the Collective tried to prevent, stop and reverse the stupid split of SF Mark I about a secondary question, the Polanski affair: comrade Gerry Downing asked for the imprisonment of Polanski as a rapist, meanwhile comrades Pete and Steve were opposed to any call to bourgeois justice whatever his crime. The Bureau tried also to make SF to function as a Trotskyist-Leninist group and not, as we discovered then, a loose circle around Gerry Downing, without conference, fees, discipline or democratic procedures. In spite of respectful and patient recommendations, SF Mark I splinted.

Since December 2010, without any political statement, Gerry Downing has stopped its previous way of collaboration with the Collective. This informal rupture was openly confirmed when he published a new issue of *Socialist Fight* (n° 5, winter 2010-11) suppressing all reference to the CoReP, without political explanation to readers. Of course, there was no yet question of Libya in the issue n° 5, published several weeks before any significant event in Libya.

In March 2011, the Bureau of the Collective sent a draft of assessment in front of the menaces of an imperialist intervention in Libya. SF never replied, only comrade Downing announced “*personal*” disagreements with the draft. In April 2011, the Bureau of the Collective circulated a draft of international joint declaration to SF and some other organizations, among them the RMG / South Africa and the LC / Brazil. None replied.

By way of answer, the following issue of *Socialist Fight* (n° 6, spring-summer 2011) was more disloyal and regressive. Without any attempt of discussion with the Collective Bureau or any proposition of a SF draft statement to the Collective about Libya, it published two articles (both are available in digital version among Gerald J. Downing’s writings at Scribds):

1. “Libya crisis” (p. 15-20) analysed 1969 military coup in Libya as a “revolution”, like Gaddafi, the imperialist ideologues and the former WRP of late Gerry Healy. It hazardously compared today Libyan rent capitalist economy with the USSR in Trotsky’s time, so that it would be some kind of deformed workers’ state that “the left” should defend as such. In line with Colonel Gaddafi, it claimed that the February

movement in Libya was a monarchist, racist and pro-imperialist plot fomented by the CIA and Al Qaeda since its inception.

2. “The soft left’s foolish illusions” (p. 20-26) attacked publically the Collective, quoting one sentence from a document of the Collective written before the military aggression of Libya and one personal sentence by a member of the Collective from of an informal blog. Because they did not treat the February youth demonstrations in all Libya as the bourgeois despotic regime did (“who have taken drugs”, “following the Islamists’ leader”, “CIA agents”, “greasy rats”...), it categorized the Collective -between SWP and CPGB- in the “soft left” which are “merely imperialist stooges”.

Both do not start from world class struggle, but from a magnified opposition between one “world imperialism” and a so-called “anti-imperialism”. Their documentation is defective; in particular, they rely heavily on outdated official reports and on Mr David Rothscum who appears a Gaddafi mouthpiece. They explain the mass upsurges of a wide range of dominated countries by CIA conspiracy or artificial imposition of democracy from outside. They overestimate bourgeois revolutionary capacities in the epoch of capitalism decay and advocate an alliance of the working class with the so-called “anti-imperialist” bourgeoisie. They misuse analogy with the former workers’ state to justify it.

Libya is not a workers’ state, not even a degenerated one

Marxists should emulate the method the International Left Opposition and the 4th International used for China and other dominated countries.

The more independent the proletarian vanguard will be in relation to the bourgeoisie, the less it will be inclined to place its fingers between the jaws of the bourgeoisie, to see it in bright colors, to overestimate its revolutionary spirit or its readiness for a “united front” and for a struggle against imperialism. (Trotsky, Summary and perspectives of the Chinese revolution, 1929, part 1)

Instead, comrade Downing chose another way that he thought more convenient for its purpose (a united front with “anti-imperialist” bourgeoisie of Libya). Libyan state should be defended... as if it was a “workers’ state”.

The method we will employ... is that which Trotsky used in his defence of the USSR as a degenerate workers’ state (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 13)

These Bonapartist regimes as in the USSR... (p. 18)

We seek to emulate the Trotsky's method in defence of the USSR (p. 19)

So, he confounds deliberately oil rent capitalism with collectivized economy issued of the expropriation of capitalists. Moreover, he reduces the meaning of the defence of the USSR to support of its leadership against foreign aggression, not without some connection with one wing of revisionists of Trotskyism and the main liquidators of the 4th International.

The 1917 October Revolution founded a workers' state from the destruction of the bourgeois state, grounded on soviets. But the level of Russian productive forces was low and the Soviets power was immediately confronted to civil war and imperialist interventions (Japan, France, USA, Great Britain). It stayed isolated after the defeats of the other European revolutions (Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, Italy...) and the soviets life soon diminished. USSR was more and more deformed. In 1924, this bureaucracy led by Stalin defeated the proletarian wing of the party and took over the USSR state and the Communist International. There was still collectivized industry and state monopoly of exchange, but the workers' state was not any more under the control of the vanguard, let alone the whole working class.

We know from older books that the labor bureaucracy and the labor aristocracy are the social foundation for opportunism. In Russia this phenomenon has taken on new forms. On the foundation of the dictatorship of the proletariat – in a backward country, surrounded by capitalism – for the first time a powerful bureaucratic apparatus has been created from among the upper layers of the workers, that is raised above the masses, that lays down the law to them, that has at its disposal colossal resources, that is bound together by an inner mutual responsibility, and that intrudes into the policies of a workers' government its own interests, methods, and regulations. (Trotsky, What next? 1932, ch. 6)

In 1933, after the German section of the 3rd International, the KPD, allowed the defeat of German working class in front of the Nazis, Trotsky oriented the International Left Opposition to a new workers International, in programmatic continuity with the four first congresses of the 3rd International (and with the conferences of Left Opposition of the 3rd International afterward).

Accordingly, Trotsky adjusted the analysis of USSR because the chief menace of restoration of capitalism inside USSR stemmed from the bureaucracy itself. In 1936, he renounced the former characterization of Stalinism as a form of centrism and of the USSR as a

deformed workers state which needed simple reform.

From the circumstance that the "bureaucratic" deformation has grown into a regime of bureaucratic autocracy we draw the conclusion that... it is necessary to overthrow the bureaucracy; this task can be carried out only by creating an illegal Bolshevik party in the USSR. From the circumstance that the degeneration of the political system has not yet led to the destruction of planned state economy, we draw the conclusion that it is still the duty of the world proletariat to defend the USSR against imperialism and to aid the Soviet proletariat in its struggle against the bureaucracy. (Trotsky, From a scratch to the danger of gangrene, 1940)

Of course, in the event of an imperialist menace, the 4th International would rank with the USSR whatever its leadership, as revolutionaries stand with an union against a boss or against the bourgeois state, whatever its leadership. That does not mean praising the bureaucracy of the union, nor the degenerated workers state. To defend actually the workers and to fight bosses, communists must democratize the union and expel the agents of the bourgeoisie.

Even when bureaucracy of a workers state or of a workers organization defends the basis of its privileges, it does it in its own way. The actual defense of the union or of the workers state needs to evince it. For instance, when USSR invaded Galicia and Belorussia, the West of Poland state in 1940, Stalin was compelled to expropriate private property of means of production. This was positive, but did not change the world appraisal of Stalinism.

With the aid of the Comintern, the Kremlin has disoriented and demoralized the working class so that it has not only facilitated the outbreak of a new imperialist war but has also made extremely difficult the utilization of this war for revolution. Compared with those crimes, the social overturn in the two provinces, which was paid for more over by the enslavement of Poland, is of course of secondary importance and does not alter the general reactionary character of the Kremlin's policy. (Trotsky, From a scratch to the danger of gangrene, 1940)

Time and again, the 4th International analyzed the USSR as a degenerated workers state whose bureaucracy was mainly reactionary inside and outside.

The USSR thus embodies terrific contradictions. But it still remains a degenerated workers' state. Such is the social diagnosis. The political prognosis has an alternative character: either the bureaucracy,

becoming ever more the organ of the world bourgeoisie in the workers' state, will overthrow the new forms of property and plunge the country back to capitalism; or the working class will crush the bureaucracy and open the way to socialism. (4th International, The death agony of capitalism and the tasks of the Fourth International, 1938)

The Fourth International can defend the USSR only by the methods of revolutionary class struggle. To teach the workers correctly to understand the class character of the state imperialist, colonial, workers'—and the reciprocal relations between them, as well as the inner contradictions in each of them, enables the workers to draw correct practical conclusions in situation. While waging a tireless struggle against the Moscow oligarchy, the Fourth International decisively rejects any policy that would aid imperialism against the USSR. The defense of the USSR coincides in principle with the preparation of the world proletarian revolution. We flatly reject the theory of socialism in one country, that brain child of ignorant and reactionary Stalinism. Only the world revolution can save the USSR for socialism. But the world revolution carries with it the inescapable blotting out of the Kremlin oligarchy. (4th International, Imperialist war and the proletarian world revolution, 1940)

To sum up,

- in capitalist countries, fight against every menace to USSR; in USSR, fight foreign armies which aim was to reverse the expropriation, even if the working class has been excluded of the power;
- fight to smash the state bureaucracy of USSR, the main internal menace to the workers state by its reactionary role inside and outside;
- build an “illegal Bolshevik Party” in USSR to lead this political revolution;
- participate in an eventual expropriation of landowners and capitalists, even led by the Stalinists; fight in capitalist countries for social revolution;
- build Leninist-Bolshevik party in every capitalist country to lead this social revolution and denounce popular fronts, which are counter revolutionary bloc with the “democratic”, “anti-fascist” or “anti-imperialist” bourgeoisie.

Comrade Downing's politics is quite different. The workers' state analogy is a fig-leaf for the recovery of Menshevik-Stalinist popular fronts, that is to say alliances with an “anti-imperialist” wing of the

bourgeoisie. Hence the need “to see the bourgeoisie in bright colors”.

The foolish illusions of “hard left” in colonels

We knew nothing before of a Marxist opposition “the soft left” versus “the hard left”. Nevertheless, we suggest to comrade Downing to add a third category to his classification: “the incoherent left”. Comrade Downing likes the idea of Permanent Revolution but finds out it is irrelevant, at least to Libya.

On the one hand, he explains:

One wonders what kind of a revolution is possible not only without but by oppressing the working class (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 17)

There is no such thing as a “democratic revolution”. That was always the term for a bourgeois revolution. And the bourgeoisie definitely are not revolutionary. (p. 18)

The bourgeoisie cannot lead a revolution so there can be no such revolution now. (p. 18)

“Democratic revolutions” and “the Arab Revolution” are fraudulent conceptions, alien to Trotskyism. (p. 21)

If we had a real successful revolution in any or all of these countries it would not be called a “democratic revolution” at all, but the dictatorship of the proletariat. (p. 22)

On the other hand, he forgets his own advice when he writes about the so-called “Guide of the Revolution”:

The gains of the 1969 revolution led by Muammar Gaddafi... (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 15)

We put forward the following programme in defence Libya and the remaining gains of the 1969 revolution... (p. 19)

We would have to defend the gains of the revolution... (p. 22)

There is a very great deal left of the Libyan revolution of 1969 worth defending and the masses now increasingly rallying to Gaddafi realise this... (p. 23)

The rebels are immediately threatening all the gains

of the 1969 revolution... (p. 24)

Gaddafi's government is still defending the gains of the 1969 revolution... (p. 26)

The only revolution possible is “*the dictatorship of the proletariat*”... but there was in 1969 in Libya a revolution without proletariat. “*The bourgeoisie cannot lead a revolution*”... but Colonel Gaddafi could. It is hardly surprising that comrade Downing compares Libya to a workers state.

He is more accurate when he compares Colonel Gaddafi to Colonel Nasser.

In 1969, a new Nasser, Muammar Gaddafi, emerged in Libya... (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 16)

For Marxists, it sounds an accusation; for comrade Downing, it is a compliment.

The prime champion of the post-war defencist movement was Gamal Abdel Nasser in Egypt and for many years he was the hope of the oppressed throughout the Arab world and much wider. He was vilified no less vilely than Gaddafi is today (SF, Statement on the uprisings in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and the rest of the Arab world, March 18, 2011)

No matter if one of the first steps of Colonel Nasser was to forbid all workers organisations and to intimidate workers.

The memory of a pair of striking workers hanged by the new government following the 1952 revolution, which brought Gamal Abdel Nasser to power, has not faded... (Foreign Policy, February 16, 2011)

But what worries comrade Downing is not the absence of red flags in Egypt, but of the portraits of the murderer of striking workers.

There has been... almost no portraits of Gamal Abdel Nasser Hussein carried by the masses, not even in Cairo. (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 20)

Powerful anti-imperialist sentiments... would be heralded by far more flag burning and the portraits of Nasser and chanting of “down with US imperialism, down with Zionism, long live the memory of Nasser”. (p. 21)

Will the next issues of *Socialist Fight* measure the degree of maturity of demonstrators in South Africa by the number of portraits of Mandela or in Argentina by the number of portraits of General Peron? Instead of starting from world class struggle, comrade Downing embellishes the epoch of Colonel Nasser. Therefore he

cannot explain bourgeois nationalist failure.

During World War II, the proletariat of Europe defended victoriously the workers state in USSR and began revolution in Italy, crushing the first fascist regime. The inter-imperialist war and the menace of social revolution weakened European imperialisms and made easier the struggle of peoples of Asia and Africa to emancipate from colonial empires (reciprocally, the struggle of colonial peoples inspired workers and youth vanguard of capitalist centre and proved imperialism was not invincible). But bureaucracy stayed in power in USSR. “Communist” parties in Italy, Greece and France disarmed workers, rebuilt bourgeois states and restored capitalist order. Stalinism still kept control, expropriating landowners and capitalist of East Europe, of China, of parts of Indochina and Korea only when USA launched the “Cold War” offensive and true war in Korea.

The 4th International was marginal. Then, the working class of dominated countries could not join its forces to socialist revolution in imperialist centres. Where there were workers parties in colonial and semi-colonial countries, they were under Kremlin control. They always alienated the independence of class of the proletariat and collaborated either directly with the imperialist bourgeoisie (oppose independence and endorsed the partition of Palestine) or with the nationalist bourgeoisie and nationalist petty bourgeoisie (whose ambition was to become a national bourgeoisie with the formal independence of the country).

Assured by Stalinists at world -and often local- scale, the bourgeoisie of backward countries subordinated the proletariat to national unity and to so-called “anti-imperialism”, first to obtain political independence, subsequently to build state capitalism it called “socialism”. All that was cautioned by international Stalinism, some Social-Democrats and all kinds of centrists Within some limits, several national bourgeoisies profited the divisions of imperialist powers, the survival of USSR and the crisis of leadership of the working class. For instance, Nasser was able to succeed in nationalizing the Canal of Suez in 1956 because the hegemonic imperialist power, the USA stopped the military intervention of Israel, France and Great Britain.

America forced the invaders to withdraw, granting Nasser a victory, bringing about Eden's downfall, hastening decolonisation and ushering in an era of American dominance in the region. (The Economist, March 26, 2011)

Colonel Nasser popularity reached its climax in Egypt, among Arabs peoples and beyond. By contrast, the scarcity of Nasser portraits in today Egypt and the burning of omnipresent official portraits of Ben Ali in

Tunisia, Gaddafi in Libya, Al Assad in Syria originate from the discrediting of the Pan-Arab nationalism.

The failure of pan Arab nationalism

Despite bourgeois Republicans seized power in several countries where Arabs were a majority of the population –Egypt, Tunisia, Algeria, Syria, Iraq, Libya, Yemen– they felt short of unity of Arabs -and the end of Zionist colonisation- they have promised. Pan-Arab nationalists did not succeed either inside their frontiers. They failed to develop really national economy, to emancipate actually from imperialism, to modernize plainly society. Most of them -and Libya was no exception- have even attempted for a decade to settle their own dynasty. By their bankruptcy and their growing concessions to imams, they paved the way for their old rivals, the most reactionary wing of the local bourgeoisies, the Islamists.

In 1967 and in 1973, Egypt -first time, under Nasser; second time, under Sadate- and Syria attacked Israel, without consultation of Palestinian leadership. Every time, the Arab armies were defeated. Of course, Israel was a formidable adversary, but Arab bourgeoisies proved unable to weaken it by any call to Hebrew workers. Instead, as the monarchs of the region, they have helped Zionist ideology, the main strength of the bourgeoisie of Israel, by pretending to drive out all Jews. As a result, Israel took control of former parts of Syria (Golan) and Egypt (Sinai). Sadat signed in 1979 a treaty in exchange for Israeli withdrawal from Sinai.

Without other enemy than themselves, they were not able either to suppress the borders inherited from colonial powers. In 1958, the unification of Egypt, North Yemen and Syria started on, but failed in 1961. In 1969, a federation between Egypt, Libya and Sudan was proclaimed, but collapsed in 1971. In 1971, a federation of Egypt, Libya and Syria was proclaimed, but collapsed in 1977. In 1972, within the federation, the complete union of Egypt and Libya began, but failed in 1973. In 1976, within the federation, the union between Egypt and Syria began, which failed in 1977. In 1974, the union between Tunisia and Libya failed immediately. In 1975, the union between Algeria and Libya aborted. In 1981, the fusion between Libya and Chad failed. In 1989, the union between Algeria, Libya, Morocco, Mauritania and Tunisia failed.

Furthermore, in 1977, Libyan army invaded another Arab state, Egypt; in 1983, Syrian army crushed Arab Palestinian OLP in Lebanon.

Unable to unify Arab peoples and to defeat Zionism, Colonel Gaddafi decided to make Libyan people more Arabic (and more Muslim). In 1970, he proceeded the ethnic cleansing of King Idris: he expelled the Italians

and, as Colonel Nasser did in Egypt in 1967, Jews. He forbade the Berbers (5% of the population) to speak their language, the Tamazight.

In the years 1990, the cultural and linguistic idiosyncrasy of the Berber communities was severely repressed by the regime of Colonel Gaddafi and many Berbers were imprisoned several years to have taught their language. (Haimzadeh, Au coeur de la Libye de Kadhafi, Lattès, 2011, p. 30)

Moreover, the so-called Pan-Arab nationalist Guide targeted foreign Arabs. Three times at least, Colonel Gaddafi expelled immigrant proletarians as expiatory victims of his erratic relations with governments of the neighbour countries or the “Palestinian Territories”.

In June 1977, Gaddafi decides to expel 225,000 Egyptian workers. (Najjar, Anatomie d'un tyran, Mouammar Kadhafi, Actes Sud, 2011, p. 44)

In August 1985, the Colonel orders the expulsion of thousands of Tunisian workmen, despoiling them their possessions and freezing their assets. (p. 46)

In 1995, Libya expelled nearly 30,000 Palestinians to protest the agreements with Israel on self-rule in the West Bank and Gaza... (Migration News, June 1996)

These deportations illustrate the social nature of the Libyan state and the inconsistency of SF panegyric of Colonel Gaddafi.

Gadaffi was a bulwark against imperialist finance capital and Zionism. (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 22)

To be sure, the 1969 military coup was not a social revolution but, at best, a “political revolution”, the replacement of one form of government by another. An armoured column took over the Tripoli, seized control of the royal palace, the military and police headquarters and the radio station. Without a fight, the Military Junta (Revolutionary Command Council) abolished the monarchy.

People of Libya! In response to your own will, fulfilling your most heartfelt wishes, answering your incessant demands for change and regeneration and your longing to strive towards these ends; listening to your incitement to rebel, your armed forces have undertaken the overthrow of the reactionary and corrupt regime... With a single blow from your heroic army, the idols have fallen and false gods have been destroyed... (RCC, Communiqué, September 1, 1969),

42 years after, the same Gaddafi will not answer the “most heartfelt wishes” of the “people of Libya”, its “incessant demands for change”.

One wonders what kind of a revolution is possible not only without but by oppressing the working class (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 17)

One wonders what kind of revolution Gaddafi led in 1969, “not only without, but by oppressing the working class”, forbidding all workers organizations. One wonders what kind of “anti-Zionist” ejected Palestinian workers already ejected from Palestine by Israeli bourgeoisie.

The failure of Libyan state capitalism

One of the main reasons of the incapacity of Arab bourgeoisies to overcome the colonial frontiers is that some inherited oil and gas, while other did not. The former ones shrunk back from partaking rent with the latter ones.

When Gaddafi took power in 1969 he set about a massive redistribution of the oil wealth. And in order to do so he had to prevent the big multi-nationals siphoning all that wealth out of the country... Only Iraq and Libya used their oil wealth for the benefit of their own people, the Saudis, the Shah of Iran and the Gulf States re-invested in the West to assist them out of their crisis. (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 16)

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya's HDI is 0.755, which gives the country a rank of 53 out of 169 countries with comparable data. The Human Development Index of Arab States as a region increased from 0.398 in 1980 to 0.590 today, placing Libyan Arab Jamahiriya above the regional average. (p. 19)

The government of the most egalitarian and anti-imperialist country in region... (p. 22)

Gaddafi is clearly one of the most substantial opponents of imperialism left... (p. 22)

Gaddafi is fighting imperialism... (p. 25)

Oil wealth was used not only for the people, but to buy a lot of arms (\$30 billion in the 1980s) and for the private benefit of Colonel Gaddafi and his family. Several foreign politicians got some too.

In 1984, was created the “Gaddafi International Prize for Human Rights” worth \$250,000. It is almost as farcical as the “Nobel Peace Prize”. Among the winners are Mandela (ANC / South Africa) who preserved capitalism confronted to revolutionary menace and was President of the South African bourgeoisie, Farrakhan

(NOI / United States) who played a role in the assassination of Malcolm X, Garaudy, a former leading Stalinist (PCF / France) who became a Muslim... and a pro-Nazi. Last winner is Erdoğan (AKP / Turkey), the Islamite Prime Minister of the Turkish bourgeoisie.

Others foreign politicians got money more discreetly, as fascist Haider.

The magazine Profil and the daily newspaper Österreich quoted former employees of Haider as saying that the money in Liechtenstein could have come from donations made by Libyan leader Moammar Gadhafi. An anonymous associate of Haider's told the magazine that Gadhafi had "repeatedly" made campaign donations in cash. Haider cultivated economic relations with Libya and was a close friend of one of Gadhafi's sons. (Spiegel, February 2, 2010)

That is how the leader of FPÖ and BZÖ / Austria used “Libyan people wealth” to hatred of migrant workers and of Marxism. In 2008, Saif al-Islam (“Sword of Islam”) al-Gaddafi, the second son and announced political inheritor of Colonel Gaddafi, attended the funeral of Haider. That is enough to make the analogy with workers’ state incongruous.

Comrade Downing refers to the “human development index”, an index that combines indicators of life expectancy, educational attainment and gross national income per capita (so, when there is more oil extracted or when oil price increases, the HDI increases). HDI of Libya is quite good; indeed, as it gave Libya rank 53 in the world in 2010. But figures are incomplete. Saudi Arabian Kingdom was just behind (rank 55) and several monarchist oil renter states did better than Libya: Kuwait (rank 47), Qatar (rank 38), United Arab Emirates (rank 32).

By nature, HDI is not adequate to evaluate internal equality. Comrade Downing does not provide figures to validate his smooth “the most egalitarian country of the region”. According to the Global Peace Index, Libya is more unequal than all states of the Arabic-Persian Gulf, but Iraq and post-Shah Iran. In 2008, the “Gini coefficient” (the bigger the coefficient, the less egalitarian the country) of Libya was not so good (36%), better than Israel (39%) and Qatar (39%) but worse than many Gulf monarchies: Saudi Arabia (32%), Oman (32%), United Arab Emirates (31%) and Kuwait (30%).

An omitted indicator is the “corruption perceptions index”. The rank of Libya in CPI was one of the worst in 2010: 146 out of 178 countries. All neighbour monarchies did better: Kuwait (rank: 54), Arabia (50), Oman (41), Emirates (28), Qatar (19)...

Vanguard workers need materialist explanations, not praise of one exploiter or another. Libya holds the largest proven oil reserves in Africa and is the world's 12th largest oil producer. Even if imperialist oil firms (through industrial profit, royalties...) and states (through tax) appropriate a large amount of the value of world energy, the dominant classes of the countries where gas and oil are extracted can obtain a significant part of world social surplus through the rent (see Marx, *Capital*, III, section 6; Marx, *Theories on surplus value*, ch. 8...) and through industrial profit if the firms which extract oil and gas are national.

Especially where the population is scarce, a renter bourgeois state can corrupt some intellectuals and (included "hard left") politicians abroad and can try, at least during a period, to buy social peace at home, whether it is monarchist or republican.

In Libya, the main relay of the distribution of the rent by Colonel Gaddafi, apart his own family, was the tribes, in spite of comrade Downing's tentative to make Colonel Gaddafi an enemy of these archaic and monarchist remnants.

Having seen the history of reactionary opposition to this redistribution of wealth... we can now see the source of the revolt... as disgruntled capitalists and tribal leaders.... (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 19)

For comrade Downing, the opposition to Gaddafi is always reactionary; Colonel Gaddafi defends gains of the revolution. The truth is the last revolt comes from the privatization in favour of Gaddafi family and his tribe and from the growing regional inequality of the distribution of the rent. Both have destroyed a lot of former social gains in all Libya, especially in the East.

*In the patronage system typical of the renter Libyan state, the counterpart of the weakness of representation at the central level in Tripoli was the weakness of the redistribution of the revenue in its area of origin. The centring on the West was thus translated, as early as in the 1980s, by delays, even cancellations of payments of the budgets of the local authorities of Cyrenaica, involving incremental disintegration of healthcare, postponement of buildings and dilapidation of the infrastructures... (Haimzadeh, *Au coeur de la Libye de Kadhafi*, Lattès, 2011, p. 173)*

Initially, Gaddafi tried to undermine the power of the tribes, but in 1975 he turned to them for political support, hence the official celebration of family and tribe. In the process, tribal affiliation became increasingly important, reflecting both the lack of

political parties and the shrinking social and geographic basis of the regime. Gaddafi's rule weakened the unity of the country, facilitating manoeuvres from imperialist powers.

Since 1993, the regime withdrew to the clans which form the tribe of Colonel Gaddafi. These last ones which are omnipresent in the Revolutionary Committees and the Revolutionary Guard, become the real pillars of the regime. This shrinkage feeds the criticisms of an irritated population... (Afrique du Nord – Moyen Orient 2005, La Documentation Française, 2005, p. 120)

Libyan economy is closer to Arab Gulf economies than comrade Downing believes. All rely heavily on oil (and gas): 95% of export earnings, 75% of government receipts, 50% of GDP for Libya. Both depend on importations to feed the population: domestic food production meets only about 25% of demand in Libya. Both import workforce: there is no official figures but probably 3 million foreigners were working in Libya, for 6.5 million inhabitants. Both export capital: from Libya \$15.32 billion are invested abroad (stock FDI at the end of 2010).

If investment abroad means "to assist West", how comrade Downing explains that "the most anti-imperialist country in the region" is assisting "West" by more than \$15 billions?

Colonel Gaddafi's turn of 2003 to "neo-liberal Imperialism" and CIA

Is it coherent with another naïve assumption, that Gaddafi has always outraged "world imperialism"?

The interests of world imperialism were severely curtailed and continue to be so to this day... (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 15)

Gaddafi... outraged, and continues to outrage, world imperialism. (p. 16)

If Gaddafi outrages a unique or united "world imperialism", why did Russian imperialism, Chinese imperialism and German imperialism disapproved the choice of the Transitional National Council (TNC) and the military operations led by France and Great Britain, backed by the USA?

To be proper, there is not one "world imperialism" -less more the "neo-liberal world imperialism" (p. 18)- which feels sentiments like "outrage". Dominated countries are part of the imperialist world economy whose opposite pole is made of several dominating countries, in rivalry to each other.

Kautsky advanced his theory of “ultra-imperialism”. By this he meant the substitution of “joint exploitation of the world by internationally united finance capital, for the struggle of capital of some nations against that of other countries”. (Lenin, Opportunism, and the collapse of the Second International, 1915)

Is it conceivable that such alliances would be more than temporary, that they would eliminate friction, conflicts and struggle in every possible form? The only conceivable basis under capitalism for the division of spheres of influence, interests, colonies, etc., is a calculation of the strength of those participating, their general economic, financial, military strength, etc. And the strength of these participants in the division does not change to an equal degree, for the even development of different undertakings, trusts, branches of industry, or countries is impossible under capitalism. (Lenin, Imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism, 1916, ch. 9)

British imperialism was not always felt so “outraged”; Foreign Office welcomed Gaddafi's coup against King Idriss. French imperialism has not always felt so “outraged”; notwithstanding the USA (and Israel) opposition, Pompidou negotiated with Gaddafi immediately after the military coup of 1969.

From Western side, France, as soon as in the autumn 1969, opens the arms to Colonel Gaddafi who wishes to reinforce his army. Secret negotiations begin then between the two countries... The contract relates to 110 Mirage fighters, helicopters, Matra 550 air-to-air missiles, Matra bombs, Cobra anti-aircraft defence, radars... (Najjar, Anatomie d'un tyran, Mouammar Kadhafi, Actes Sud, 2011, p. 47-48)

In 1972, United States recalled their ambassador. In 1981, US Navy fighters downed two Libyan aircraft. In 1986, a US task force sank two Libyan ships. The same year, the US army bombed Tripoli, killing 41 persons. But, because there is no proper “world imperialism”, the government of Italian imperialism informed Gaddafi 2 days before the attack.

Former Italian Prime Minister Bettino Craxi warned Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi that the U.S. would bomb his country in 1986, saving the colonel's life, Libyan Foreign Minister Abdel Rahman Shalgam said today. (Bloomberg, October 30, 2008)

In 1986, the United States adopted economic sanctions and, in 1992, the UN imposed sanctions. Nevertheless, the emergent imperialist China increased bilateral trade well before the ban was lifted.

The book comrade Downing uses (p. 16) “to see in bright colors” the Guide is *Libya a country study* collected by Helen Chapin Metz. Unfortunately, he forgets to precise the date of the edition he quotes. The Library of Congress published it... in 1986, when Libya was still backed by USSR and was defying the USA, Great Britain and France (in his bourgeois way, mainly through terrorism against civilians).

Actually, Colonel Gaddafi incorporated plainly Libya in world capitalism. Since 1987, he has given up any “socialist” or “anti-imperialist” language. He spoke then of “popular capitalism”. In 2003, confronted to the US and British invasion of Iraq, he stopped nuclear research, and started to open Libya to foreign firms.

His regime abandoned radical socialism [sic], inviting foreign investment and encouraging private business. (The Economist, February 26, 2011)

Its “neo-liberal” agenda led to degrade the previous social improvements.

Privatizations are done by simple transfer of property of the former state organizations towards the usual beneficiaries of the corruption system: Gaddafi's family of, tribes of the West, army officers, officers of the revolutionary committees. The system of welfare which had ensured a minimum of guarantees to the population is dismantled little by little. (Haimzadeh, Au coeur de la Libye de Kadhafi, Lattès, 2011, p. 173)

Since 2008, the regime has prevented African immigration to Europe. A huge amount of trade and business agreements (trillion dollars) have been signed with European, American, Chinese corporate and governments.

New Libya is attractive. The main European governments made the voyage to Tripoli: Silvio Berlusconi (Italy), José Maria Aznar (Spain), Tony Blair (the United Kingdom), Gerhard Schröder (Germany) and Jacques Chirac (France) made each one official a visit to Mr. Gaddafi. (Afrique du Nord – Moyen Orient 2005, La Documentation Française, 2005, p. 111)

Obviously, Gaddafi did not outrage these representatives of “world imperialism”.

And vice versa. Colonel Gaddafi opened the oil industry to foreign companies, unlike the sheik of Saudi Arabia.

The largest oil company of the world is not Exxon Mobil, BP or Total. It is Saudi Aramco, the national oil company of Saudi Arabia... The largest countries holders of oil reserve are closed to foreign

investment. It is the case of Saudi Arabia, Iran, Abu Dhabi and Kuwait. Only the countries with smaller reserves are open to, like Algeria, Libya, Syria and Egypt. (Afrique du Nord – Moyen Orient 2006, La Documentation Française, 2006, p. 123)

The USA did not outrage any more Colonel Gaddafi.

In August 2004, the LNOC sells 15 authorisations of exploitation... 11 out of these 15 blocks are allotted to Americans (Occidental, Amerade Hess, Chevron Texaco). Clearly, priority of the government is to associate once again the oil companies of USA, to the detriment of the European companies like Total, in spite of their previous support when sanctions hit Libya... (Le Monde Diplomatique, April 2011)

Then, the ideologue of “New Labour”, Giddens, congratulated Colonel Gaddafi.

On economic change, Gaddafi was less equivocal. He was not negative about globalisation, as so many politicians in developing countries are, and recognised that Libya must change to prosper. He accepts the need to reform banking, diversify the economy, train entrepreneurs and dismantle inefficient state-owned enterprises. Impressive progress has been made towards these objectives in the past three years. (The Guardian, March 9, 2007)

Moreover, Colonel Gaddafi collaborated plainly with the CIA.

The former chief of the CIA praised Libyan leader Moamer Kadhafi's past cooperation and said his downfall could complicate US interests in the short term. Retired general Michael Hayden, who led the Central Intelligence Agency from 2006 to 2009 under president George W. Bush, said that restive Syria also helped US intelligence but only in selective areas. (AFP, April 27, 2011)

One wonders how a collaborator of the CIA and a friend of Blair, Berlusconi, Haider... “*fights imperialism*”. One wonders if he is “*a bulwark*” against “*CIA agents*”...

Islamist “socialism”, third way of Colonel Gaddafi

Comrade Downing is unable to explain in a dialectical and materialist way why Islamism has grown up at the expense of the Arab nationalism, Palestine included. Instead, he adopts conspiracy thesis.

The history of existing society is not any more the history of class struggles but the history of CIA and MI6 plots, from the fall of Berlin Wall to Libyan upsurge.

There are al Qaeda CIA backed opponents (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 16)

There are many reports on the involvement of Al Qaeda cell in Libya... (p. 16)

British intelligence paid large sums of money to an al-Qaeda cell in Libya... (p. 16)

MI6 passed £100,000 to the al-Qaeda plotters (p. 16)

The CIA-sponsored guerrilla training was integrated with the teachings of Islam. (p. 16)

Comrade Downing is not coherent. If the criteria to appreciate a political current are its “anti-imperialist” stance, why does he favor pan Arab nationalism which has capitulated to imperialism for years, even decades? Moreover, Bin Laden exploded more occidental civilian planes than Gaddafi (only two) and killed more people in New York, Madrid and London than Gaddafi in Berlin.

To justify his political backing of Colonel Gaddafi, he overstates the contrast between these two wings of the Arab bourgeoisie. He tends to embellish the pious Guide.

It [the dictatorship of the proletariat] would have to do many of the things that that old dictator Gaddafi has done in the past to ensure survival. That is it would have to execute the counter-revolutionaries, the CIA agents and their unfortunate deluded and confused followers just like the Bolsheviks had to do. (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 22)

He forgets “*the need for a determined struggle against attempts to give a communist colouring to bourgeois-democratic liberation trends in the backward countries*” (Lenin, *Draft theses on national and colonial questions for the Second Congress of the Communist International, 1920*)?

No wonder why there is no place –among 15 pages on Libya– for a workers revolutionary party in Libya.

1. Colonel Gaddafi is a revolutionary (who else leads a revolution and fights counter-revolutionaries?).
2. Victims he executes are always “counter revolutionaries” or “CIA agents”.
3. Bolsheviks would do such a repression and other “many things” he does.

Equating despotic bourgeois and collaborator of secret services of the main imperialist state to Bolshevik Party is hitherto more foolish than relating oil rent capitalist economy to USSR.

Comrade Downing should take seriously two constancies of the versatile "Guide": his denunciation of Marxism and his propagation of Islam, two features of genuine counter-revolution, not to mention prohibition of Marxist books and workers strikes, oppression, deportation and torture of foreign workers.

Religion contains tradition and absorbs it... Its teachings comprise basic social guidelines and answers to the fundamental questions of existence. (Green Book, 1975, part I)

All revolutions since the Dutch War of Independence declared freedom of religion, but not the obscurantist "Guide of Revolution".

A sound rule is that each nation should have a religion. For it to be otherwise is abnormal. There is no other solution but to be harmonious with the natural rule, i.e., each nation has a single religion. (Green Book, 1981, part III)

When King Idris, an opponent to Italian colonisation from 1922 to 1943, unified Tripolitania, Fezzan, and Cyrenaica after WWII, the article 5 of the Constitution proclaimed Islam the religion of the new state.

In 1969, the military coup changed the Constitution, but article 2 still proclaimed Islam the religion of the state; article 6 vaunted Arab and Muslim traditions; article 8 made the legacy a matter of Sharia, the religious law.

Within few months, the Military Junta (CCR) forbade political opposition (called "proselytize against the state"), Marxism (called "arouse class hatred"), demonstrations (but in favour of the junta) and, of course, workers strikes.

Qadhafi concluded that his power depended upon tight control. His Revolutionary Command Council issued a "Law for the Protection of the Revolution," making it a criminal offense to proselytize against the state, to arouse class hatred, to spread falsehood, or to participate in strikes and demonstrations. (Middle East Quarterly, winter 2006)

Clearly, the target was not only counter-revolutionaries, even less CIA which has never been troubled by undemocratic measures, especially those against strikes and "class hatred".

In 1972, law 71 banned officially political parties. Government enacted a law providing for the amputation of the right hands of convicted thieves. Colonel Gaddafi founded the "World Islamic Call Society" to propagate Islam and an "Islamic Legion" to Arabize Chad and Sudan.

In 1973, on the birthday of the Prophet Muhammad, Colonel Gaddafi delivered a "Five-Point Address". He announced suspension of all existing laws, implementation of Sharia and purging the country of the "politically sick", that is to say anti-Monarchists, Islamists... and Marxists. Law 75 denied all freedom of expression. Occidental LP records, atheist and Marxist books were burnt during auto-da-fé (as a friend of Marx once said: "Das war ein Vorspiel nur, dort wo man Bücher verbrennt, verbrennt man am Ende auch Menschen", Heine, 1820).

In 1973 and 1974, laws provided lashings and imprisonment of adulterers, imprisonment of homosexuals for up to five years and floggings for those transgressing the fast of Ramadan were issued as laws "in line with positive Islamic legislation." Another law provided forty lashes for any Muslim who drank or served alcoholic beverages. In 1974, Colonel Gaddafi menaced all dissidents of death penalty.

I could at any moment send them to the People's Court... and the People's Court will issue a sentence of death based on law, because execution is the fate of anyone who forms a political party. (quoted in Middle East Quarterly, Winter 2006)

In 1975, Colonel Gaddafi changed the official name of the state, changed the flag from pan Arab nationalist colours to Islamic green. He transformed cathedrals into mosques and forbade alcohol. He enunciated his "Third universal theory" (sic) as an alternative to capitalism and communism, because both of these ideologies (sic) had been proven invalid. He began to publish his *Green Book*, which was to substitute the Constitution. This was a mishmash of Muhammad, Proudhon, Bakunin and Sun Yan-tsen.

Gaddafi's masterpiece celebrated patriarchal family and tribe.

The individual without a family has no value or social life...

To separate children from their mothers and to cram them into nurseries is a process by which they are transformed into something very close to chicks, for nurseries are similar to poultry farms into which chicks are crammed after they are hatched.

The tribe forms a behaviour pattern for its members, developing into a social education which is better and more noble than any school education. (Green Book, 1981, part III)

His own daughter wears veil in public. The bigotry of the regime fetters sexual freedom, especially for youth, in

spite of rather high level of education.

A country without alcohol, where the population abides by strict codes of male-female conduct that require both sexes to stay virgins until marriage—there are no dance clubs, no bars, no young couples strolling down the street, holding hands... Away from the progressive cities of Tripoli and Benghazi, women stay largely in the home, out of sight. (The best American travel writing, Houghton Mifflin, 2006, p. 229)

Of course, as in Iran, the “moral code” imposed to the youth is not for the bourgeoisie. Capitalists drink and fuck what they like. For instance, several Gaddafi’s greedy sons were famous for alcoholic consumption and luxury life abroad, including yachts and high tariff prostitutes.

Comrade Downing explains that the Permanent Revolution Collective makes “democratic demands... that have already been realised”. Certainly, a tiny organisation without presence in Libya may be wrong. However, comrade Downing mentions only one example... which is not convincing.

On the emancipation of women for instance, Libya has the most progressive law on women’s rights in the whole region. (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 25)

Before the military coup of 1969, women got already some rights, at the time among “the most progressive in the whole region”: they had right to vote and to participate in political life, they could also own and dispose of property independently of their husbands.

Under the nationalist regime, in 1973, women got equal rights in obtaining a divorce. The state opened education to girls and healthcare to women. The ratio girls/boys in primary and secondary education was more than 100% in Libya in 2009. But it was no exception, even in the region. Tunisia, Israel, United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Qatar... got a ration more than 100% too.

One more time, facts do not fit the panegyric. Nurseries and contraception do not receive state support. As a result, the fecundity rate is 2.54 births per woman in Libya in 2011. It is 1.83 in Tunisia, 1.84 in Israel, 1.86 in Emirates, 2.07 in Turkey, 2.12 in Kuwait, 2.3 in Algeria. Abortion is illegal as in clerical and republican Iran or clerical and monarchist Saudi Arabia (the exception in these countries is “to protect woman’s life”).

In the “whole region”, at least of three countries do better for women.

- In Israel, there is complete law equality for both

genders and the circumstances under which abortion is legal are broader.

- In Turkey, there is complete law equality and abortion is legal.

- In Tunisia, there is complete law equality and abortion is legal. Women can even obtain government-subsidized abortions without their husband’s permission.

Public views of Colonel Gaddafi on women were not progressive.

In view of his different nature and in line with the laws of nature, the male has played the role of the strong and striving not by design, but simply because he is created that way. The female has played the role of the beautiful and the gentle involuntarily because she was created so... To ignore natural differences between men and women and to mix their roles is an absolutely uncivilized attitude. (Green Book, 1981, part III)

His dark side is worse. In 1984, he tried to rape French journalist Memona Hintermann... It is probable there were other cases whose victims did not disclose. Comrade Downing splinted SF Mark I because he wanted filmmaker Polanski jailed for sexual abuse. What about his “anti-imperialist” hero?

How “hard left” SF Mark II props up Gaddafi’s political police

Probably, comrade Downing was not aware of the sexual abuses of the “Guide”. But, as a writer of 15 pages on Libya -and from his self-proclaimed supremacy on the question upon all Marxists of Earth- he must know the so-called “Revolutionary Committees” launched in 1977.

Since 1977, the "revolutionary committees" ensure an "ideological control" on the people, animate the meetings of the Popular Committees and, since 1979, select openly the delegates. They infiltrate also the army and the General Congress, controls the press.... The Movement of revolutionary committees appears as a state into ht state. It counts more than 300,000 members and 30,000 militiamen; it is at the same time the police, the political police and the single party which organizes the demonstrations of support for the Guide. (Najjar, Anatomie d'un tyran, Mouammar Kadhafi, Actes Sud, 2011, p. 58-59)

The ban on parties, confirmed by the *Green Book*, gave the monopoly of political activity to “revolutionary committees”, in fact the single party of the totalitarian regime. RC were also part of the repressive apparatus of

the bourgeois state.

Revolutionary Committees run prisons with little or no documentation of the inmate population or of such basic data as crime and sentence. Revolutionary committees dispense justice, targeting, in particular, participants of the Basic Peoples' Congresses who voice opposition to the state's agenda. (Middle East Quarterly, Winter 2006)

That so-called "Revolutionary Committees" are part of the repressive bourgeois state is confirmed by one official reference comrade Downing quoted in a former edition:

The infamous "hit squads," composed of elements of the revolutionary committees, pursued Qadhafi's opponents overseas, assassinating a number of them. Violent clashes occurred between revolutionary committees and the officially recognized or legitimate people's groups and the armed forces. It became clear by the mid-1980s that the revolutionary committees had frequently stifled freedom of expression. (Metz, Libya a country study, Library of Congress, 1987)

Today, SF Mark II supports plainly the bourgeois "revolutionary committees". RWG / South Africa and LC / Brazil too, perhaps by ignorance (time will show). They do not argue for workers independence and workers soviets, but demand actually the strengthening of Gaddafi's militia.

For Revolutionary Committees in all workplaces, colleges and regions, linked up nationally! (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 19)

Build Revolutionary Committees in all work-places, colleges and regions against Imperialist intervention! (p. 14)

In 1980, Colonel Gaddafi asserted that he wanted the so-called "Revolutionary Committees" to assassinate "dogs", "scum" dissident refugees. Amnesty International listed at least 25 assassinations between 1980 and 1987.

A paramilitary wing of the Revolutionary Committees, the "Revolutionary Guards" (sic), became entrenched within the armed forces. They served as a parallel channel of control. The Republican Guard recruits almost exclusively from tribes whose loyalty he cultivates through economic largess.

In 1996, security guards machine-gunned 1,200 disarmed men in Abu Salim prison (Tripoli).

In 1997, the Law of collective punishment allowed the state to sanction entire families, towns, or districts for

the wrongdoing of individuals.

In recent years, hundreds of suspected government opponents have been arbitrarily arrested, often without any arrest warrant, and held incommunicado during the first months of their detention during which they were reportedly tortured. (Amnesty International, 1997)

Torture by bourgeois dominated states are not Jacobin or Bolshevik expedients. They are the other face of torture by bourgeois imperialist states, both aimed at the defence of the world capitalist order at its period of decay, imperialism. Both confirm that the alternative is not "progressive", "democratic", "anti-imperialist" bourgeoisie vs "reactionary", "fascist", "imperialist" bourgeoisie, but *socialism or barbarism*.

Comrade Downing opposes wrongly the "anti-imperialist" Gaddafi to the "racist" TNC.

In Libya we had a who knew how to divert these masses against black workers first and then in favour of imperialism. (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 16)

No doubt the TNC encouraged jingoism and covered hatred against Black workers who were often accused by armed rebels, mobs, robbers to be mercenaries.

But Gaddafi sowed the seeds of racism. Foreign workers testify they were proposed to join Gaddafi's troops during the civil war. Moreover, they were persecuted well before the civil war. Colonel Gaddafi "knew to divert masses" against foreign workers.

In 1998, six foreign medical workers were charged with conspiring to deliberately infect over 400 children of Benghazi Hospital with HIV. Libyan investigators tortured 10 months Palestinian doctor Ashraf El-Hajouj: "They used electric shocks, drugs, beatings, police dogs, sleep prevention", he told. The Bulgarian nurses were exposed 10 months to aggressive dogs, raped, beaten and tortured by electric shocks. Gaddafi's court condemned them to death. Now, some of the men in charge of inquiry and judgement are members of the TNC.

In 2000, there were even pogroms against migrants. Colonel Gaddafi encouraged the racists and never sanctioned them. At the same time, he financed racist Haider in Austria and soon after collaborated with Italian imperialism to prevent African migration to European Union.

Libya must end its practices of racial discrimination against black Africans, particularly its racial persecution of two million black African migrant workers. There is substantial evidence of Libya's pattern and practice of racial discrimination against migrant workers.

In 1998, the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) expressed concern about Libya's alleged "acts of discrimination against migrant workers on the basis of their national or ethnic origin."

In 2000, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions issued a condemnation of "racist attacks on migrant workers" in Libya.² Migrant workers from Ghana, Cameroon, Sudan, Niger, Burkina Faso, Chad and Nigeria were the victims of attacks by Libyans targeting black migrants, following a government-ordered crackdown on foreign employment, and state-sponsored news reports portraying African migrants as being involved in drug-trafficking or dealing in alcohol. (UN Human Rights Council, February 16, 2010)

The following years, the government molested itself migrants.

Libyan authorities... have instituted a number of repressive measures. These include more restrictive immigration regulation, lengthy and arbitrary detention of immigrants in poor conditions in prisons and camps, physical abuse, and the forced repatriation of tens of thousands of immigrants. From 2003 to 2005, the Libyan government deported approximately 145,000 irregular migrants, mostly to sub-Saharan countries. (Migration Information Source, November 2006)

Is Bolshevism comparable with propagation of religion, mass massacre of prisoners, ban of strikes and *aut-da-fé* of Marxist books? Were expelled Egyptian, Tunisian and Palestinian workers counter revolutionaries? Were tortured Bulgarian nurses and Palestinian doctor, deported black migrant workers agents of the CIA?

“Hard left” united front with Gaddafi

Comrade Downing quotes approvingly an interview of Trotsky.

Truly, one must have an empty head to reduce world antagonisms and military conflicts to the struggle between fascism and democracy. (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 18)

Please note that in the same interview, Trotsky said:

The policy of the “People’s Front”... consists in subordinating the proletariat to the left-wing of the bourgeoisie. (Trotsky, An interview with Mateo Fossa, 1938)

The interview of September 1938 is often quoted by epigones who want an “orthodox” cover for their united front with the bourgeoisie. Trotsky was not very straight

in this interview. First, he was not yet familiar with Latin America, as he told to his interviewer. Secondly, he has to be careful not to endanger President Cardenas who welcomed him in Mexico when he was expelled from “democratic” France and Norway, banned by “democratic” Great Britain and USA. So, the following years, he was to sign “Crux” his plain positions on Latin America.

Any interview is politically inferior to programmatic documents. There is nothing wrong in the archive, but it is incomplete. The 4th International’ *Manifesto* -whose draft was written by Trotsky- stated openly:

In the colonial and semi-colonial countries, the struggle for an independent national state, and consequently the “defence of the fatherland,” is different in principle from that of the imperialist countries. The revolutionary proletariat of the whole world gives unconditional support to the struggle of China or India for national independence, for this struggle... strikes powerful blows at the imperialist states.

At the same time, the Fourth International knows in advance and openly warns the backward nations that their belated national states can no longer count upon an independent democratic development. Surrounded by decaying capitalism and enmeshed in the imperialist contradictions, the independence of a backward state inevitably will be semi fictitious, and its political regime, under the influence of internal class contradictions and external pressure, will unavoidably fall into dictatorship against the people—such is the regime of the “People’s” party in Turkey, the Kuomintang in China; Gandhi’s regime will be similar tomorrow in India. The struggle for the national independence of the colonies is, from the standpoint of the revolutionary proletariat, only a transitional stage on the road toward drawing the backward countries into the international socialist revolution.

The Fourth International does not draw watertight distinctions between the backward and the advanced countries, the democratic and the socialist revolutions. It combines them and subordinates them to the world struggle of the oppressed against the oppressors. Just as the only genuinely revolutionary force of our era is the international proletariat, so the only real program to liquidate all oppression, social and national, is the program of the permanent revolution. (Imperialist war and the proletarian world revolution, 1940)

To advocate, against the program of permanent revolution, a united front between the working class and the “anti-imperialist” bourgeoisie, comrade Downing argues that:

International finance capital wants freedom and democracy smash the organisations of the metropolitan working class and to open up the economies of the semi-colonial world to its unfettered penetration, to reduce these countries to the state of Iraq, Afghanistan, Somalia and the Congo. The international working class must deny them this freedom and democracy if they are to survive and advance to world revolution. (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 15)

The ignoring of the real conditions of the masses in Libya and the championing of idealised ‘freedoms’ and ‘rights’ sets them up for imperialist super-exploit. (p. 18)

In Tunisia and Egypt... middle class and opportunist politicians had an agenda... to allow a more “democratic” and better functioning capitalist society. (p. 20)

If we had a real successful revolution in any or all of these countries it would not be called a ‘democratic revolution’ at all, but the dictatorship of the proletariat. And it would have to do many of the things that that old dictator Gaddafi has done in the past to ensure survival. That is it would have to execute the counter-revolutionaries, the CIA agents and their unfortunate deluded and confused followers just like the Bolsheviks had to do. (p. 22)

One wonders who embellishes the “*real conditions of the masses in Libya*”.

True, in the interest of world proletariat, communists differentiate oppressed nations and oppressors, imperialist countries and dominated countries and support the latter against the former, whatever political forms of the respective bourgeois states.

All the rest is a travesty of Marxism:

1. Capital wants to impose democracy.
2. The working class must deny it.
3. Anti-imperialism obliges to deny democracy.
4. The working class must support anti-imperialist regimes.

This support of the working class takes the form of an anti-imperialist bloc or front. This alliance with the bourgeoisie cannot be conjectural. It must be long-lasting because it is a front with the leader(s) of revolution(s), with some relentless anti-imperialist fighter (s).

That explains why there is no need for a workers revolutionary party in Libya.

Such a revision cannot be confined to Libya. There are already some signs.

- The severity towards the internationalist Collective contrasts with the indulgence towards the nationalist INLA-IRSP / Ireland (which got much aid, in the old days, from Gaddafi).

The IRSP is dedicated to mobilising the working class on a political and revolutionary socialist basis. (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 16)

- Even Gbagbo becomes an anti-imperialist fighter.

We know who to support in the Ivory Coast, not the pro-imperialist ‘democratically-elected’ President Alassane Ouattara, who has gained the assistance of world imperialism in banning the export of cocoa to deny his rival the opportunity to raise funds but the hold-out President Laurent Gbagbo who has nationalized the Ivory Coast’s cocoa industry to rally the anti-imperialist masses. (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 18)

When he had been the president, from 2000 to 2010, Gbagbo had guaranteed US and French firms grip on cocoa. He nationalized purchases and exports of cocoa only in March, after a ban was imposed on Ivory Coast’s cocoa when he refused to accept Ouattara’s victory at presidential elections of November 2010.

- All the issue forgets deliberately the slaughtering of Syrian people by al-Assad Junior.

“Hard left” supports dictatorship against the people

Comrade Downing vision of a world plot by imperialism to impose democracy is a departure for Marxism. He echo the propaganda of imperialism: “we are there not for money but for freedom” and the arguments of many bourgeois despots too: “civil liberties are not suited for our (great) people, leave us fight communism (or Islamism), leave me rule without elections, leave us forbid parties, strikes, papers, leave us arrest, retail, torture and execute opponents or national minority...”.

The Libyan leader also said that what was often viewed as government heavy handedness in the Middle East in dealing with political opposition stemmed from the violent nature of dissent. "In the Middle East, the opposition is quite different than the opposition in advanced countries. In our countries, the opposition takes the form of explosions,

assassinations, killings" he said. (BBC News, March 24, 2006)

Communists do not accuse the bourgeoisie of too much democracy, rather the reverse. The historical record of the domination of a few countries on the rest of the planet is not the imposition of democracy, rather the opposite.

Imperialism is the epoch of finance capital and of monopolies, which introduce everywhere the striving for domination, not for freedom. Whatever the political system, the result of these tendencies is everywhere reaction... (Lenin, Imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism, 1916, ch. 9)

Every recent revolt in North Africa and West Asia has been aimed at brutal dictators who were enforced by all the imperialist powers.

Political regime of backward state, under the influence of internal class contradictions and external pressure, will unavoidably fall into dictatorship against the people. (Trotsky, Imperialist war and the proletarian world revolution, 1940)

The main tendency of bourgeois states is not to extend but to restrain civil liberties, including at home, see for instance the "Antiterrorism Act" in Great Britain.

Of course, to their own peoples, bourgeois states tell that their motives are patriotic or democratic. For instance, British and French bourgeoisies told that they wanted to prevent a massacre by Gaddafi's troops of civilians. For instance, Colonel Gaddafi told that his *Green Book* will deliver more democracy than the political parties, elections and parliament. When masses revolted from West to East of Libya, Gaddafi said, as Mubarak and Ben Ali before him, he was defending the country against foreign intrusion. Now, he claims he defends the Muslims against "the crusaders" (by the way, is not the language of Al Qaeda?).

Communists know they all lie. Any fraction of the bourgeoisie defends capitalism in general and its specific interests in particular. Through republic and parliament if they can, without if they must. Bourgeois democracy is always limited. Communists fight for a superior democracy, that of the Commune of Paris, the Russian soviets, the German councils... Some restrictive measures of this democracy inside a workers state which stays isolated and without enough productive forces are legitimate, but are not the norm of the dictatorship of proletariat. On no account, such temporary measures at the first steps of the transition to socialism could justify any lack of rights for workers in capitalist society.

Communists assert that "civil liberties" (universal suffrage, freedom of speech, freedom of demonstration,

freedom of press, freedom of organization, public courts, freedom of strike...) are useful to prepare the social revolution. Of course, communists do not ask for a constituent assembly where there already civil liberties (as did the opportunist PO, MAS, PTS, LOI and MST in Argentina in December 2001).

Communist demand democratic rights where they are not guaranteed. They defend them when they are restricted by bourgeois governments or attacked by fascists.

Engels became a communist through his participation in Chartism which demanded the right to vote for British male workers. When revolution spread in all Europe in 1848 (as today in North African and West Asia), the Communist League supplemented its recent international program (*Manifesto of the communist party*) by a one-page leaflet special for Germany.

Every German, having reached the age of 21, shall have the right to vote and to be elected, provided he has not been convicted of a criminal offence... Universal arming of the people... All civil servants shall receive the same salary, the only exception being that civil servants who have a family to support... Complete separation of Church and State... Only by the realisation of these demands will the millions in Germany, who have hitherto been exploited by a handful of persons and whom the exploiters would like to keep in further subjection, win the rights and attain to that power to which they are entitled as the producers of all wealth. (Marx, Engels, Demands of the communist party in Germany, 1848)

By the way, a lot of 1848 demands for Germany are still worth for today Libya. During the revolution, Marx and Engels published a democratic and revolutionary paper and fought for freedom of the press, for power to the elected assembly against the absolute monarchy. After the defeat, never they departed from.

The workers' party would have no choice but, notwithstanding the bourgeoisie, to continue its campaign for bourgeois freedom, freedom of the press and rights of assembly and association which the bourgeoisie had betrayed. Without these freedoms it will be unable to move freely itself; in this struggle it is fighting to establish the environment necessary for its existence, for the air it needs to breathe. (Engels, The Prussian military question and the German workers' party, 1865, part III)

When the revolution shook the Russian Empire, the communists did not stop democratic demands.

Whereas both the direct interests of the Russian

proletariat and those of its struggle for the ultimate aims of socialism require the fullest possible measure of political freedom, and, consequently, the replacement of the autocratic form of government by the democratic republic. (Lenin, The Third Congress of the RSDLP, 1905)

At the head of the whole of the people, and particularly of the peasantry—for complete freedom, for a consistent democratic revolution, for a republic! At the head of all the toilers and the exploited—for Socialism! Such must in practice be the policy of the revolutionary proletariat, such is the class slogan which must permeate and determine the solution of every tactical problem, every practical step of the workers' party during the revolution. (Lenin, Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, 1905, part 13)

The proletariat in Russia carries on the struggle against both absolutism and capitalism. It only wants the forms of bourgeois democracy, but it wants them for itself, for the purposes of the proletarian class. It wants the 8-hour day, the people's militia, the republic, demands that simply point to bourgeois society, not socialist. But these demands at the same time press so hard on the outermost borders of the rule of capital that they appear as transitional forms to proletarian dictatorship. (Luxemburg, 1649-1789-1905, 1906)

When the Stalinist leadership of the 3rd International dropped democratic demands, communist objected to.

The Sixth Congress condemned democratic slogans as impermissible (constituent assembly, universal suffrage, freedom of speech and of the press, etc.) and thereby completely disarmed the Chinese Communist Party in the face of the dictatorship of the military oligarchy. (Trotsky, "Introduction to the Russian edition", The permanent revolution, 1931)

When a fraction of the bourgeoisie tried to destroy the democratic gains, communists defended them.

When a state turns fascist, it doesn't only mean that the forms and methods of government are changed in accordance with the patterns set by Mussolini, but it means, primarily and above all, that the workers' organizations are annihilated; that the proletariat is reduced to an amorphous state; and that a system of administration is created which penetrates deeply into the masses and which serves to frustrate the independent crystallization of the proletariat. (Trotsky, What next? 1932, part I)

Where they were not yet obtained, democratic demands were still a part of communist slogans.

It is impossible merely to reject the democratic program; it is imperative that in the struggle the masses outgrow it. The slogan for a National (or Constituent) Assembly preserves its full force for such countries as China or India. This slogan must be indissolubly tied up with the problem of national liberation and agrarian reform. As a primary step, the workers must be armed with this democratic program. Only they will be able to summon and unite the farmers. On the basis of the revolutionary democratic program, it is necessary to oppose the workers to the "national" bourgeoisie. Then, at a certain stage in the mobilization of the masses under the slogans of revolutionary democracy, soviets can and should arise. (The death agony of capitalism and the tasks of the Fourth International, 1938)

The same method is needed today.

The conspiracy thesis of the "Hard Left"

The unique divergence comrade Downing finds retrospectively to justify his rupture with the Permanent Revolution Collective is:

The CoReP supports the forces of imperialism in the form of the rebels. (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 25)

He goes so far as to accuse the Collective to be "imperialist stooges" (p. 26), accomplices of "every imperialist power" and "every reactionary Gulf state".

The CoReP is only contributing to the political confusion and lining up with every imperialist power and every reactionary Gulf state who were slaughtering their own genuine revolutionaries. (p. 25)

Till the end, comrade Downing sounds illogical and unconvincing.

- Even if CoReP was wrong, as Russian imperialisms and Chinese imperialism have reprovved all mass upsurges, CoReP cannot be accomplice of "every" imperialist power.

- If there are "reactionary states", there are also are progressive bourgeois states. For sure, Libya is such a progressive state for comrade Downing. Maybe he will add Syria (who approved the slaughtering in Bahrain), Iran (who supports the slaughter in Syria), Venezuela, Bolivia, Algeria... Anyway, a "progressive state" is a petit-bourgeois dream irreconcilable with the permanent revolution.

- Is not strange that comrade Downing - who is silent about today massacres by al-Assad, who

justifies the past and today massacres by Colonel Gaddafi - blames the CoReP while the latter supported all the upsurges of the region and opposed the military intervention of the imperialist coalition in Libya?

To substantiate his ridiculous accusation -anybody who supported the demonstrations of 14 February in Libya is an imperialist stooge- he must oppose absolutely Tunisian and Egyptian movements to Libyan one.

The uprising in Libya is not any type of revolution but a counter-revolution, with an imperialist-backed and CIA sponsored leadership. It is a continuation of a whole series of reactionary attempts to restore the Monarchy and tribal privileges. (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 15)

This uprising has become in fact the central stratagem of imperialism to counter and defeat the great progressive uprising in Tunisia, Egypt and Bahrain... (p. 15)

We can see the source of the revolt not as confused workers fighting unemployment and oppression... but as disgruntled capitalists and tribal leaders... (p. 17)

A putsch organised by extreme reactionary leaders... (p. 24)

As often, comrade Downing repeats –with a veneer of Marxism- what said Colonel Gaddafi, as Ben Ali and Mubarak before. Mubarak claimed that Islamists were behind the Egyptian revolution. Ben Ali said the same in Tunisia. King Abdullah of Jordan sees an Islamist hand – behind the civil insurrection across the Arab world. The Bahraini authorities discovered Hezbollah’s hand behind the uprising there. If the revolts were so opposite, why Colonel Gaddafi supported Ben Ali during the massive demonstrations in Tunisia?

Of course, each mass movement is different, but all mass demonstrations in the region: Tunisia (17 December), Algeria (7 January), Egypt (17 January), Yemen (23 January), Jordan (28 January), Iran (14 February), Bahrain (14 February), Libya (16 February), Syria (18 February), Iraq (25 February) combined democratic demands and social aspiration, inspired each other and had similar roots.

There was no massive accumulation of capital in the region, but in Israel and Turkey. The old Pan Arab nationalist bourgeois movement has revealed its impotence and converged in fact with the Arab Monarchist bourgeoisies in oppression towards the masses, submission to imperialism, incapacity to employ the youth.

In Middle East and North Africa, 100 millions of 15-19 years are one third of the population... They are the main victims of unemployment... between 20 and 25% out of 15-24 years are out of job... (Alternatives Internationales, March 2011)

Gaddafi couldn’t be accounted any longer by some imperialist governments, not because of his “anti-imperialism”, but because he was being rejected by too many Libyans, as Mubarak and Ben Ali. The beginning of the demonstrations in Libya was very similar to those of Tunisia and Egypt.

Libya’s second city, Benghazi, stages the first on February 15th. Barely 60 youth showed up. Similar protests erupted in other cities over the next two days and they were met by security forces with heavy weapons. In Tobruk and Beida, protesters kept the anti-aircraft cartridges as evidence, but four deaths and 80 people injured only spurred larger numbers into the streets. (The Economist, February 26, 2011)

The upsurge took place everywhere, even in Tripoli.

Entire towns outside Tripoli have been torn apart by fighting between pro- and anti-Gaddafi forces. In the suburbs of the city, especially in the Noufreen district, militias fought for 24 hours on Sunday with machine guns and pistols, a battle the Gaddafi forces won. (The Independent, February 24, 2011)

At first, there was hostility in Cyrenaica to any imperialist intervention.

The people of eastern Libya have already said they do not wish for foreign intervention. David Cameron, please note. (The Independent, March 3, 2011)

The “Transition National Council” (TNC) was created on March 5th to prevent the social revolution, in the same way some imperialist powers and the local army propelled the “Provisional Government” in Tunisia. It has a similar composition: former ministers, former generals, “democratic” exiles, Islamist leaders. It called immediately to imperialist backing.

All the new governments, in Tunisia, in Egypt and Libya are bourgeois to the core. Any revolutionary in the world guesses that there cannot be total identity of the revolted youth (who fought heroically the bourgeois repression of “Revolutionary Committees”, “Revolutionary Guards”, “Green Brigades”...) with the TNC.

There are several revolutions in Libya. The first revolution is a kind of Commune of Paris, with its civil, young people, tradesmen or rank civil

servants, armed with their Kalashnikov and their enthusiasm, savagely defending an insurgent city and the released territories. Without them, nothing would be possible, because they fight. They took, in February, under the grapeshot and with naked hands then, the barracks of Benghazi...

Secondly, there is a bourgeois revolution, evocating that of 1848, under the aegis of the "Transition National Council" (TNC) – an aggregation from the Libyan elite, powerful families, tribes, exiled opponents, influential notabilities, lawyers, doctors or engineers, and a troop of Anglophone and pragmatic businessmen, often related to oil. (Le Monde, July 5, 2011)

The main difference with Tunisia and Egypt - the lack of influence of the working class- proceeds from the absence of any transition to socialism, of the absence of any previous bourgeois revolution, from the flaw of the Libyan bourgeoisie: no real industrialisation outside oil industry, a lot of African, Asian and even European migrants to do waged work (exactly as in Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar...).

There is no need *"to paint in bright colors"* (Trotsky) the national bourgeoisie of dominated country to oppose imperialism, as did the forerunners of SF Mark II, the fake "4th Internationals" of Pabloites (ISFI-USFI) and, later, Healyites (ICFI).

The Pabloite precedent of the muddle of workers state and bourgeois state

The 4th International position on USSR was challenged inside our movement by two twin revisions.

- Shachtman, Castoriadis, Cliff, Landy, following Kautsky or Rizzi, pretended that nothing was to be defended in USSR. To justify their renouncement, they decided that the state bureaucracy was a plain class, either a bourgeoisie of the capitalist mode of production or a new type of exploiters of the collectivist bureaucratic mode of production. Of course, Stalinist parties were, in their opinion, worse than Social-democrat or Labour parties. When imperialist pressure was high, these revisionists often decided USSR was worse than the USA. Lambert -who did not care of forging a theory adequate to his politics- was a variant of this deviation.

- Symmetrically, Pablo, Mandel, Robertson, Healy, in the steps of Webb and Deutscher, shared illusions in the capacity of the bureaucratic caste to build socialism in one country or confidence in the military capacity of the bureaucracy to confront imperialism. The building of a revolutionary party and the upsurge of workers and youth could be counter-productive,

because their main perspective was to reform the bureaucratic caste which stayed for them a part of the "communist movement". Of course, Stalinist parties were, in their opinion, a lot better than older reformist parties. The "hard left" -in comrade Downing's classification- "Spart Family" (SL, IBT, IG, LBI...) is a second wave Pabloism: hence the infamous poster of General Jaruzelski in the headquarters of the SL / United States or the shameful "Long live to the Berlin Wall!" of the LBI / Brazil.

The first type of revisionism was defeated in 1939-1940 because Cannon fought it in the SWP / United States and because Trotsky backed him. But the second type proved devastating and irreversible in 1949-1953. The destruction of the 4th International came from its own European leadership: "Pablo" (Michel Raptis), "Germain" (Ernest Mandel), Pierre Frank and Livio Maitan. Pablo instigated an attack to the program on Stalinism. In 1949, the International Secretariat, without much resistance aligned itself with Tito and Mao. The 3rd Congress in 1951 ratified this orientation in spite of some opposition from the RCP / China, the MAS / Switzerland and the PCI / France. The IS expelled the PCI in 1952. The Club / Great Britain and SWP / United States denounced Pabloism in 1953.

In place of holding to the main course of building independent revolutionary socialist parties by all tactical means, Pablo looks to the Stalinist bureaucracy, or a decisive section of it, to so change itself under mass pressure as to accept the "ideas" and "program" of Trotskyism. (SWP, A letter to Trotskyists throughout the world, 1953)

Stirred by the proletarian upsurge of June 1953 against the Stalinist bureaucracy in Berlin and all East Germany, that opened the perspective of the socialist German -and European- revolution, the sections of United States, France, Switzerland and Great Britain formed the "International Committee" (ICFI).

The International Committee charges the Pabloites with the crime of covering up the current betrayals of Stalinism and attempting to foist a dictatorial rule on the International in the interest of the new revisionist doctrine of Pablo. The International Committee condemns the Pabloites for having dared to speak to the East German workers in the name of Trotsky's Fourth International as nothing but lukewarm 'critics' of the Stalinist counter-revolutionaries, and for having refused to demand the withdrawal of the Kremlin's troops from East Germany although Moscow used these troops to suppress the East German workers. (SWP, Fourth international rallies against Pablo, 1953)

After the crushing of the proletarian revolution by the

reactionary USSR bureaucracy, the latter and its GDR agency built up the “Berlin Wall” and 1,400 kilometres -more than 600 miles- of barrier and anti-personnel mines. SF Mark II seems close to endorse this reactionary measure (*Socialist Fight* n° 6, p. 15, p. 18). The aim was less to fight imperialism than to keep its own people in a huge jail, providing worldwide capitalist politicians and ideologues one striking argument against socialism.

Needless to say, the Pabloite liquidators have not limited their revision to Stalinism; they extended it towards national bourgeoisie in dominated countries, tail ending the Stalinists. In 1951, the “world Congress” took up the flawed “United Anti-Imperialist Front” of the 4th Congress of the Communist International to make the 4th International to adopt the popular front in Latin America, without any opposition.

Pablo predicted that the policy of the Kremlin bureaucracy and that of the Stalinist parties would increasingly develop leftward, while the masses would flock about them; from this he deduced an entrism tactic into the Stalinist parties with political capitulation by the Trotskyists, entrism 'sui generis': these ideas and this liquidationist tactic were subsequently extended to the reformist parties and to all mass organizations under petty-bourgeois leadership: the Bolivian MNR, the Peronist movement in Argentina, the Ibanist in Chile, etc. (PCI, Les Phases successive du révisionisme pabliste, 1953)

This led to catastrophic results in Bolivia as soon as 1952. Unfortunately, the ICFI was not able to set up a balance of the Bolivian Revolution. It adopted federalism, preventing itself to fight in a coordinated way the ISFI usurpers and allowing its own sections to display the same adaptation to “socialist” enemies of world proletarian revolution: state bureaucracies, workers bourgeois parties and bourgeois nationalists. For instance, in the French section, Lambert expelled Bleibtreu, dropped the name of the party and subordinated the group to the Algerian nationalist party, the MNA led by Messali Hadj.

At the climax of the Pan-Arab nationalism, the ISFI advocated an “Arab revolution” in line with the Kremlin. Accordingly, it dropped any pretention to build a workers’ revolutionary party based on Marxism to lead the proletarian revolution in North Africa and West Asia. Pablo wrote an article to substantiate the nationalist “Arab Revolution” in Marxist terminology, at a time he was already deceived by the Egyptian army and Colonel Nasser, but still enthusiastic about the Iraqi army and General Kassem.

In Iraq, because of the weakness of the industrial

bourgeoisie, the hostility of the feudalists, and the successive purges of pro-Nasser elements in the army, Kassem has been seen to yield gradually to the pressure of the revolutionary masses... (Pablo, “La révolution arabe”, Quatrième Internationale, February 1959)

Pablo was also convinced that the Pan-Arab -and more religious- FLN nationalists of Algeria would express too “the pressure of the revolutionary masses”.

If the Iraqi revolution constitutes at present the most advanced stage, socially and from the viewpoint of proletarian perspectives, of the Arab revolution, the Algerian revolution, at the other end of the Arab world, represents a no less important peculiarity of that revolution... What can and must be contemplated is transforming the FLN into a transitional political formation by means of working up a definite program and a structure that links it to its base and ensures that base’s control over it. (Pablo, “La révolution arabe”, Quatrième Internationale, February 1959)

No need to build patiently the International and the proletarian revolutionary party in each country. By an irresistible objective process, the pressure of the masses was supposed to make the bourgeois nationalists to act as substitutes to the working class and its conscious vanguard. Preparing its split from the ICFI, the SWP / United States sunk in the same kind of opportunism.

Under mass revolutionary pressure, particularly in combination with imperialist attack, some of these nationalist movements can take extremely radical steps. This has been shown in Mexico, Bolivia, Egypt, Algeria and other places. (SWP, The world struggle for socialism, 1961)

At that time, the SLL / Great Britain tried to defend the program and the ICFI.

Nkrumah, Mboya, Nasser, Kassem, Nehru, Soekarno, and their like, represent the national bourgeoisie of their own countries. The dominant imperialist policy-makers both in the USA and Britain recognize full well that only by handing over political ‘independence’ to leaders of this kind, or accepting their victory over feudal elements like Farouk and Nuries-Said, can the stakes of international capital and the strategic alliances be preserved in Asia, Africa, and Latin America...

It is not the job of Trotskyists to boost the role of such nationalist leaders. They can command the support of the masses only because of the betrayal of leadership by Social-Democracy and particularly Stalinism, and in this way they become buffers

between imperialism and the mass of workers and peasants. The possibility of economic aid from the Soviet Union often enables them to strike a harder bargain with the imperialists, even enables more radical elements among the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leaders to attack imperialist holdings and gain further support from the masses.

But, for us, in every case the vital question is one of the working class in these countries gaining political independence through a Marxist party, leading the poor peasantry to the building of Soviets, and recognizing the necessary connections with the international socialist revolution. In no case, in our opinion, should Trotskyists substitute for that the hope that the nationalist leadership should become socialists. The emancipation of the working class is the task of the workers themselves... (SLL, Letter to the SWP, 1961)

But the SWP adopted “the Arab Revolution”, splinted the ICFI and joined the ISFI, with the POR / Argentina, to form the pro-Castrist “USFI” in 1963. Definitely, the official “4th International” (USFI) stayed in the hands of Pabloites. Meanwhile, Pablo himself became an unofficial member of the first bourgeois Algerian government (1962-1965). The ISFI stated:

The decisions adopted during last weeks by the Ben Bella government... correspond to the requirements and the major aspirations of the masses... After the last measures, Algeria is entering a transitory phase concerning its economic and social structures, a phase whose outcome will be the establishment of a workers state. (“La nouvelle phase de la révolution algérienne”, Quatrième Internationale, 3rd quarter 1963)

The Healyite precedent of “United Front” with Colonel Gaddafi

Unfortunately, the very same who resisted Pabloism in 1953 and 1963 concluded their own united front in 1976 with a wing of the Arab bourgeoisie, Colonel Gaddafi’s regime. In 1971, Healy splinted abruptly the remnants of the ICFI. Then, the SLL / Great Britain took the name of WRP, discarded proletarian internationalism, assumed that the problem of world proletarian leadership will be solved by the imminent British revolution and, outside, subordinated itself to bourgeois Arab nationalism and despotic regimes of Africa and West Asia.

From the end of the 1970s, Healy’s adaptation to bourgeois nationalist regimes and organisations in the Third World proceeded apace. After the Shah of Iran was overthrown in the 1979 revolution, the WRP soon gave up any attempt at Marxist analysis in favour of unconditional support for Khomeini’s

Islamic regime, to the extent of endorsing its suppression of the Iranian USec group. In Zimbabwe the Popular Front, and in particular Joshua Nkomo’s ZAPU, were given uncritical backing. News Line notoriously justified the execution of Iraqi Communist Party members by the Ba’athist regime, and even published a glossy brochure extolling the glories of Iraq under the leadership of Saddam Hussein. Formal references to the permanent revolution still appeared occasionally in WRP and International Committee statements, but these served only as a cover for a political line which depicted Libya under Colonel Gaddafi as a society in transition to socialism, and renounced the fight to construct independent working class parties in those countries where Healy had established opportunist relations with the existing nationalist leaderships. Indeed, by the late 1970s Healy had abandoned any serious attempt to build his own ‘world party of socialist revolution’, the International Committee. (Pitt, The Rise and Fall of Gerry Healy, 1994, ch. 10)

WRP leaders and their own little “4th International” became crude apologists of Libyan “revolution” and “socialism”.

When Gaddafi and the Free Unionist Officers seized popular control in 1969, they set Libya on the road of socialist development and expansion... Gaddafi has developed politically in the direction of revolutionary socialism and he has shunned the palaces and harems of some other Arab leaders. (WRP, December 12, 1981 quoted in Fourth International, summer 1986)

The WRP advocated a “united front” with Colonel Gaddafi.

The Libyan revolution was close to Gerry’s heart; he pioneered a united front between the WRP and the Gaddafi revolution... The Libyan Peoples Jamahiriya (which in Arabic means “state belonging to the masses”) has used country’s oil wealth for the benefits of the masses... (Lotz and Feldman, Gerry Healy, a revolutionary life, Lupus Books, 1994, p. 47)

Colonel Gaddafi “used the oil wealth to the benefits of the masses” is now the assessment of neo-Healyite SF: “Only Iraq and Libya used their oil wealth for the benefit of their own people” (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 16).

Guess who led the front?

Oil wealth did not benefit only to the Libyan masses. The “Trotskyite” part of the “bloc” looked for money to finance its new daily paper, *News Line*, which was to be

launched in May 1976.

WRP delegation was reportedly sent to Libya in April 1976 to request money for a new printing press for the News Line, and Healy himself apparently visited in August 1977 in search of further financial assistance from the Libyan regime. Not surprisingly, adulatory articles about Colonel Gaddafi were one of the notable innovations of the new paper. (Pitt, The Rise and Fall of Gerry Healy, 1994, ch. 10)

Negotiating the anti-imperialist “united front” in 1976 in Tripoli, the compliant WRP delegates were rather defensive when Libyan officials discovered that their interlocutors claimed allegiance, at least for youth and workers audience, to Jewish famous revolutionists like Marx, Luxemburg and Trotsky.

Our principal meeting was to take place at the International Centre for Green Book Studies and Research with its director, Ahmed al-Shahati... There was another tense moment during a later meeting when he suddenly said, ‘You told me your leader was Leon Trotsky. Wasn’t he Jewish?’

This time Corin Redgrave took the floor to explain that while Trotsky’s parents were Russian Jews, he had not adopted the faith and became a convinced atheist before the age of 20.

There was a furtive discussion around the room in Arabic before al-Shahati said, ‘How could Trotsky stop being a Jew?’

Redgrave patiently explained that Jews were not a nationality but members of a religion. There were Jewish citizens in countries throughout the world and they held the citizenship of those countries. Some Jews practised their religion, but others like Trotsky and Karl Marx, whose parents were Jewish, adopted atheism. (Mitchell, Come to revolution, a memoir, 2011, ch. 17)

Finally, the WRP delegation got what it mattered.

We happily shifted the agenda to our daily newspaper and the need for financial assistance to continue our editorial support for national liberation struggles in Africa and the Middle East. We were aware that al-Shahati’s office was committed to giving money to political parties and popular movements who stood against colonialism and racism, and we made our pitch. The day before we were due to return to London, a final meeting was arranged, to discuss future contacts between us...In a moment of embarrassing generosity he suddenly pulled an envelope from his drawer and said, ‘Here’s [US] \$15,000 for your newspaper.’ (Mitchell, Come

to revolution, a memoir, 2011, ch. 17)

It is no wonder Mitchell concluded proudly after the first meeting of Healy with Gaddafi in 1977: “We had become Colonel Gaddafi’s revolutionary party in Britain”.

From an internal report written when the WRP entered crisis, the anti-imperialist united front included the Libyan secret services.

The Commission was able to secure a section of the correspondence relating to the Middle East from the files in G Healy's former office. The documents examined by the Commission are seven relating to Iraq, four relating to Kuwait and other Gulf states, 23 relating to the PLO and 28 relating to Libya... From internal evidence in the documents under our control, it is obvious that much more material must exist... We were told repeatedly that Healy wanted no formal record kept of the money coming in...

In April 1980 a WRP delegation led by G Healy visited Libya, presenting his redrafted WRP perspective and asking for more money. From March 8 to 17, 1981 G Healy made a further visit to Libya, putting forward demands totalling £800,000. The Commission found a report in Healy's handwriting of this. This report contains the following statements: "In the evening we had a two hour audience with [name suppressed]. We suggested that we should work with Libyan Intelligence and this was agreed. ... March 13. The delegation was visited by [name suppressed] from the intelligence"... (ICFI Commission, Interim report, December 16, 1985)

Healy himself enjoyed Colonel Gaddafi’s jet.

The defence of the Libyan revolution with its radical nationalism and anti-imperialist policies led to a political bloc... In July 1977, following an abortive Egyptian invasion, the WRP and the General People’s Congress of Libya signed a joint alliance... Healy met Colonel Gaddafi on a number of occasions, once even flying back to London in the Libyan leader’s jet... (Lotz and Feldman, Gerry Healy, a revolutionary life, Lupus Books, 1994, p. 273-274)

Of course, the accords were –and still are- secret for Libyan and British workers. But it is worth noting that the first printing of Gaddafi’s *Green Book* in English was by the print shop of the WRP, the party where comrade Downing learnt politics.

The “united anti-imperialist front” was not limited to Libya. The ICFI declared on Iran:

We pay tribute to the Ayatollah Khomeini who became the symbol of the anti-Shah revolution. (Bulletin, February 27, 1979)

An infamous collaboration with Iraq government was revealed in 1985, when the WRP exploded.

At these meetings [of the WRP branches, in October 1985] the selling of photographs of Iraqi oppositionist demonstrators to Saddam Hussain's brutal regime was revealed. These could have been used to send oppositionists to their deaths. This was the most horrible crime and one which has never been properly investigated. After the Iraqi TU leader who spoke at a conference of the All Trade Union Alliance (ATUA) -the WRP's fake industrial wing- was executed after returning home without a murmur from the WRP. Did, in fact, monetary transactions result in executions? The justification by the WRP of the executions of the Iraqi CP members by Saddam Hussain suggested that this would not have bothered the WRP leaders... (Downing, WRP explosion, 1991, ch. 1)

Such are the antecedents of SF Mark II analogy of Libya with the former USSR, of SF Mark II united front or bloc with Gaddafi, of SF Mark II omission of the necessity of the proletarian revolutionary party in Libya, of SF Mark II vaunting of Gaddafi's "revolution", of SF Mark II call to build Gaddafi's committees in every place..

It is still time to stop a dangerous regression

Communists have, all along the 20th century, defended states, even led by despots, against assaults by imperialism, and rightly so. But this hardly extends to the defence of despots against assaults by the people ruled by those bourgeois and police states. To defeat really imperialism, we need proletarian revolution now and revolutionary workers party in all countries to lead them as soon as possible.

CoReP is not the stooge of any bourgeoisie:

- CoReP has supported all people and youth upheavals in North Africa and West Asia against bourgeois states and all their forces of repression.
- CoReP has opposed new bourgeois governments in Tunisia, Egypt and Libya.
- CoReP has opposed the imperialist blockade of Iran, has opposed imperialist intervention in Lebanon and Libya.

The problem is not with CoReP, it is with SF. SF Mark I aim was to make alive the long time dead 4th International corpse. In less than two years and half, SF has changed its international connections three times. The main internal crisis did not bring out any educational gain and led to severe the international relations with the Collective without the least internal struggle. This is more close to Healy tradition, both domestically and abroad, than to the Bolshevik Party and the Fourth International ones.

SF Mark II refuses the expression "Arab Revolution"; however it adopts its content:

1. The struggle is not between the main two world classes, but between imperialism and anti-imperialism.
2. The Arab national bourgeoisie, especially army officers, are consequent anti-imperialist and even leads revolutions.
3. Any opposition to "anti-imperialist" despots comes from agents of imperialism.
4. The socialist revolution is not really on the agenda; it is a distant goal.
5. The building of a proletarian revolutionary party against all the political fractions of the exploiters classes is not on the agenda either.

There is lot of political confusion in the last issue of the paper about the capacity of the bourgeoisie to defy imperialism, on imperialist unity and unification, on democratic demands, on workers' state.... Misconception of permanent revolution leads, as usual, to a strategic "front" with the so-called "anti-imperialist" bourgeoisie.

It is urgent to reverse SF regression into Healyism, to restore the international collaboration on safe grounds, to build soon a real militant and democratic communist group in Great Britain... A worldwide proletarian revolution is urgent. The illusions in one bourgeoisie or another and the splits they cause in workers organizations postpone the building of the world party, postpone the world socialist revolution.

With our internationalist regards

September 1st, 2011,

BUREAU OF THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION COLLECTIVE



Open Letter to RMG / South Africa and LC / Brazil

Dear comrades of the Revolutionary Marxist Group and of the Liga Comunista

According to a British paper you have approved a statement which called Libyan workers to support and rejoin the so-called "revolutionary committees":

Build Revolutionary Committees in all work-places, colleges and regions against Imperialist intervention! (Socialist Fight n° 6, p. 14)

Of course, we have to oppose imperialist intervention in Libya which still goes on in Sirte. But we hope you did not know that "revolutionary committees" were like the so-called "guardians of revolution" in Iran, that is to say shock troops against workers and youth. After the burning of Marxist books, the banning of unions and strikes, the bourgeois despot Gaddafi launched from the top of bourgeois state his militia and single party

Revolutionary Committees run prisons with little or no documentation of the inmate population or of such basic data as crime and sentence. Revolutionary committees dispense justice, targeting, in particular, participants of the Basic Peoples' Congresses who voice opposition to the state's agenda. (Middle East Quarterly, Winter 2006)

Appearance of revolutionary committees in late 1977 marked a further evolution of the political system. In response to Qadhafi's promptings, revolutionary committees sprang up in offices, schools, businesses, and in the armed forces. Carefully selected, they were estimated at 3,000 to 4,000 members in 1985. These supposedly spontaneous groups, made up of zealous, mostly youthful individuals with modest education, functioned as the watchdogs of the regime and guides for the people's committees and popular congresses.. (Metz, Libya a country study, Library of Congress, 1987)

Since 1977, the "revolutionary committees" ensure an "ideological control" on the people, animate the meetings of the Popular Committees and, since 1979, select openly the delegates. They infiltrate also the army and the General Congress, controls the press.... The Movement of revolutionary committees appears as a state into ht state. It counts more than 300,000 members and 30,000 militiamen; it is at the same time the police, the political police and the single party which organizes the demonstrations of support for the Guide. (Najjar, Anatomie d'un tyran, Mouammar Kadhafi, Actes Sud, 2011, p. 58-59)

Bolshevik greetings,

POLITICAL BUREAU OF THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION COLLECTIVE



Permanent Revolution Collective: Anti-imperialist United Front versus Permanent Revolution

The quotes in the text are part of a longer written debate with the GRA, an Austrian organization composed of former members of the now L5I, unorganized comrades and a member of the CoReP, which started in 2005. In this exchange of letters the CoReP tried to gain over the GRA as a whole to its position. This attempt failed, and the supporters of the CoReP were excluded in 2007. One crucial difference was the question of the anti-imperialist united front. After some necessary political clarifications and the intermediary stage of publishing the bulletin "New Course", former members of the GRA founded the Gruppe Klassenkampf which is today the Austrian section of the CoReP.

For an alliance between the proletariat, the other workers and the youth

You are perfectly right to note that a correct position on Bolivia requires an answer to the issue of the land. The issue of the alliance with the peasantry is still crucial, especially in countries like Peru or Bolivia.

We must promote a "united front" with the students' organisations and peasants ones. (Leon Trotsky, Discussions on China, 1935)

On the world scale, the accumulation of capital leads to question the main contradiction of our period on a higher level, more capital against more proletariat. On the world scale, one of the most important consequences is the numerical lowering of the traditional petite-bourgeoisie (especially the peasants), and the numerical strengthening of the working class (workers, employees, technicians...). In advanced countries, the need for exploitation and for social cohesion, as well as the pressures by intermediate layers and by the working class for instruction and for qualification lead to a new situation: most of the youth gets educated instead of being immediately exploited.

However, in the early 21st century, the social forms bear marks of the decline of capitalism: huge reserve army of the economy (unemployed) and decline of the industrial workforce in the imperialist countries, proliferation of professionals in repression bodies (army, police, prison officers, private militias...) and of some petit-bourgeois

layers (liberal professions and mainly executives in advanced countries, independent workers in cities of countries under domination).

The artificial preservation of antiquated petty-bourgeois strata in no way mitigates the social contradictions, but, on the contrary, invests them with a special malignancy, and together with the permanent army of the unemployed constitutes the most malevolent expression of the decay of capitalism. (Leon Trotsky, Ninety Years of the Communist Manifesto, 1937)

The communists must find catchwords to answer that situation: Popular and workers' alliance? Alliance of all the workers (wage-earners, self-employed, in formation)? In any case, the catchword of workers' and peasant government has no meaning anymore in countries of Europe, North America, Oceania and Asia, where there are more students, and even more engineers and doctors than working peasants.

There is only one oppressed people in Palestine

We think that it is absolutely necessary to add that we advocate full rights for Israeli-Jewish workers and that Israeli-Jewish and Palestinian workers must fight together against their reactionary regimes and against the world imperialism.

Unless translation problem, such a symmetry between Palestinian and Jewish workers who are supposed to

fight against *their* respective reactionary regime is false. The ones have all rights, the others have none. It leads to the solution of the "two States" proposed by the UN and the imperialist powers.

The Collective admits that transitional, or even democratic, catchwords, will have a function in the mobilization of the masses under the rule of the proletariat. That is precisely the reason why we do not put on the same plan *an oppressive state* (Israel) and *an oppressed people* (the Arabs from Palestine). No Palestinian tank has ever entered Israel territory, whereas the Zionist army drones all Palestine, frightens Arabs, destroys their cultivations, their infrastructures and their housings. If only the proletariat of the Middle-East can solve the national issue, the Jewish workers from Israel can play their part only *if they succeed in breaking up with Jewish nationalism*, whereas the Palestinian workers must *lead the struggle against the national oppression* against the Arabs from Palestine (living in Israel or the Territories) and the Palestinian refugees. The Collective does not conceal that it is in favour of the destruction of the colonial state, which is representative of the American imperialism in the region, as a preliminary condition for a Palestine in which atheistic or Israelite Jews will be allowed to live as well as atheistic, Muslim or Christian Arabs, within a socialist federation of the Middle-East.

The Permanent Revolution Collective upholds that only the unity of the workers of all the area around the oppressed Palestinians in Israel, the Territories and the refugee camps will open the possibility of a Palestine as well for the Jews as the Arabs, secular, democratic and socialist, who will be viable only within the Socialist Federation of the Middle East. (Release the Militants of the FPLP! 2006)

The Collective rejects all adaptation to the imperialist bourgeoisies and to their UN, which leads to the justification of the colonial state of Israel. It denies any adaptation to the reactionary Islamism under the pretext of Anti-Imperialist United Front with the Palestinian bourgeoisie and with the Arabic (or Persian) regimes in the neighbourhood.

The Constituent Assembly may turn into a slipknot under the neck of the proletariat

For us, the issue of the constituent assembly corresponds to the issue of the working class consciousness. We naturally reject it as a strategy but in some situations we think that it is good and necessary as a tactics. You rejected it in Bolivia, seemingly because, as a starting point, you assumed that most of the Bolivian masses had already broken with reformism and that the demand for a

constituent assembly only could send them away from the fight for power. Some comrades in the GRA do not share that view. They think that, even if oppressed and exploited masses in Bolivia, which are isolated and extremely disorganized, have shown revolutionary energy, they have not broken with crucial reformist illusions yet. For these comrades, the tactics of the Revolutionary Constituent would have been a way for clearing masses from such reformist illusions.

Reformists and centrists often recall that Luxemburg criticized the dissolution of the National Assembly by the Bolshevik Party. What they forget is that, soon before her assassination by the social-democrat government, as she faced the democratic slipknot gripped by the leaders of the SPD around the neck of the German proletariat and of the workers' councils, she wrote the following:

The French National Assembly is an out of date heritage of the bourgeois revolutions, an empty thimble, a residue of the time of the middle-class illusions on the "single people", on "freedom, equality, fraternity" of the bourgeois state. Who, today, resort the national assembly, that one wants, consciously or unconsciously, to bring back the revolution until the historical stage of the bourgeois revolutions; it is a camouflaged agent of the bourgeoisie... (Rosa Luxemburg, The National Assembly, 1918)

The temporary catchword of a Constituent or a National Assembly is meaningful only when the masses, especially the majority of the petit-bourgeoisie, are denied the right to influence the official policy, by a foreign oppressor, or by domestic authoritarian regime.

The slogan for a National (or Constituent) Assembly preserves its full force for such countries as China or India. (Leon Trotsky, The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International, 1938)

Socialism does not result from the bourgeois democracy, as Ted Grant and Peter Taaffe wrote, but from the power of the soviets.

At a certain stage in the mobilization of the masses under the slogans of revolutionary democracy, soviets can and should arise. Their historical role in each given period, particularly their relation to the National Assembly, will be determined by the political level of the proletariat, the bond between them and the peasantry, and the character of the proletarian party policies. Sooner or later, the soviets should overthrow bourgeois democracy. Only they are capable of bringing the democratic revolution to a conclusion and likewise opening an

era of socialist revolution. (The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International)

The government of the MAS used the Constituent Assembly in order to prevent the emergence of Soviet organs, like the indigenous popular Assembly in El Alto and the Coordination of Cochamba in June 2005.

The « Trotskyists » follow the bourgeois and reformist nationalists, who turn democratic catchwords, which only can be episodic, into slipknots around the proletariat like in France in 1945, in Brazil in 1985 and in Bolivia in 2006. For instance, the LCR France, who openly rejected the dictatorship of the proletariat, who voted Chirac in 2002, who advocated the No in the European Union referendum, with the PCF and the chauvinistic party MRC, approves the Constituent Assembly.

Evo Morales election victory results from Bolivian popular mobilizations for the nationalization of hydrocarbons and of natural resources, for the defence and the industrialization of the production of coca leaves, for a sovereign economic policy to the US and European imperialisms, for a democratic society founded by a new Constituent Assembly. (LCR, Communiqué, 2005 December 19th)

The PT France, a social-chauvinist sect which does not defend the right to entry for immigrant workers, which had a campaign with the MRC against the European Constitution, favours the Constituent Assembly, in France as in Bolivia:

Bolivia: No early elections, no succession. Sovereign Constituent Assembly, nationalization of oil and of gas! (Informations Ouvrières, 2005 June 23th)

All the same, the SWP Britain, which organized the European Social Forum in London in October 2004 with the social-democrat mayor Ken Livingstone, and which takes part in the implementation of a Popular Front (Respect) in its own country, supports the Constituent Assembly of the bourgeois government in Bolivia.

MAS must now convert its proposals into reality, promoting growth and keeping its promises — nationalisation of the country's vast hydrocarbon reserves, land reform, the elimination of corruption, increased investment in education and culture, and the organisation of a constituent assembly, planned for August 2006. (Socialist Worker, 7 January 2006)

WP Britain follows its motherhouse:

A Constitutional Assembly can be a powerful tool in sweeping away privileges, corruption, an

undemocratic constitution and so on. (Workers Power, May 2006)

The LCR and the PT, the SWP and the WP give so many advantages to a simple change in the appearance of the bourgeois state! In a country where the democratic rights have been recovered since 1982, where the masses drove an elected president away and attempted to organize Soviet organs, the Constituent Assembly is nothing else than an attempt by the bourgeois government to create a diversion.

It is true that the Collective rejected the catchword for a Constituent Assembly in Argentina in 2001, in Bolivia in 2003 and 2005, in Ecuador in 2005, but not because it had judged that the masses “*had broken with reformism*”! We have tried to assess the concrete situation, the real mobilization of the masses. On the one hand, democratic freedoms, including the right to vote for deputies, to enter political parties, have existed for years in those three countries. On the other hand, the revolutionary mobilization of the proletarian and petit-bourgeois masses did not confront with a fascist regime or with an absolute monarchy, but with the *bourgeois democracy*, with organs resulting from universal suffrage, in chasing away the *elected* president.

The party must remember that, compared to its principal objective (the conquest of the capacity weapons to the hand), the democratic watchwords are only one secondary, provisional, momentary, episodic. (Leon Trotsky, The Chinese Question after the 6th congress of the Communist International, 1928)

But the formulae of democracy (freedom of press, the right to unionize, etc.) mean for us only incidental or episodic slogans in the independent movement of the proletariat and not a democratic noose fastened to the neck of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie's agents (Spain!) (Leon Trotsky, The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International, 1938)

The capitulation of the “Trotskyists” on the Constitutional Assembly in Bolivia is connected to their perspective to support sectors of the bourgeoisie.

Why keeping a formulation which has resulted into disasters for more than eighty years?

We find it curious that, whereas you insist on the necessity to amend the outmoded character of the 1938 formula on the productive forces, you show respect for a formula dating at least from 1922. It proved to be outmoded even at the time of the 3rd International, and it has been used to conceal the worst mistakes of the

“Trotskyists” afterwards. It was also decisive in the destruction of the 4th International.

We share your opinion that, with reference to the Lenin's Anti-Imperialist United Front tactics, the 4th International and its epigones made many unprincipled alliances with national bourgeois parties in the imperialist world. However, this does not prove for us that this tactics is absolutely wrong. We found no passage, after 1927, in which Trotsky had a positive or a negative attitude to it. Whether it took a wrong path since the beginning and should then be retrospectively rejected, or it is basically correct even if its achievement is very unlikely and will be more and more unlikely, is still an open question to us.

The 3rd International wavered over strategy for the backward countries, in particular over class alliances, as discussed during the 2nd Congress of the Communist International (1920), the 1st Congress of the Peoples of the East (1920), and the 4th Congress of the Comintern (1922).

At Lenin's insistence, understanding the revolutionary character of the movement of the peoples of the colonies and other dominated countries, the Communist International projected the victorious strategy of the Bolshevik Party in Russia onto the world scale as an alliance of the proletariat of Europe with the peasants of the countries of Asia.

With regard to the more backward states and nations, in which feudal or patriarchal and patriarchal-peasant relations predominate, it is particularly important to bear in mind the need, in backward countries, to give special support to the peasant movement against the landowners, against landed proprietorship, and against all manifestations or survivals of feudalism, and to strive to lend the peasant movement the most revolutionary character by establishing the closest possible alliance between the West European communist proletariat and the revolutionary peasant movement in the East... (Theses on the National and Colonial Questions, 2nd CI Congress, 1920)

But this leaves open the question of the orientation in practice *within* the dominated countries. During the debates of the 3rd International, Lenin accepted a strategy different from what he put forward in Russia increasingly clearly after 1903: the democratic revolution will be led by a bloc between the working class and the peasantry, and it is necessary to reject any alliance with the Russian “liberal” bourgeoisie. Lenin started from the feebleness of the communist nuclei and the weakness of the proletariat in these countries:

We have here quite a number of representatives of the revolutionary movement in the colonial and backward countries. This is only a small beginning, but the important thing is that a beginning has been made. At this Congress we see taking place a union between revolutionary proletarians of the capitalist, advanced countries, and the revolutionary masses of those countries where there is no or hardly any proletariat... (Vladimir Lenin, Report on the World Situation and Tasks of the CI, 2nd Congress of the CI, 1920)

From this Lenin deduced the necessity of an alliance with the national bourgeoisie:

The Communist International must enter into a temporary alliance with bourgeois democracy in the colonial and backward countries, but should not merge with it, and should under all circumstances uphold the independence of the proletarian movement even if it is in its most embryonic form. (Vladimir Lenin, Outline of Theses on the National Question, 1920)

He clashes with Manabendra Nath Roy (India) who said:

The gap in the colonial countries between the bourgeois democratic movement led by the bourgeoisie and the movement of the workers and poor peasants worsens unceasingly. The former tries to control the later. The CI must oppose to this control... (Communist International and Colonial Problems and India, 1921-22)

The result of the debate was rather confused. Certain aspects among the most debatable of the theses projected by Lenin were mitigated. Thus they were unanimously adopted by the 2nd Congress along with the “Complementary Theses” of Roy, which were more contradictory than complementary, according to the proposal of Henk Sneevliet (Indonesia). The false character of Lenin's positions was rapidly confirmed in Turkey, where the bourgeois nationalist movement assassinated in 1921 Mustafa Suphi, the delegate to the 1st Congress of the CI, and massacred the entire leadership of the young Communist Party.

Between the 3rd and the 4th Congress, the KPD and the leadership of the 3rd International adopted the tactic of the “workers' united front” based on the German experience and the Russian Revolution. By definition, the *workers'* united front rejects any alliance with the bourgeoisie:

The precise task of the CI and its sections will be to reveal to the masses the hypocrisy of the workers leaders who prefer the union with the bourgeoisie... By unity of the proletarian front, it is necessary to

understand the unity of all the workers wishing to fight capitalism... (Thesis on the Unity of the Proletarian Front, 1922)

The 4th Congress of the CI adopted ambiguous theses for countries under domination. Along with all kinds of correct claims, it asserted that the bourgeoisie can play a progressive role in Asia, and it envisages alliances between the bourgeoisie and the workers' party under the term "Anti-Imperialist United Front."

The fundamental task, commune with all the national revolutionary movements, consists in carrying out the national unity and the political autonomy. The real and logical solution of this task depends on the importance of the working masses that any national movement will be able to involve in its course, after having broken all relations with the feudal elements and reactionaries... Just as the slogan of the proletarian united front has contributed and still contributes in Occident to uncover the treason, by the social democrats, of the interests of the proletariat, the slogan of the anti-imperialist united front will contribute to uncover the hesitations and uncertainties of the various groups of bourgeois nationalism. (General Theses on the Orient Question, 1922)

If the Anti-Imperialist United Front in backward countries corresponds to the workers' united front in the advanced countries and if the superior form of the workers' united front (as Trotsky said later) is the Soviet, what is the superior form of the Anti-Imperialist United Front?

The Anti-Imperialist United Front is the proposal by the communist parties for a *political* coalition with the *bourgeois* nationalism in dominated countries. The reporter of the Commission on the issue of Orient, Karl Radek, addressed explicitly the 4th Congress:

The 2nd Congress had decided to support the bourgeois nationalist movement in the colonies: it was a right decision and it is necessary to continue to conform to it, in spite of the "treason" of Kemal Pasha in Turkey, which represents an episode of the class struggle. In the East, the revolution is not close and we should not be over-estimated the revolutionary forces...

In China, "bourgeois nationalism" was called the Kuomintang. The Chinese communists entered the Kuomintang in 1923. In 1926, Bukharin and Stalin gave them the assignment not to create Soviets but to slow the workers down so as not to discomfort the Kuomintang. In 1927, the 3rd International founds an "anti-imperialist Alliance" on the world scale with the Kuomintang; Chiang Kai-Shek, leader of the

Kuomintang, is appointed as honour member of the 3rd International.

The crushing of the proletarian revolution in China in 1927 and the massacre of CCP members by the Kuomintang made necessary a programmatic rectification which a part of the Opposition had already outlined.

By adopting the strategy of the permanent revolution, the 4th International removes an ambiguity of the 3rd International

Since 1922, there has been a revolution and a counter-revolution in China. This marked the birth of the *International Left Opposition*.

There was the Russian Revolution. It is a test. Then the Chinese Revolution - it is by there that we started. (Leon Trotsky, Discussion on a Possible Fusion with Lovestonists, 1938)

When Stalin and Bukharin invented "socialism in one country," forgot Lenin's advice and trespassed the safeguards of the first four congresses of the CI, regressing back to Menshevism and plunging into the alliance with the Kuomintang, Trotsky multiplied his warnings against submission to the nationalist leadership, called for leaving the Kuomintang and for dissolving the Anti-Imperialist Alliance, and drew essential, decisive, lessons from the tragedy of the Chinese revolution:

The Chinese revolution has a bourgeois national content... Whatever the relative importance of the "feudal" elements, they can be swept only by the revolutionary way, so by the fight against the bourgeoisie and not in alliance with it. (Leon Trotsky, the Chinese Revolution and theses of Stalin, 1927)

If you agree with that, what is left from the "Anti-Imperialist United Front"?

No decision of the CI was infallible. The first four congresses were inadequate concerning democracy within the party, fascism, the analysis of the capitalist economy, class alliances in countries under domination... Likewise, the revolutionary cadres had to urgently deal with problems for which Marx and Engels left them no precise guidelines. In the light of eighty years of retreat, the AIUF must be regarded as a confused, anachronous and dangerous formula, testimony to a revolutionary stage of our history but certainly not a slogan for the present.

As with the programmatic documents from 1930 to 1940

which were adopted by the 4th International, our reference to the first four congresses of the 3rd International means that we value its basic strategy, not every sentence and above all not the tactic of the Anti-Imperialist United Front which history has proved wrong.

Equally formalistic is your statement that you find unacceptable the statutes of the French Ligue Communiste which refer to the first four Congresses of the CI. In all likelihood, there is not French comrade who holds that everything in the decisions of the first four congresses is infallible and immutable. It is for them a question of the basic strategic line. (Leon Trotsky, To the Editorial Board of Prometeo, 1930)

After the experiences of the CI in the countries under domination, the Left Opposition extended and systematized the strategy of Permanent Revolution, which had been conceived by Trotsky for Tsarist Russia and which was entirely confirmed by 1917. Even if the abandonment of the erroneous theses of the CI was not explicit, for reasons easy to understand at a time when the Stalinists were slandering the Bolsheviks-Leninists and setting Lenin against Trotsky, the AIUF was never cited by the Left Opposition, and it is clear to every careful reader that Trotsky had dropped it. The Groupe Bolchevik challenged the POR of Argentina to find a reference to it in the documents of the 4th International during Trotsky's lifetime. We still await the answer.

One of the most decisive contributions of Trotsky is that, in our epoch of capitalist decay, the working class must bring itself to the head of every revolution, even in backward countries where it is socially a minority.

Not only the agrarian, but also the national question assigns to the peasantry—the overwhelming majority of the population in backward countries—an exceptional place in the democratic revolution. Without an alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry the tasks of the democratic revolution cannot be solved, nor even seriously posed. But the alliance of these two classes can be realized in no other way than through an irreconcilable struggle against the influence of the national-liberal bourgeoisie. (Leon Trotsky, The Permanent Revolution, 1931)

The 4th International clearly advises as a strategy the alliance of wage workers with the independent workers and the youth organizations, under the hegemony of the proletariat.

It is necessary to distinguish the united front from common actions... A common action, in particular a short-term action, is a thing. But the capitulation in front of the bourgeoisie, a plain permanent front as

the French Popular Front is another thing. It is completely different... We must promote a united front with the peasants organisations and students organisations. (Leon Trotsky, Discussions on China, 1935)

Up through 1927 Radek defended the adhesion of the CCP to the Kuomintang, and he kept justifying it afterwards. From 1934 on, the leadership of the 3rd International and the Communist Parties in the imperialist countries foundered into patriotism, making Stalinism the twin of social democracy and confirming the diagnosis of the Left Opposition in 1933: the 3rd International is dead as a revolutionary organization. The bureaucracy of the USSR, the social force which controls the 3rd International and which turned it into its own instrument, extends the Anti-Imperialist United Front even to the advanced countries, including those which had a bourgeois revolution, under the name of the Popular Front. In the countries under domination, submitting the proletariat to the national bourgeoisie led to many defeats: Greece in 1944, Iran in 1953, Iraq in 1958, Indonesia in 1965, Jordan in 1970, Chile in 1973, etc.

The 1938 program was not limited to transitional demands. It also rejected the Popular Front for backward countries (and therefore the Anti-Imperialist United Front) as well as for advanced countries, and it updated and improved the strategy of the world revolution by including the question of the degenerated workers' state (*political revolution*) and by clarifying the class character of the revolution in backward countries (*permanent revolution*).

The relative weight of the individual democratic and transitional demands in the proletariat's struggle, their mutual ties and their order of presentation, is determined by the peculiarities and specific conditions of each backward country and to a considerable extent by the degree of its backwardness. Nevertheless, the general trend of revolutionary development in all backward countries can be determined by the formula of the permanent revolution. (Leon Trotsky, The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International, 1938)

Moreover, the 1940 manifesto rejects Radek's Anti-Imperialist United Front and any political coalition with the bourgeoisie:

The fight for the national independence of the colonies is, from the point of view of the revolutionary proletariat, a transitory stage on the road which will plunge the backward countries into the international socialist revolution. The 4th International does not draw up a wall between

backward countries and advanced ones, between democratic and socialist revolutions. It combines them and subordinates them to the world struggle of the oppressed against the oppressors. Just as the only authentically revolutionary force of our time is the international proletariat, in the same way the only true program for the liquidation of any oppression, social or national, is that of the permanent revolution. (Leon Trotsky, The Imperialist War and the World Proletarian Revolution, 1940)

In 1922, the Anti-Imperialist United Front was a mistake; in 1951, it was a crime

In 1951, at the 3rd Congress, the leadership of the 4th International itself revised the program at the 3rd Congress of the FI. In 1952 it turned to the liquidation of the International with the expulsion of the French section, which had opposed its deviations before the 3rd Congress, and with the support by the International Secretariat for the pro-Stalinist factions in the British and American sections.

The Pablo-Mandel-Maitan-Frank-Posadas International Secretariat considered that the Stalinist bureaucracy, or at least a decisive part of it, was able to change and to adopt "Trotskyism," – which made superfluous the construction of workers' revolutionary parties of the Bolshevik type. In countries where the bureaucracy had usurped the power of the working class (Yugoslavia, China, Eastern Europe and USSR), the political revolution, the perspective of defeating the bureaucracy by the working class, was actually abandoned. In countries under the rule of Stalinist parties, the International Secretariat ordered its sections to join the ruling communist parties. In the dominated countries, especially in Latin America where there existed several sections, it meant adaptation to the policy of the Stalinists and to the Popular Fronts.

At the 3rd Congress of the 4th International in 1951, its leaders Pablo and Mandel regressed into the "Anti-Imperialist United Front," that is, the alliance with sectors of the national bourgeoisie, against the strategy of the permanent revolution, which was the explicit programmatic basis of the Bolshevik-Leninist international. As Pablo could not openly act at that stage, he intermingled orthodox formulations with the affirmation – hesitant or concealed – of an orientation that led him to become an adviser to an Algerian bourgeois government. The maneuver went like this:

1. First, Pablo called for *temporary* alliances with anti-imperialist movements of the petty-bourgeoisie – something which is actually possible, and even necessary, in certain circumstances.

The proletariat and its party could be brought to lead momentary alliances with one or another such movement of the petty bourgeoisie for limited and precise goals of common action. (Resolution on the Latin America, 1951)

2. Then he fraudulently presented bourgeois nationalist movements (APRA, MNR) as petty-bourgeois.

What distinguishes us from the past, what determines the quality of our current movement and which constitutes the surest pledge of our future victories, is our increasing capacity to understand, to appreciate the movement of the masses such as it exists... and to seek to find our place in this movement... It is the case for example in Latin America where the mass anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist movement often takes confused forms, under a petty bourgeois leadership, as in Peru with the APRA, as in Bolivia with the MNR, or even bourgeois as in Brazil with Vargas, as in Argentina with Perón. (Michel Pablo, Report to the 3rd Congress, 1951)

3. Finally Pablo introduced the alliance with the bourgeoisie, the Popular Front against which the 4th International was founded, under the formula "anti-imperialist united front." This term seemed to him more acceptable for a congress of the 4th International taking place eleven years after the assassination of Trotsky.

In Bolivia, our section... will try to influence the left wing of the MNR... It will recommend a tactic of anti-imperialist united front towards the whole of the MNR... (Resolution on the Latin America, 1951)

One of the weakest points of the International Committee of the 4th International, the fraction founded in 1953 by the sections which resisted Pabloism (China, France, Great Britain, Switzerland, USA), was its inability to question this 1951 revision and to draw lessons from its application in Bolivia in 1952. Worse, under the leadership of Pierre Lambert, the PCI of France adopted this revision with regard to the nationalist movement in Algeria (MNA) in the second half of the 1950's. Under the leadership of Gerry Healy, the WRP of Britain applied it to the bourgeois nationalist regimes in the Middle East in the end of the 1970's. Today again, almost all the currents which claim to represent the 4th International and Trotskyism advocate the "Anti-Imperialist United Front," including the CRI of France and the L5I (the former LRCI).

Indeed, the illegitimate introduction of the Popular Front under the hypocritical formula of Anti-Imperialist United Front has been used to cover real betrayals of the proletariat under the banner of the 4th International. In Bolivia, Argentina, Peru, Sri Lanka, Algeria... Pabloism

has reproduced the policy of social-democracy and Stalinism. During the Bolivian revolutions in 1952 and 1971, this programmatic revision and historical regression resulted in the subordination of the proletariat to the bourgeoisie, identically to the politics of Stalinism.

The Anti-Imperialist United Front in practice is the Popular Front

In practice, Pablo and Mandel's line went beyond "temporary alliances for limited and precise goals," both in its objective and in time, and it rapidly extended to nationalisms that were judged bourgeois by the 1951 resolution, like the Justicialist Movement in Argentina. Two Argentinean groups took part to the 3rd Congress, the section recognized by the International Secretariat, the GCI led by Posadas, and the POR led by Moreno. The delegation of the POR, including Moreno, made a self-criticism:

Two POR delegates make a self-criticism: the direction of our party was against the slogan of anti-imperialist united front ... (Declaration of the Argentinean POR at the Latin-American Commission, 1951)

Thus inspired by the 3rd Congress of the FI, the POR lined up under the banner of bourgeois nationalism. During his entire career, Moreno was to build "mass parties" claiming allegiance to Perón, and then to Castroism.

The 1953 general strike in East Germany and the 1956 revolution in Hungary, like the 1952 revolution in Bolivia, rapidly proved the failure of Pabloism. The POR Bolivia had a working class basis, with a tradition and an influence. It played a major role in the insurrection of April 1952. A revolution led by a Bolshevik-Leninist party was within reach in Bolivia. It would have changed the situation in all Latin America, it would have returned the 4th International onto the [correct] programmatic road, and it would have been an inspiration to the whole world. Alas, against all the lessons of Bolshevism, against the permanent revolution, the POR supported the MNR bourgeois government of Paz Estenssoro, aligned with Lechín's "left wing" in the bourgeois nationalist party – the MNR – which controlled the new workers' federation, the COB. Lechín was appointed minister in the bourgeois government.

A Bolivian government which will obey the will of the Bolivians and not of the Yanks... The petty bourgeois government, owing to the force of political circumstances, has the possibility of being transformed and changed into a phase of the Workers and Peasants government. (POR, Lucha Obrera, May 25, 1952, quoted byr José Villa, La

Revolución de 1952, Poder Obrero, 1992)

The POR will support the left wing of the MNR in its fights against the line of the party... (Lucha Obrera, November 11, 1952)

The working class must actively intervene in the formation of the new government. (Lucha Obrera, November 11, 1952)

The whole fight is centred on the slogan: control total of the state by the left wing of the MNR. (POR, June 23, 1953)

Consequently, thanks to the MNR, aided by its left wing which in turn was flanked by the POR, the Bolivian bourgeoisie preserved control of the situation, rebuilt its army and was able to re-establish order. The POR splintered from 1953 to 1956, a good part of its cadre joining the MNR. In 1971, the remainder of the POR counted on generals to arm the proletariat. After the working class was crushed, Guillermo Lora, the hopeless partisan of the Anti-Imperialist United Front, entered into a political coalition with the Stalinists and the bourgeois nationalists who opposed the Banzer dictatorship – in short, a true Popular Front.

In 1956, the POR of Peru supported, together with the Stalinist party, the candidacy of Belaúnde sponsored by the national front of young democrats, who founded the bourgeois party Acción Popular. Later he became president twice. As far as what remained of the POR, it became a Castroist follower of peasant guerrilla under the name of FIR. In 1985, the sister organization of the LCR dissolved into the PUM, which called for voting for the reactionary Fujimori in 1990.

In Sri Lanka (Ceylon), the LSSP, with a significant working class basis, also implemented the Anti-Imperialist United Front. In 1956, the LSSP critically supported the bourgeois SLFP when the latter took the power. In 1960, the LSSP supported the SLFP again during the elections. In 1964, the LSSP entered the bourgeois government. The most important FI section in Asia was destroyed.

The alliance with the bourgeoisies in Asia, which was advocated by Lenin at the 2nd Congress of the 3rd International in 1920 for the countries without a real working class, and then formalized under the title "Anti-Imperialist United Front" in 1922 by Radek, proved to be a historical dead-end: the bourgeoisies in countries under domination have no more revolutionary role to play than did the bourgeoisie in Russia in 1905 and in 1917. Besides, the development of the productive forces numerically strengthened the proletariat in many former colonies and semi-colonies: South Africa, Brazil, Mexico, South Korea...

Late Nahuel Moreno ended up questioning permanent revolution, like the late Tony Cliff before him, linked with the strategic slogan of the Constituent Assembly. As for the Cliffite SWP, it has more than once supported Muslim reactionaries in countries under domination. In its own country, it takes part in a petty-bourgeois nationalist party (SSP) in Scotland and it has itself sponsored a Popular Front coalition (Respect) in England with a Muslim organization (MAB) and a reformist leader who favors immigration controls and opposes abortion (Galloway).

The adoption by the LICR of the "Anti-Imperialist United Front" led WP and its L5I to adulate the World Social Forum, like the SWP and its IST, and to a policy of putting pressure on the ruling Popular Front in Brazil:

The Brazilian working class, poor landless peasants and small farmers must be welded into an unstoppable power to force the Lula government off the path of enslavement to the IMF and its domestic backers and onto the road of confrontation with Brazilian capitalism. (Fifth International n 2, p. 91)

The L5I nourished the grotesque hope that the PT-PSDB-PDT-PRB government will "confront capitalism".

Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva is a candidate for his own succession... Mr. Lula da Silva will be accompanied by the same vice-president, José Alencar, of the Brazilian Republican Party, linked to the Evangelists. (Le Monde, June 26, 2006)

For the L5I, the perspective for the working class is to pressure a *bourgeois* government. It is following the

tracks of the GR, the POUM, the LSSP, the MIR and many others, including the so called 4th International which has now a minister in the Lula-Alencar government. With the shibboleth of the Popular Front, the L5I proves itself to be a variant of centrism and revisionism. Its line of a "fighting Popular Front" (Marceau-Pivert) is antagonistic to the program of *breaking with the bourgeoisie*.

The central task of the Fourth International consists in freeing the proletariat from the old leadership, whose conservatism is in complete contradiction to the catastrophic eruptions of disintegrating capitalism and represents the chief obstacle to historical progress. The chief accusation which the Fourth International advances against the traditional organizations of the proletariat is the fact that they do not wish to tear themselves away from the political semi-corpse of the bourgeoisie... Of all parties and organizations which base themselves on the workers and peasants and speak in their name, we demand that they break politically from the bourgeoisie and enter upon the road of struggle for the workers' and farmers' government. On this road we promise them full support against capitalist reaction. At the same time, we indefatigably develop agitation around those transitional demands which should in our opinion form the program of the "workers' and farmers' government." (Leon Trotsky, The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International, 1938)

[from a letter of CoReP to GRA / Austria, July 2006]



Colectivo Revolución Permanente: ¿Frente único antiimperialista o revolución permanente?

Las citas del texto son parte de un largo debate escrito con el GRA , una organización austriaca formada el 2005 y compuesta por antiguos miembros de la ahora L5I, por activistas sin grupo previo y un miembro del Corep. En este intercambio de cartas el Corep intentó ganar a todo el GRA para sus posiciones. El intento falló y los partidarios del Corep fueron excluidos el 2007. Una diferencia crucial fue la cuestión del frente único antimperialista. Después de algunas necesarias clarificaciones políticas y de la fase intermedia de publicación del boletín “Nuevo Curso”, ex miembros del GRA fundaron el Grupo Lucha de Clase, que es hoy la sección austriaca del Corep.

Por la alianza del proletariado, los otros trabajadores y la juventud en formación

Tenéis perfecta razón al destacar que una posición correcta sobre Bolivia exige responder a la cuestión agraria. En particular en países como Perú o Bolivia, la cuestión de la alianza con la paisanaje sigue siendo esencial.

Debemos promover un "frente único" con las organizaciones de estudiantes y campesinas. (León Trotsky, Debates sobre China, 1935)

La acumulación del capital conduce, a escala mundial, a colocar cada vez la contradicción principal de nuestro tiempo a nivel más elevado, más capital contra más proletariado. A escala mundial, una de las consecuencias más importantes es el debilitamiento numérico del pequeña-burguesía tradicional (en particular los campesinos) y el refuerzo numérico de la clase obrera (trabajadores, empleados, técnicos, etc). En los países avanzados, las necesidades de la explotación y de cohesión social, así como la presión de las capas intermedias y del proletariado por alcanzar instrucción y cualificación, consiguen una nueva situación: una mayoría de juventud se forma en vez de ser inmediatamente explotada.

Sin embargo, las formaciones sociales del principio del siglo XXI llevan las marcas de la decadencia del capitalismo: enorme ejército de reserva de la economía (parados) y reducción de las plantillas industriales en los países imperialistas, multiplicación de los profesionales de los cuerpos de represión (ejército, policía, funcionarios de prisiones, milicias privadas...) y de

algunas capas pequeño- burguesas (profesiones liberales y sobre todo cuadros en los países avanzados, trabajadores independientes en las ciudades de los países dominados).

La conservación artificial de las capas pequeño-burguesas desde hace tiempo caducas no reduce de ningún modo las contradicciones sociales. Al contrario, las vuelve especialmente mórbidas. Añadiéndose al ejército permanente de los parados, es la expresión más maligna de la podredumbre del capitalismo. (León Trotsky, 90 años de Manifiesto comunista, 1937)

Los comunistas deben encontrar consignas para responder a esta situación: Alianza obrera y popular? ¿Alianza de todos los trabajadores (asalariados, independientes y en formación)? En cualquier caso, la consigna de Gobierno obrero y campesino no tiene ya sentido en los países de Europa, Norteamérica, Oceanía y Asia donde ya hay más estudiantes e incluso ingenieros o médicos que campesinos trabajadores.

Hay un único pueblo oprimido en Palestina

Nosotros consideramos absolutamente necesario añadir que preconizamos conjuntamente los plenos derechos de los trabajadores israelíes-judíos y que los trabajadores israelíes-judíos y palestinos deben combatir conjuntamente contra sus regímenes reaccionarios respectivos y contra el imperialismo mundial.

Salvo problema de traducción, esta simetría entre trabajadores palestinos y judíos supuestamente para

luchar contra su régimen reaccionario respectivo es engañosa. Algunos tienen todos los derechos, otros no tienen ninguno. Desemboca en la solución de los "dos Estados" de la ONU y de las potencias imperialistas.

El Colectivo conviene que las consignas transitorias, o incluso de las consignas democráticas, desempeñarán un gran papel en la movilización de las masas bajo hegemonía del proletariado. Precisamente por eso no ponemos sobre el mismo plano a un Estado opresor (Israel) y a un pueblo oprimido (los árabes de Palestina). Jamás se ha visto ningún tanque palestino en el territorio de Israel, mientras que el ejército sionista surca toda la Palestina, incluidos los guetos de la Autoridad palestina, aterroriza allí a los árabes, destruye sus culturas, sus infraestructuras y sus viviendas. Si bien es cierto que solamente el proletariado del Oriente Próximo puede solucionar la cuestión nacional, los trabajadores judíos de Israel no pueden allí cumplir plenamente su papel más que si *consiguen romper con el nacionalismo judío*, mientras que los trabajadores palestinos deben ponerse *a la cabeza de la lucha contra la opresión nacional* de la que son víctimas los árabes de Palestina (los de Israel y los de los Territorios) y los refugiados palestinos. El Colectivo no oculta que está a favor de la destrucción del Estado colonial, enlace del imperialismo americano en la región, como condición previa de una Palestina donde los Judíos ateos o israelitas tendrán el derecho a vivir tanto como los árabes ateos, musulmanes o cristianos en el marco de la federación socialista del Próximo oriente.

El Colectivo revolución permanente mantiene que solamente la unidad de los trabajadores de toda la región en torno a los Palestinos oprimidos en Israel, en los Territorios y en los campos de refugiados abrirá la posibilidad de una Palestina tanto para los Judíos como los Árabes, laicos, democráticos y socialistas, que sólo será viable en la federación socialista del Próximo Oriente. (¡Liberación de los militantes de la FPLP! 2006)

El Colectivo rechaza toda adaptación a las burguesías imperialistas y a su ONU, lo que conduce a la justificación del Estado colonial de Israel, toda adaptación al islamismo reaccionario bajo pretexto de frente único antiimperialista con la burguesía palestina y los regímenes árabes (o persa) de la vecindad.

La Asamblea Constituyente puede transformarse en nudo corredizo en torno al cuello del proletariado

Relacionada - a nuestro modo de ver - con el tema de la conciencia de la clase obrera está vuestra posición sobre la Asamblea Constituyente. Naturalmente, la rechazamos como estrategia pero en algunas situaciones es una táctica buena y

necesaria. En Bolivia, la rechazasteis porque visiblemente partíais de que la gran mayoría de las masas bolivianas ya había roto con el reformismo y de que la reivindicación de Asamblea Constituyente sólo serviría para alejarlas de la lucha por el poder. Algunos camaradas del GRA no ven las cosas así. Según su estimación las masas oprimidas y explotadas de Bolivia que viven de manera aislada y extremadamente dispersa han demostrado ciertamente su energía revolucionaria pero todavía no han roto con ilusiones reformistas esenciales. Estos camaradas creen que la táctica de la constituyente revolucionaria habría sido una posibilidad de curar las masas de sus ilusiones reformistas.

A los reformistas y a los centristas les gusta recordar que Luxemburg criticó la disolución de la Asamblea nacional por el Partido bolchevique. Olvidan que, ella misma, enfrentada al nudo corredizo democrático que los dirigentes del SPD apretaban en torno al cuello del proletariado alemán y a los consejos obreros, escribió poco antes de su asesinato por el Gobierno socialdemócrata:

La Asamblea nacional es una herencia caduca de las revoluciones burguesas, una vaina vacía, un residuo del tiempo de las ilusiones pequeño-burguesas sobre el "pueblo unido", sobre la "libertad, igualdad, fraternidad" del Estado burgués. El que, hoy, recurre a la asamblea nacional, quiere, consciente o inconscientemente, hacer retroceder la revolución hasta la fase histórica de las revoluciones burguesas; es un agente camuflado de la burguesía... (Rosa Luxemburg, La Asamblea nacional, 1918)

La consigna temporal de Asamblea nacional o constituyente sólo tiene sentido en las circunstancias donde la masa de la población, en particular la mayoría de los pequeño-burgueses, ve que se le niega todo derecho a intervenir en la vida política oficial por el opresor extranjero o por un régimen autóctono autoritario:

La consigna de asamblea nacional - o constitutiva - conserva todo su valor en países como China o la India. (La Agonía del capitalismo y las tareas de la Cuarta internacional, 1938)

El socialismo no resulta de la democracia burguesa, como lo ha aventurado en sucesivas ocasiones Ted Grant o Peter Taaffe, sino del poder de los soviets:

En una determinada etapa de la movilización de las masas sobre las consignas de la democracia revolucionaria, los soviets pueden y deben surgir. Su papel histórico en cada período dado, en

particular sus relaciones con la asamblea nacional, viene determinado por el nivel político del proletariado, por la conexión entre éste y la clase campesina, y por la naturaleza de la política del partido proletario. Pronto o tarde, los soviets deben acabar con la democracia burguesa. (León Trotsky, La agonía del capitalismo y las tareas de la Cuarta internacional, 1938, GB, p. 33)

El Gobierno del MAS utiliza la Asamblea Constituyente para impedir la aparición de órganos soviéticos como la Asamblea popular indígena de El Alto y la Coordinación de Cochabamba de junio de 2005.

Los epígonos siguen a los nacionalistas burgueses y a los reformistas que transforman las consignas democráticas, que no pueden ser sino coyunturales, en nudo corredizo en torno al proletariado como en Francia en 1945, en Brasil en 1985 y en Bolivia en 2006. Por ejemplo, la LCR Francia, que ha renunciado abiertamente a la dictadura proletariado, que votó a favor de Chirac en 2002, que ha llevado la campaña por al No en el referéndum de la Unión Europea con el PCF y partido chauvinista MRC, aprueba la Asamblea constituyente:

El éxito electoral de Evo Morales es el fruto de las movilizaciones populares bolivianas por la nacionalización de los hidrocarburos y los recursos naturales, por la defensa e industrialización de la producción de hoja de coca, por una política económica soberana respecto a los imperialismos norteamericano y europeo, por una sociedad democrática fundada por una nueva Asamblea constituyente. (LCR, Comunicado, 19 de diciembre de 2005)

El PT Francia, una secta social- chauvinista que no defiende el derecho a entrar de los trabajadores inmigrantes, que hizo campaña contra la constitución europea con el MRC, está por la Asamblea Constituyente, en Francia como en Bolivia:

Bolivia: Ni elecciones anticipadas, ni sucesión. ¡Asamblea Constituyente soberana, nacionalización del petróleo y el gas! (Informations Ouvrières, 23 de junio de 2005)

Igualmente, el SWP Gran Bretaña, que fue el organizador del Foro social europeo de Londres en octubre de 2004, con el alcalde socialdemócrata Ken Livingstone, y que está comprometido con la constitución de un Frente Popular (Respect) en su propio país, sostiene la Asamblea Constituyente del Gobierno burgués de Bolivia.

El MAS debe ahora transformar sus propuestas en realidades, garantizando el crecimiento y respetando sus promesas: nacionalización de las

extensas reservas de hidrocarburos, reforma agraria, eliminación de la corrupción, inversiones masivas en la educación y la cultura, y organización de una Asamblea Constituyente prevista para agosto de 2006. (Socialist Worker, 7 janvier 2006)

WP Gran Bretaña sigue a su sede central:

La Asamblea Constituyente puede ser una herramienta potente para barrer los privilegios, la corrupción, la constitución antidemocrática, etc. (Workers Power, mayo de 2006)

¡Cuántas virtudes le prestan la LCR y el PT, el SWP y WP, a un simple cambio de la fachada del Estado burgués! En un país donde las libertades democráticas se restablecieron en 1982, donde las masas han expulsado a un Presidente elegido y han intentado crear de los órganos soviéticos, la Asamblea Constituyente no es más que otra tentativa de diversión por parte del Gobierno burgués.

El Colectivo rechazó efectivamente la consigna de Asamblea Constituyente en Argentina en 2001, en Bolivia en 2003 o en 2005, en Ecuador en 2005, pero no porque consideraba que las "masas ha roto con el reformismo". Intentamos tener en cuenta la situación concreta, la movilización real de las masas. Por una parte, las libertades democráticas, entre ellas el derecho a elegir los diputados, a adherirse a partidos políticos, existían en estos tres países. Por otra parte, la movilización revolucionaria de las masas proletarias y pequeño-burguesas choca, no con el régimen fascista o una monarquía absoluta, sino con a la democracia burguesa, con los organismos que resultan del sufragio universal, y expulsan al Presidente *elegido*.

El partido debe acordarse de que, con relación a su objetivo principal (la conquista del poder con las armas en la mano), las consignas democráticas sólo tienen un carácter secundario, provisional, momentáneo, episódico. (León Trotsky, La Cuestión china tras el 6º congreso de la Internacional comunista, 1928)

Las fórmulas de la democracia (libertad de asociación, de prensa, etc), sólo son para nosotros consignas momentáneas o episódicas en el movimiento independiente del proletariado, y no un nudo corredizo democrático pasado en torno al cuello del proletariado por los agentes de la burguesía (¡España!). (León Trotsky, La agonía del capitalismo y las tareas de la Cuarta internacional, 1938)

La capitulación de los epígonos sobre la Asamblea Constituyente en Bolivia está vinculada a su perspectiva de apoyo de los sectores de la burguesía.

¿Por qué mantener una formulación que ha conducido a catástrofes desde hace más de 80 años?

Curiosamente, mientras insistís mucho en la necesidad de corregir el carácter caduco de la fórmula de 1938 sobre las fuerzas productivas, seguís siendo respetuosos de una fórmula que se remonta al menos a 1922, que se reveló pasada del tiempo incluso con la 3ª Internacional y que sirvió posteriormente para cubrir los peores hábitos de los epígonos y desempeñó un papel preponderante en la destrucción de la 4ª Internacional.

Estamos de acuerdo con vosotros en que la 4ª Internacional y sus epígonos colaron numerosas alianzas sin principios con partes de la burguesía nacional en el mundo imperialista a nombre de la táctica de FUA de Lenin. Pero para nosotros eso no es ninguna prueba de que el FUA sea absolutamente falso. Hasta el momento no hemos encontrado ningún pasaje donde Trotsky después de 1927 se refiera en positivo o en negativo a la táctica de FUA. Que esta táctica haya tenido desde el principio ya una falsa trayectoria y deba ser pues retrospectivamente rechazada o que siga siendo básicamente correcta aunque su realización sea altamente improbable y sea cada vez más increíble sigue siendo una cuestión abierta para nosotros.

La 3ª Internacional vaciló sobre la estrategia en los países atrasados, en particular sobre las alianzas de clases, abordada en el 2º congreso de las IC (1920), el 1er congreso de los pueblos de Oriente (1920) y el 4º congreso de la IC (1922).

Comprendiendo, bajo la insistencia de Lenin, el carácter revolucionario del movimiento de los pueblos de las colonias y de los otros países dominados, la Internacional comunista proyectó la estrategia victoriosa del Partido bolchevique en Rusia a escala mundial como una alianza del proletariado de Europa con los campesinos de los países de Asia.

Es especialmente importante apoyar el movimiento campesino de los países atrasados contra la aristocracias, contra la gran propiedad de la tierra, contra todas las manifestaciones o supervivencias del feudalismo. Es necesario esforzarse en conferir al movimiento campesino el carácter más revolucionario, uniendo por todas partes donde eso es posible a los campesinos y todos los explotados en los soviets, y por ello mismo, realizando la unión más estrecha posible del proletariado comunista de Europa Occidental con el movimiento revolucionario de los campesinos en Oriente... (Tesis sobre las cuestiones nacional y colonial, 2º congreso de la IC, 1920)

Pero eso deja abierta la cuestión de la orientación a practicar en los países dominados. En los debates de la 3ª Internacional, Lenin acepta una estrategia diferente de aquélla que había preconizado en Rusia cada vez más claramente a partir de 1903: la revolución democrática será conducida por un bloque entre clase obrera y el campesinado, hay que rechazar toda alianza con la burguesía "liberal" rusa. Lenin parte de la debilidad de los núcleos comunistas y de la debilidad del proletariado en estos países.

No está mal la representación que tenemos aquí del movimiento revolucionario de los países capitalistas avanzados y de los países atrasados. Esto es sólo un pequeño principio, pero lo importante es que haya un principio. La unión de los proletarios revolucionarios de los países capitalistas avanzados con las masas revolucionarias de los países donde no hay o casi no hay proletariado... (Vladimir Lenin, Informe sobre la situación mundial y las tareas de la IC, 1920)

Lenin deduce la necesidad de una alianza con la burguesía nacional:

La Internacional Comunista debe concluir una alianza temporal con los demócratas burgueses de las colonias y los países atrasados... (Vladimir Lenin, Esbozo de tesis sobre la cuestión nacional, 1920)

Se enfrenta a Manabendra Nath Roy (India) que dice:

La ruptura en los países coloniales entre el movimiento democrático burgués dirigido por la burguesía y el movimiento de los obreros y campesinos pobres se agrava sin cesar. El primero intenta controlar al otro. La IC deben oponerse a este control...

El resultado del debate es más bien confuso. Se atenúan algunos aspectos de entre los más cuestionables del proyecto de tesis de Lenin. Así pues, se adoptan por unanimidad en el 2º congreso al mismo tiempo que las "tesis complementarias" de Roy que son más contradictorias que complementarias, bajo propuesta de Henk Sneevliet (Indonesia). El carácter equivocado de las posiciones de Lenin se comprueba rápidamente en Turquía, donde el movimiento nacionalista burgués asesina en 1921 a Mustafa Suphi, el delegado al 1er congreso de la IC y masacra a toda la dirección del joven Partido comunista.

Entre el 3º y el 4º congreso de la IC, el KPD y la dirección de la IC adoptan la táctica del "frente único obrero" a partir de la experiencia alemana (y de la revolución rusa). Por definición, el frente único obrero se opone a toda alianza con la burguesía:

La tarea precisa de la IC y sus secciones será revelar a las masas la hipocresía de los dirigentes obreros que prefieren a la unión con la burguesía... Por unidad del frente proletario, es necesario entenderla unidad de todos los trabajadores que desean combatir el capitalismo... (Tesis sobre la unidad del frente proletario, 1922)

El 4º congreso de la IC adopta tesis ambiguas para los países dominados. Junto a toda clase de afirmaciones correctas, podemos encontrar que la burguesía puede desempeñar un papel progresista en Asia y se prevén alianzas del partido obrero con ésta, bajo el vocablo "frente único antiimperialista" o "frente unido antiimperialista":

La tarea fundamental, común a todos los movimientos nacional- revolucionarios, consiste en realizar la unidad nacional y la autonomía política. La solución real y lógica de esta tarea depende de la importancia de las masas trabajadoras que tal o cual movimiento nacional sabrá implicar en su curso, después de haber roto todas las relaciones con los elementos feudales y reaccionarios... Así como la consigna del frente único proletario contribuyó y contribuye aún en Occidente a destapar la traición, por los socialdemócratas, de los intereses del proletariado, la consigna del frente antiimperialista único contribuirá a destapar las vacilaciones y las incertidumbres de los distintos grupos del nacionalismo burgués. (Tesis generales sobre la cuestión de Oriente, 1922)

Si el frente único antiimperialista en los países retrasados es el equivalente del frente único obrero en los países avanzados y si la forma superior del FUIO (como Trotsky lo dirá más tarde) es la soviética, ¿cuál es la forma superior del FUIAI? El FUIAI es la propuesta que hacen los partidos comunistas al nacionalismo burgués de los países dominados para formar un bloque político. El ponente de la Comisión sobre la cuestión de Oriente, Karl Radek, es explícito cuando se dirige al 4º congreso:

El 2º congreso decidió apoyar el movimiento nacionalista burgués en las colonias: era una decisión correcta y hay que seguir ajustándose a ellas, a pesar de la "traición" de Kemal Pacha en Turquía, que representa un episodio de la lucha de clase. En Oriente, la revolución no está próxima y no hay que sobrestimar las fuerzas revolucionarias...

El "nacionalismo burgués" se llamaba China Guomindang. Los comunistas chinos vuelven a entrar en 1923 en el Guomindang. Bujarin y Stalin, en 1926, les dan la consigna de no crear soviets, de frenar a los campesinos y los obreros, de no trastornar indisponer al Guomindang. En 1927, la IC funda una "Alianza

antiimperialista" a escala mundial con el Guomindang; Chiang Kai-shek, el jefe del Guomindang, es declarado miembro de honor de la IC.

El aplastamiento de la revolución proletaria en China en 1927 y la masacre de los militantes del PCC por el Guomindang requieren una rectificación programática que una parte de la Oposición rusa ya había esbozado.

La 4ª Internacional elimina una ambigüedad de la 3ª Internacional adoptando la estrategia de la revolución permanente

A partir de 1922, hubo una revolución y una contrarrevolución en China. Debéis tenerlo en cuenta, tanto más cuanto que es la partida de nacimiento de la Oposición de izquierda internacional.

Hubo la Revolución rusa. Es una prueba. Luego la Revolución china. Hemos empezado por aquí. (León Trotsky, Debate sobre una posible fusión con los lovestonistas, 1938)

Cuando Stalin y Bujarin inventan el "socialismo en un sólo país", olvidan las recomendaciones de Lenin y trasgreden lo construido en los cuatro primeros congresos de la IC, regresan al menchevismo y se abandonan en la alianza con el Guomindang, Trotsky multiplica las advertencias contra la sumisión a la dirección nacionalista, reclama la salida del Guomindang y la disolución de la Alianza antiimperialista y saca las lecciones esenciales, decisivas, de la tragedia de la revolución china:

La revolución china tiene un carácter nacional burgués... Cualquiera que sea la importancia relativa de los elementos "feudales", no pueden ser barridos sino por la vía revolucionaria, por lo tanto por la lucha contra la burguesía y no en alianza con ella. (León Trotsky, La Revolución china y las tesis de Stalin, 1927)

Si estáis de acuerdo con esta lección, qué es lo que queda del "frente único antiimperialista"?

Toda decisión de la IC no era infalible. Los cuatro primeros congresos son insuficientes sobre la democracia en el partido, sobre el fascismo, sobre el análisis de la economía capitalista, sobre las alianzas de clase en los países dominados... Los cuadros revolucionarios tenían la excusa de tener que tratar urgentemente de los problemas para los cuales Marx y Engels los habían dejado a veces sin línea precisa. Vosotros deberíais considerar el FUIAI, con la ventaja de 80 años de perspectiva, como una fórmula confusa, anacrónica y peligrosa, testimonio de una etapa pasada de nuestra historia, y sobre todo no como una consigna

para hoy.

Como para los textos programáticos de 1930 a 1940 adoptados por la 4ª Internacional, la referencia del Colectivo a los cuatro primeros congresos del 3ª Internacional vale para su línea estratégica básica, no para cada frase, y sobre todo no la táctica desmentida por la historia del FUIAI.

Igualmente formalista es vuestra declaración según la cual encentráis inaceptables los estatutos de la Liga comunista francesa, que se solidarizan con los cuatro primeros congresos del Internacional comunista. Con toda probabilidad, no hay un sólo camarada francés que piense que todas las decisiones de los cuatro primeros congresos son infalibles e incambiables. Es una cuestión de línea estratégica básica. (León Trotsky, Al comité de redacción de Prometeo, 1930)

Después de las experiencias de la IC en los países dominados, la Oposición de izquierda extiende y sistematiza la estrategia de *la revolución permanente* que Trotsky había concebido para la Rusia zarista y que fue enteramente verificada por 1917. Aunque el abandono de las tesis erróneas de la IC no es explícito, por razones fáciles de comprender en una época en la que los estalinistas calumnian a los leninistas bolcheviques y oponen Lenin a Trotsky, el FUIAI ya no es citado por la Oposición de izquierda de la IC y queda claro, para que quien lee atentamente Trotsky, que lo abandonó. El Grupo Bolchevik desafió al POR Argentina a encontrar cualquier referencia al frente unido antiimperialista en los documentos de la 4ª Internacional en vida de Trotsky. Todavía esperamos la respuesta.

Una de las contribuciones decisivas de Trotsky es que la clase obrera debe ponerse a la cabeza de toda revolución, incluso en los países atrasados donde es socialmente minoritaria.

Para los países con desarrollo burgués retardatario, y en particular para los países coloniales y semicoloniales, la teoría de la revolución permanente significa que la solución verdadera y completa de sus tareas democráticas y la liberación nacional no puede ser otra que la dictadura del proletariado, que toma la cabeza de la nación oprimida, sobre todo de sus masas campesinas... Pero la alianza entre estas dos clases no se realizará más que en una lucha implacable contra la influencia de la burguesa nacional. (León Trotsky, La Revolución permanente, 1931)

La 4ª Internacional preconiza claramente como estrategia la alianza de los trabajadores asalariados con los trabajadores independientes y juventud en

formación, bajo la hegemonía del proletariado:

Hay que distinguir el frente único de las acciones comunes... La acción común, en particular una acción a corto plazo, es una cosa. Pero la capitulación ante la burguesía, un "frente unido" permanente como el Frente Popular francés es otra cosa. Es completamente diferente... Debemos promover un "frente único" con las organizaciones de estudiantes y campesinas. (León Trotsky, Debates sobre China, 1935)

Radek defendió hasta 1927 la adhesión del PCC al Guomindang y siguió justificándolo a continuación. A partir de 1934, la dirección de la IC y los partidos comunistas de los países imperialistas se hundieron en el patriotismo, haciendo del estalinismo un gemelo de la socialdemocracia y confirmando el diagnóstico de la Oposición de izquierda de 1933: la 3ª Internacional murió como organización revolucionaria. La burocracia de la URSS, la fuerza social que controla la IC y que la transformó en un instrumento a su servicio, extiende el frente unido antiimperialista a los países avanzados mismos, incluidos los que ya habían conocido una revolución burguesa, bajo el nombre de Frente Popular. En los países dominados, esta orientación condujo a múltiples derrotas el proletariado que fue sometido a la burguesía nacional: Grecia 1944, Irán 1953, Irak 1958, Indonesia 1965, Jordania 1970, Chile 1973, etc

La contribución del programa de 1938 no se limita a las reivindicaciones transitorias. Va más allá, refuta el Frente Popular para los países atrasados (por tanto el frente único antiimperialista) lo mismo que para los países avanzados y actualiza y mejora la estrategia de la revolución mundial integrando la cuestión del Estado obrero degenerado (revolución política) y clarificando la naturaleza de clase de la revolución en los países postpuestos (revolución permanente).

El peso específico de las distintas reivindicaciones democráticas y transitorias en la lucha del proletariado, sus vínculos mutuos y su orden de sucesión están determinados por las particularidades y las condiciones propias de cada país atrasado, en una parte considerable por el grado de su atraso. Sin embargo, la dirección general del desarrollo revolucionario puede estar determinada por la fórmula de la revolución permanente. (León Trotsky, La agonía del capitalismo y las tareas de la 4ª Internacional, 1938)

Del mismo modo, el manifiesto de 1940 se opone al frente único antiimperialista de Radek, a todo bloque político con la burguesía:

La lucha por la independencia nacional de las

colonias, desde el punto de vista del proletariado revolucionario, no es más que una etapa transitoria en el camino que lleva a los países atrasados hacia la revolución socialista internacional. La 4ª Internacional no levanta una barrera estanca entre países atrasados y avanzados, revolución democrática y socialista. Los combina y los supedita a la lucha mundial de los oprimidos contra los opresores. Así como la única fuerza auténticamente revolucionaria de nuestro tiempo es el proletariado internacional, así mismo el único programa verdadero para la liquidación de toda opresión, social o nacional, es el de la revolución permanente. (León Trotsky, *La guerra imperialista y la revolución proletaria mundial*, 1940)

En 1922, el frente único antiimperialista era un error; en 1951, era un crimen

Pero en 1951, la misma dirección de la 4ª Internacional revisa el programa en el 3er congreso de la CI. Pasa en 1952 a la liquidación de la internacional, con la expulsión de la sección francesa, que se había opuesto, antes del 3er congreso, a sus desviaciones, y con el apoyo del Secretariado internacional a fracciones pro estalinistas en la sección británica y la sección americana.

El Secretariado internacional de Pablo-Mandel-Maitan-Frank-Posadas consideró que la burocracia estalinista, o al menos una fracción decisiva de ésta, era apta para reformarse y adoptar el "trotskismo", lo que volvía superflua la construcción de partidos obreros revolucionarios de tipo bolchevique. En los países donde la burocracia usurpaba el poder de la clase obrera (Yugoslavia, China, Europa del Este y la URSS) se abandona de hecho la revolución política, la perspectiva de que la clase obrera derroque a la burocracia. En los países donde domina el partido estalinista, el SI ordenará a las secciones que se incorporen a su interior. En los países dominados, en particular en América Latina donde existen un cierto número de secciones, eso significa la adaptación a la política del estalinistas, a los Frentes Populares.

En el 3er congreso de la 4ª Internacional, en 1951, sus dirigentes Pablo y Mandel vuelven al "frente único antiimperialista", es decir, a la alianza con sectores de la burguesía nacional, contra la estrategia de la revolución permanente que era la base programática explícita de la internacional bolchevique-leninista. Como Pablo no puede proceder abiertamente en esta etapa, embrolla frases ortodoxas con la afirmación - vacilante o disimulada - de una orientación que le conducirá a convertirse en el consejero del Gobierno burgués argelino. La maniobra es la siguiente:

1. Pablo llama a alianzas *momentáneas* con los

movimientos antiimperialistas de la *pequeña-burguesía*, lo que en efecto es posible, o incluso necesario, en algunos casos:

El proletariado y su partido podrán verse obligados a efectuar alianzas momentáneas con tal o cual movimiento de la pequeña-burguesía para objetivos limitados y precisos de acción común. (Resolución sobre América Latina, 1951)

2. Luego presenta fraudulentamente a los movimientos nacionalistas burgueses (APRA, MNR) como pequeños-burgueses:

Lo que nos distingue del pasado, lo que le da calidad a nuestro movimiento actual y que constituye la prenda más segura de nuestras victorias futuras, es nuestra capacidad creciente de comprender, de apreciar el movimiento de las masas tal y como existe... y de pretender encontrar nuestro lugar en este movimiento... Es el caso por ejemplo en América Latina donde el movimiento de las masas antiimperialista y anticapitalista toma a menudo formas confusas, bajo una dirección pequeño-burguesa, como en Perú con el APRA, como en Bolivia con el MNR, o incluso burguesa como en Brasil con Vargas, como en Argentina con Perón. (Michel Pablo, Informe al 3er congreso, 1951)

3. Lo que permite introducir la alianza con la burguesía, el Frente Popular contra el que se fundó la 4ª Internacional, bajo la etiqueta de "frente único antiimperialista" más aceptable para un congreso de la 4ª Internacional, sólo once años después del asesinato de Trotsky.

En Bolivia, nuestra sección... se esforzará por influenciar el ala izquierda del MNR... preconizará una táctica de frente único antiimperialista hacia el conjunto del MNR... (Resolución sobre América Latina, 1951)

Una de las más graves debilidades del Comité internacional de la CI, la fracción fundada en 1953 por las secciones que habían resistido al pablismo, fue su incapacidad que debe poner en entredicho esta revisión de 1951 y extraer las lecciones de su aplicación en Bolivia en 1952. Bajo la dirección de Pierre Lambert, el PCI Francia la adoptó hacia el movimiento nacionalista argelino (MNA) en la segunda mitad de los años cincuenta. Bajo la dirección de Gerry Healy, el WRP Gran Bretaña la aplicó con los regímenes nacionalistas burgueses del Próximo Oriente a mediados de los años setenta. Hoy aún, la casi totalidad de las corrientes que se reclaman de la 4ª Internacional y del trotskismo reivindican el "frente único antiimperialista", entre ellas el CRI Francia y L5I (ex LICR).

Ahora bien, la introducción de contrabando del *frente*

popular bajo la etiqueta hipócrita de frente único antiimperialista sirvió para cubrir verdaderas traiciones al proletariado en nombre de la 4ª Internacional. El pablismo reprodujo para Bolivia, Argentina, Perú, Sri Lanka, Argelia... la política de la socialdemocracia y el estalinismo. Durante las revoluciones bolivianas de 1952 y de 1971, esta revisión programática y esta regresión histórica desembocaron en la subordinación del proletariado a la burguesía, idéntica a la política estalinista.

El frente único antiimperialista en la práctica es siempre el frente popular

En la práctica, la línea de Pablo y Mandel superará, en su objeto y en el tiempo, las "*alianzas momentáneas para objetivos limitados y precisos*", se extenderá rápidamente a nacionalismos reconocidos por la Resolución de 1951 como burgueses, como el Movimiento justicialista de Argentina. Dos grupos argentinos participan en el 3er congreso, la sección reconocida por el SI, el GCI dirigido por Posadas, y el POR dirigido por Moreno. La delegación del POR, que incluye a Moreno, hace una autocrítica:

Los dos delegados del POR hacen una autocrítica: la dirección de nuestro partido estuvo en contra de la consigna de frente único antiimperialista... (Declaración del POR argentino a la Comisión latinoamericana, 1951)

Así inspirado por el 3er congreso, el POR iba a alinearse con la bandera del nacionalismo burgués. A lo largo de toda su carrera, Moreno construirá "partidos amplios", reclamándose de Perón, luego del castrismo.

La huelga general de 1953 en Alemania del Este y la revolución en Hungría de 1956, como la revolución en Bolivia de 1952, probaron rápidamente la quiebra del pablismo. El POR Bolivia tenía una base obrera, una tradición, una influencia. Desempeñó un gran papel en la insurrección de abril de 1952. Una revolución dirigida por un partido bolchevique-leninista estaba al alcance en Bolivia. Habría cambiado la situación de toda América Latina, habría vuelto a poner en la vía del programa a la 4ª Internacional y le habría dado un impulso en todo el mundo... Pero, contra todas las lecciones del bolchevismo, contra la revolución permanente, el POR dio su apoyo al Gobierno burgués MNR de Paz, el POR se alineó bajo "el ala izquierda" de Lechín (que era ministro del gobierno burgués), del partido nacionalista burgués que controlaba la nueva central obrera, la COB.

El Gobierno pequeño- burgués, gracias a las circunstancias, tiene la posibilidad de transformarse en Gobierno obrero y campesino. (Lucha Obrera, diario del POR, 25 de mayo de 1952, citado por José Villa, La Revolución de 1952, Poder Obrero, 1992)

El Partido obrero revolucionario sostendrá el ala izquierda del MNR en su lucha contra la derecha del partido... (Lucha Obrera, 11 de noviembre de 1952)

La clase obrera debe intervenir activamente en la formación del nuevo Gobierno. (Lucha Obrera, 11 de noviembre de 1952)

La totalidad de la lucha se centra en la consigna: control total del Estado por el ala izquierda del MNR. (BP del Partido obrero revolucionario, 23 de junio de 1953)

En consecuencia, la burguesía boliviana, gracias al MNR, ayudado por su ala izquierda, esta misma flanqueada por el POR, conservó el control de la situación, reconstituyó su ejército y pudo restablecer el orden. El POR estalló de 1953 a 1956, y una buena parte de sus cuadros se integraron en el MNR. En 1971, lo que quedaba del POR apostó por los generales para armar el proletariado. Después del aplastamiento de la clase obrera, Guillermo Lora, el impenitente partidario del FUI, se adhirió a un bloque político con los estalinistas y nacionalistas burgueses opuestos a la dictadura de Banzer, resumidamente, a un Frente Popular.

En 1956, el POR Perú apoyó, junto al partido estalinista, la candidatura de Belaúnde presentada por el Frente nacional de los jóvenes demócratas, que fundó el partido burgués Acción Popular. Belaunde será más tarde dos veces presidente. En cuanto a lo que quedaba del POR, iba a convertirse en un adepto castrista de la guerrilla campesina bajo el nombre de FIR. En 1985, la organización hermana de la LCR se disolvió en el PUM, que llamó a votar por el reaccionario Fujimori en 1990.

El LSSP Sri Lanka (Ceilán), que tenía una base obrera importante, también aplicó el frente único antiimperialista. En 1956, aportó su apoyo crítico al SLFP burgués cuando accedió al poder. En 1960, el LSSP sostuvo de nuevo el SLFP en las elecciones. En 1964, el LSSP volvió a entrar en el Gobierno burgués. La más importante sección de Asia era liquidada.

La alianza con las burguesías de Asia, preconizada por Lenin en 1920, en el 2º congreso de la IC, para los países sin auténtica clase obrera, formalizada bajo el nombre de "frente único antiimperialista" por Radek en 1922, se reveló un callejón sin salida histórico: las burguesías de los países dominados no tienen más papel revolucionario que la de Rusia en 1905 o en 1917. Además, el desarrollo de las fuerzas productivas que vosotros invocáis reforzó numéricamente el proletariado en muchas antiguas colonias o semicolonias: Sudáfrica, Brasil, México, Corea del Sur...

El difunto Nahuel Moreno terminó por cuestionar la revolución permanente, como el difunto Tony Cliff antes

que él. En la práctica, el SWP cliffiste apoyó la reacción musulmán en los países dominados en más de una ocasión. En su propio país, participa en un pequeño partido nacionalista-burgués (SSP) en Escocia y él mismo creó una coalición de Frente Popular (Respect) en Inglaterra con una organización musulmana (MAB) y un dirigente reformista partidario del control de la inmigración y antiabortista (Galloway).

La adopción por la LICR del "frente único antiimperialista" condujo al WP y su L5I a la adulación del Foro Social, como el SWP y su TSI, y a una política de presión sobre el Frente Popular en el poder en Brasil:

La clase obrera brasileña, los campesinos sin tierra y los pequeños agricultores deben soldarse en una fuerza irresistible para forzar al Gobierno Lula a salir del camino de la esclavitud al FMI y a sus apoyos locales, hacia la confrontación con el capitalismo brasileño. (Fifth Internacional n 2, p. 91)

La L5I alimenta la esperanza grotesca de ver al Gobierno PT-PSDB-PDT-PRB conducir una "confrontación con el capitalismo".

Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva es candidato a su propia sucesión... El Sr. Lula da Silva estará acompañado por el mismo Vicepresidente, José Alencar, del Partido republicano brasileño, vinculado a los evangelistas. (Le Monde, 26 de junio de 2006)

La L5I le da a la clase obrera como todo horizonte el de ejercer presión sobre un gobierno burgués. Camina sobre los rastros de la GR, el POUM, el LSSP, el MIR y de muchos otros incluida la falsa 4ª Internacional, que tiene un Ministro dentro del gobierno Lula-Alencar. En el test del Frente Popular, la L5I se revela ser una variente del centrismo y el revisionismo. Su línea de "Frente Popular de combate" (Marceau-Pivert) es antagónica del programa, que propone *la ruptura* con la burguesía.

La acusación capital que la 4ª internacional lanza contra las organizaciones tradicionales del proletariado es que no quieren separarse del semi-cadáver de la burguesía.... De todos los partidos y organizaciones que se apoyan en los obreros y los campesinos y hablan en su nombre, exigimos que rompan políticamente con la burguesía y entren en la vía de la lucha por el Gobierno obrero y campesino. En esta vía, les prometemos un apoyo completo contra la reacción capitalista. Al mismo tiempo, desplegamos una agitación incansable en torno a las reivindicaciones transitorias que, en nuestra opinión, deberían constituir el programa del "Gobierno obrero y campesino". (León Trotsky, La agonía del capitalismo y las tareas de la 4ª Internacional, 1938)

[extracto de una carta del CoReP al GRA / Austria]



Archivos del comunismo

Archives of communism

INTRODUCTION

In the era of imperialism, the bourgeoisie has no revolutionary potential any more. The only revolutionary class is the proletariat. To subordinate the proletariat to the bourgeoisie is a treachery either, either advocated by the Stalinists (and some centrists) to the bourgeoisie of the dominated countries in name of conquering independence, or advocated by the social democrats (and some centrists) to the imperialist bourgeoisie in name of bringing democracy to the dominated countries.

The epigones of the 4th International - to revise its program and to ease the strategy of the permanent revolution - tell that Trotsky was supporting democratic slogans, approved the entrisism of the PCCh into the Kuomintang and that nobody then rejected the "anti-imperialist united front" with sectors of the bourgeoisie. Although never documents of the of International Left Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninist), nor of the 4th International mentions the AIUF, the "Liaison Committee for the Fourth International" (LC Brazil, SF Great Britain, TMB Argentina) persists in forging the history and the program of the deceased trotskyst International:

"We have already pointed out that even after Chiang's first coup against the communists (March 1926) Trotsky called for the maintenance of a 'political bloc' with sections of the KMT." (Marut, "The AIUF is the tactic, Permanent Revolution is the strategy", Socialist Fight N°8, winter 2011-2012, p.34)

The neo-healystes cannot prove this assertion. The editor of the article "The AIUF is the tactics, the permanent revolution is the strategy" (sic) does not quote Trotsky, but the columnist Stuart King. King is an authority... in the art of confusion. This former founder of Workers Power (Great Britain) wrote on the party of the bonapartist Chávez:

"There are potentially three directions in which the PSUV could go, none of them pre-determined and all of them subject to the influence of the class struggle and the active intervention of revolutionaries. The PSUV could become a revolutionary workers' party" (Permanent Revolution n° 7, winter 2007-2008, p.49)

Certainly, Marut has in his book-shelf the book *Leon Trotsky on China*; he should read the letter of Trotsky to Max Shachtman on page 490.

His contortions are explained by his support, in the name of anti-imperialism, for the Arab and Iranian bourgeoisies against their own working classes and youth, as did the revisionist WRP in the 1970s and 1980s. Therefore, in no issue of his bulletin, there is not any support towards the workers and the students of Syria or Iran who face the Chiangs and the KMTs of today. The "4th International" of the CECL is the pro-bourgeois counterfeit of Pablo, Mandel, Posadas and Lora in 1951 or Lambert's counterfeit in 1954, Moreno in 1956 and Healy in 1976. It is not the International of Trotsky. The document that we publish proves it.

From 1923 onward, in many countries, the Communists opposed the leadership of the Russian Communist Party and of the 3rd International. Up from 1927, the victory of the bureaucracy in Russia broke up internationalism ("socialism in one country") and lead the International to the road of opportunism in Great Britain (alliance with the leadership of the TUC), in China (adaptation to the bourgeois nationalism of the Kuomintang) or in Russia (rejection of the economic plan and concessions to the kulaks).

In light of the catastrophic consequences (defeat of the general strike in Great Britain in 1926, crushing of the proletariat in China in 1927, brutal collectivization in Russia in 1928...), Trotsky wrote polemics against Stalinism to reorient the Communist International (*The permanent Revolution, 1928; The 3rd International one after Lenin, 1928-1934*). In both, he never used the expression "anti-imperialist united front".

The Bolshevik-Leninists constituted the International Left Opposition in April 1930. One of the first documents of the ILO (BL) is the *Manifesto on China* of September 1930, written by Trotsky. Certainly, the democratic claims are not a separated stage; they are incorporated in a revolutionary program and can be realized by the soviets (workers councils):

"From the very beginning of the revolutionary upsurge, we urged that the organization of workers', soldiers', and peasants' soviets be initiated; we urged that the workers take their place at the head of the peasant insurrection and carry through the agrarian revolution to its conclusion.(...) The Stalinists say that the democratic

dictatorship, as the next stage of the revolution, will grow into a proletarian dictatorship at a later stage. This is the current doctrine of the Comintern, not only for China but for all the Eastern countries. It is a complete departure from the teachings of Marx on the state and the conclusions of Lenin on the function of the state in a revolution.” (Manifesto on China)

Nevertheless, in spite of the accusations of SF (LCFI) against Trotsky:

“From the beginning, we, the representatives of the International Left Opposition, the Bolshevik-Leninists, were against entering the Kuomintang and for an independent proletarian policy.” (Manifesto on China)

In the epoch of the capitalist decline, the Communists propose the united front to the other working-class organizations, to the peasant organizations, to the student organizations, but they are hostile to any “political block” (King and Marut) with the bourgeoisie:

“The fundamental idea of the Stalinists was to transform the Chinese bourgeoisie into a leader of the national revolution against feudalism and imperialism. The results of this political strategy ruined the revolution. (...) The proletarian insurrection in China can and will develop only as a direct and immediate revolution against the bourgeoisie. The peasants' revolt in China, much more than it was in Russia, is a revolt against the bourgeoisie.” (Manifesto on China)

POLITICAL BUREAU OF THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION COLLECTIVE



Manifesto on China

International Left Opposition, September 1930

During the last few months a peasant movement of considerable scope has again appeared in certain provinces of southern China. Not only the world press of the proletariat, but the press of its enemies as well, is filled with the echoes of this struggle. The Chinese revolution, betrayed, defeated, exhausted, shows that it is still alive. Let us hope that the time when it will again lift its proletarian head is not far off. And in order to be prepared for this, we must put the problems of the Chinese revolution on the agenda of the working class of the world.

We, the International Communist Left Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninists), consider it our duty to raise our voices now in order to attract the attention of all communists, all advanced revolutionary workers, to the task of liberating this great country of East Asia and at the same time to warn them against the false policy of the dominant faction of the Communist International, which obviously threatens to undermine the coming Chinese revolution as it ruined the 1925-27 revolution.

The signs of the rebirth of the Chinese revolution in the countryside indicate its inner forces and immense potentialities.

But the task is to transform these potentialities into reality. The first condition for success is to understand what is happening, that is, to make a Marxist analysis of the motive forces and to estimate correctly the current stage of the struggle. On both counts, the ruling circle of the Comintern is wrong.

The Stalinist press is filled with communications about a "soviet government" established in vast provinces of China under the protection of a Red army. Workers in many countries are greeting this news with excitement. Of course! The establishment of a soviet government in a substantial part of China and the creation of a Chinese Red army would be a gigantic success for the international revolution. But we must state openly and clearly: this is not yet true.

Despite the scanty information which reaches us from the vast areas of China, our Marxist understanding of the developing process enables us to reject with certainty the Stalinist view of the current events. It is false and extremely dangerous for the further development of the revolution.

For centuries the history of China has

been one of formidable uprisings of a destitute and hungry peasantry. Not less than five times in the last two thousand years the Chinese peasants succeeded in effecting a complete redistribution of landed property. Each time the process of concentration began anew and continued until the growth of the population again produced a partial or general explosion. This vicious cycle was an expression of economic and social stagnation.

Only the inclusion of China in the world economy opened up new possibilities. Capitalism invaded China from abroad. The backward Chinese bourgeoisie became the intermediary between foreign capital and the mercilessly exploited masses of their own country. The foreign imperialists and the Chinese bourgeoisie combine the methods of capitalist exploitation with the methods of feudal oppression and enslavement through usury.

The fundamental idea of the Stalinists was to transform the Chinese bourgeoisie into a leader of the national revolution against feudalism and imperialism. The results of this political strategy ruined the revolution. The Chinese proletariat paid a heavy price

for knowledge of the truth that their bourgeoisie cannot, does not want to, and never will fight either against so-called feudalism, which constitutes the most important part of its own system of exploitation, or against imperialism, whose agent it is and under whose military protection it operates.

As soon as it was clear that the Chinese proletariat, in spite of all the obstacles put in its path by the Comintern, was ready to proceed on its own independent revolutionary road, the bourgeoisie, with the help of the foreign imperialists, beginning in Shanghai, crushed the workers' movement. As soon as it was clear that friendship with Moscow could not paralyze the uprising of the peasants, the bourgeoisie shattered the peasants' movement. The spring and summer of 1927 were the months of the greatest crimes of the Chinese bourgeoisie.

Frightened by the consequences of its mistakes, at the end of 1927 the Stalinist faction abruptly tried to compensate for its blunders of the past years. The Canton insurrection was organized. The Stalinist leaders assumed that the revolution was still on the rise; actually, it was already on the decline. The heroism of the vanguard workers could not prevent the disaster caused by the adventure of these leaders. The Canton insurrection was drowned in blood. The second Chinese revolution was completely destroyed.

From the beginning, we, the representatives of the International Left Opposition, the Bolshevik-Leninists, were against entering the Kuomintang and for an independent proletarian policy. From the very beginning of the revolutionary upsurge, we urged that the organization of workers', soldiers', and peasants' soviets be initiated; we urged that the workers take their place at the head of the peasant insurrection and carry through the agrarian revolution to its conclusion. Our course was rejected. Our supporters were persecuted and expelled from the Comintern; those in the USSR were arrested and exiled. In the name of what? In the name of a bloc with Chiang Kai-shek.

After the counterrevolutionary coup d'état in Shanghai and Wuhan we, the Communist Left Oppositionists, warned insistently that the second Chinese revolution was finished, that a temporary triumph of the counterrevolution had supervened, and that an attempt at insurrection by the advanced workers in

the face of the general demoralization and fatigue of the masses would inevitably bring additional criminal blows against the revolutionary forces. We demanded a shift to the defensive, a strengthening of the underground organization of the party, the participation in the economic struggles of the proletariat, and the mobilization of the masses under democratic slogans: the independence of China, the right of self-determination for the different nationalities in the population, a constituent assembly, the confiscation of the land, the eight-hour workday. Such a policy would have allowed the communist vanguard to emerge gradually from its defeat, to re-establish connections with the trade unions and with the unorganized urban and rural masses, and to prepare to meet the new revolutionary upsurge fully armed.

The Stalinist faction denounced our policy as "liquidationist," while it, not for the first time, went from opportunism to adventurism. In February 1928, when the Chinese revolution was at its lowest point, the Ninth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International announced a policy of armed insurrection in China. The results of this madness were the further defeat of the workers, the murder of the best revolutionaries, a split in the party, demoralization in the ranks of the workers.

The decline of the revolution and a temporary lessening of the struggle between the militarists permitted a limited economic revival in the country. Strikes occurred again. But these were conducted independently of the party, which, not understanding the situation, was absolutely unable to present a new perspective to the masses and to unite them under the democratic slogans of the transitional period. As a result of new errors, opportunism, and adventurism, the Communist Party now counts in its ranks only a few thousand workers. In the Red trade unions, according to the figures given by the party itself, there are about sixty thousand workers. In the months of the revolutionary upsurge there were about three million.

The counterrevolution left its mark more directly and much more ruthlessly on the workers than on the peasants. The workers in China are few in number and are concentrated in the industrial centers. The peasants are protected to a certain extent by their numbers and their diffusion over vast areas. The revo-

lutionary years trained quite a few rural local leaders, and the counterrevolution did not succeed in eliminating them all. A considerable number of revolutionary workers hid from the militarists in the countryside. In the last decade a large amount of arms was widely dispersed. In conflicts with local administrators or military units, these arms were obtained by the peasants and Red guerrilla bands were organized. Agitation flared up in the armies of the bourgeois counterrevolution, at times leading to open revolts. Soldiers, with their guns, deserted to the side of the peasants, sometimes in groups, sometimes in whole companies.

It is quite natural, therefore, that even after the defeat of the revolution, waves of the peasant movement continued to roll through the various provinces of the country and have now forcefully rushed ahead. Armed peasant bands drive out and exterminate local landlords, as many as can be found in their regions, and especially the so-called gentry and tuchuns, the local representatives of the ruling class -- the bureaucrat-proprietors, the usurers, the rich peasants.

When the Stalinists talk about a soviet government established by the peasants in a substantial part of China, they not only reveal their credulity and superficiality; they obscure and misrepresent the fundamental problem of the Chinese revolution. The peasantry, even the most revolutionary, cannot create an independent government; it can only support the government of another class, the dominant urban class. The peasantry at all decisive moments follows either the bourgeoisie or the proletariat. So-called peasant parties may disguise this fact, but they cannot annul it. Soviets are the organs of power of a revolutionary class in opposition to the bourgeoisie. This means that the peasantry is unable to organize a soviet system on its own. The same holds true for an army. More than once in China, and in Russia and other countries too, the peasantry has organized guerrilla armies which fought with incomparable courage and stubbornness. But they remained guerrilla armies, connected to a local province and incapable of centralized strategic operations on a large scale. Only the predominance of the proletariat in the decisive industrial and political centers of the country creates the necessary basis for the organization of a Red army and for the extension of a soviet system into the

coutryside. To those unable to grasp this, the revolution remains a book closed with seven seals.

The Chinese proletariat is just beginning to recover from the paralysis of the counterrevolution. The peasant movement at the present time is advancing, to a large degree, independently of the workers' movement, according to its own laws and at its own tempo. But the heart of the problem of the Chinese revolution consists in the political coordination and organizational combination of the proletarian and peasant uprisings. Those who talk about the victory of the soviet revolution in China, although confined to separate provinces in the South and confronted with passivity in the industrial North, ignore the dual problem of the Chinese revolution: the problem of an alliance between the workers and peasants and the problem of the leading role of the workers in this alliance.

The vast flood of peasant revolts can unquestionably provide the impulse for the revival of political struggle in the industrial centers. We firmly count on it. But this does not mean in any case that the revolutionary awakening of the proletariat would lead immediately to the conquest of power or even to the struggle for power. The resurgence of the proletariat might at first assume the character of partial economic and political defensive and offensive struggles. How much time would the proletariat, and particularly the communist vanguard, require to rise to its role as leader of a revolutionary nation? At any rate, more than weeks or months. Bureaucratic command is no substitute for the independent growth of the class and its party.

At this juncture the Chinese communists need a long-range policy. They must not scatter their forces among the isolated flames of the peasant revolt. Weak and small in number, the party will not be able to take hold of this movement. The communists must concentrate their forces in the factories and the shops and in the workers' districts in order to explain to the workers the meaning of what is happening in the provinces, to lift the spirits of the tired and discouraged, to organize groups of workers for a struggle to defend their economic interests, and to raise the slogans of the democratic-agrarian revolution. Only through the process of

activating and uniting the workers will the Communist Party be able to assume leadership of the peasant insurrection, that is, of the national revolution as a whole.

To support the illusions of adventurism and to conceal the weakness of the proletarian vanguard, the Stalinists say that a democratic dictatorship, not a proletarian, is the issue. On this central point their adventurism relies entirely on the premises of opportunism. Not satisfied with their Kuomintang experiment, the Stalinists are devising a new formula for the coming revolution with which to put to sleep and chain the working class, the "democratic dictatorship."

When the vanguard workers in China advanced the slogan of soviets, they were saying: we want to do what the Russian workers did. Only yesterday the Stalinists replied to this: no, you must not, you have the Kuomintang, and it will do what is necessary. Today the same leaders respond more cautiously: you will have to organize soviets, not for a proletarian but for a democratic dictatorship. They thereby tell the proletariat that the dictatorship will not be in their hands, that there is some other as-yet-undiscovered force which can introduce the revolutionary dictatorship in China. In this way the formula of the democratic dictatorship opens the gates to a new deception of the workers and peasants by the bourgeoisie.

To justify the slogan of the "democratic dictatorship," the Stalinists describe the Chinese counterrevolution as "feudal militarist and imperialist." Thus they exclude the bourgeoisie from the counterrevolution, that is, they again as before idealize the bourgeoisie. In reality the militarists express the interests of the Chinese bourgeoisie, which are inseparable from feudal interests and relations. The Chinese bourgeoisie is too hostile to the people, too closely tied up with the foreign imperialists, and too afraid of the revolution to be eager to rule in its own name by parliamentary methods. The militarist-fascist regime of China is an expression of the antinational, antirevolutionary character of the Chinese bourgeoisie. The Chinese counterrevolution is not a counterrevolution of feudal barons and slave-owners against bourgeois society. It is a counterrevolution of all property holders -- and first of all bourgeois -- against the

workers and peasants.

The proletarian insurrection in China can and will develop only as a direct and immediate revolution against the bourgeoisie. The peasants' revolt in China, much more than it was in Russia, is a revolt against the bourgeoisie. A class of landlords as a separate class does not exist in China. The landowners and the bourgeoisie are one and the same. The gentry and the warlords, against whom the peasant movement is immediately directed, represent the lowest link to the bourgeoisie and to the imperialist exploiters as well. In Russia the October revolution, in its first stage, counterpoised all the peasants as a class against all the landlords as a class, and only after several months began to introduce the civil war within the peasantry. In China every peasant uprising is, from the start, a civil war of the poor against the rich peasants, that is, against the village bourgeoisie.

The middle peasantry in China is insignificant. Almost 80 percent of the peasants are poor. They and they alone play a revolutionary role. The problem is not to unite the workers with the peasants as a whole, but with the village poor. They have a common enemy: the bourgeoisie. No one but the workers can lead the poor peasants to victory. Their mutual victory can lead to no other regime but the dictatorship of the proletariat. Only such a regime can establish a soviet system and organize a Red army, which will be the military expression of the dictatorship of the proletariat supported by the poor peasants.

The Stalinists say that the democratic dictatorship, as the next stage of the revolution, will grow into a proletarian dictatorship at a later stage. This is the current doctrine of the Comintern, not only for China but for all the Eastern countries. It is a complete departure from the teachings of Marx on the state and the conclusions of Lenin on the function of the state in a revolution. The democratic dictatorship differs from the proletarian in that it is a bourgeois democratic dictatorship. The transition from a bourgeois to a proletarian dictatorship cannot occur as a peaceful process of "growing over" from one to the other. A dictatorship of the proletariat can replace a democratic, or a fascist, dictatorship of the bourgeoisie only through armed insurrection.

The peaceful "growing over" of a de-

mocratic revolution into a socialist revolution is possible only under the dictatorship of one class -- the proletariat. The transition from democratic measures to socialist measures took place in the Soviet Union under the regime of the proletarian dictatorship. This transition will be accomplished much faster in China because its most elementary democratic problems have much more of an anti-capitalist and antibourgeois character than they had in Russia. The Stalinists apparently need one more defeat, paid for by the workers' blood, before they can bring themselves to say: "The revolution has reached the highest stage, whose slogan is the dictatorship of the proletariat."

At this moment nobody can tell the extent to which the present peasant insurrection combines the reflection of the second revolution with the summer lightning of the third. Nobody can foretell now whether the hearths of the peasant revolt can keep a fire burning through the whole long period of time which the proletarian vanguard will need to gather its own strength, bring the working class into the fight, and coordinate its struggle for power with the general offensive of the peasants against their most immediate enemies.

What distinguishes this movement in the countryside today is the desire of the peasants to give it the form of soviets, at least in name, and to fashion their own guerrilla armies as much as possible after the Red Army. This shows how intensely the peasants are seeking a political form that would enable them to overcome their dispersion and impo-

tence. From this point of departure, the communists can proceed successfully.

But it must be understood in advance that in the consciousness of the Chinese peasant the general slogan of soviets does not by any means signify the dictatorship of the proletariat. The peasants cannot speak for the proletarian dictatorship a priori. They can be led to it only through the experience of a struggle that will prove to them in life that their democratic problems cannot be solved in any way except through the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is the fundamental reason why the Communist Party cannot lead the proletariat to a struggle for power except under democratic slogans.

The peasant movement, although adorned with the name of soviets, remains scattered, local, provincial. It can be elevated to a national movement only by connecting the struggle for land and against oppressive taxes and burdens of militarism with the ideals of the independence of China and the sovereignty of the people. A democratic expression of this connection is the sovereign constituent assembly. Under such a slogan the communist vanguard will be able to unite around itself the vast masses of workers, the oppressed small townspeople, and the hundreds of millions of poor peasants for an insurrection against foreign and native oppressors.

The organization of workers' soviets can be attempted only on a rising tide of revolution in the cities. In the meantime we can prepare for it. To prepare means to gather strength. At present we can do it only under consistent and courageous

revolutionary democratic slogans.

And we must explain to the vanguard elements of the working class that a constituent assembly is only a step on the revolutionary road. We are setting our course toward the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of a soviet regime.

We do not shut our eyes to the fact that such a dictatorship will place the most difficult economic and international problems before the Chinese people. The proletariat in China constitutes a smaller part of the population than the proletariat in Russia did on the eve of the October revolution. Chinese capitalism is more backward than was Russia's. But difficulties are conquered not by illusions, not by an adventurist policy, not by hopes in a Chiang Kai-shek or in a "democratic dictatorship." Difficulties are conquered by clear thinking and revolutionary will.

The Chinese proletariat will take power not in order to resurrect the Chinese Wall and under its protection construct national socialism. By winning power the Chinese proletariat will win one of the most important strategic positions for the international revolution. The fate of China, like that of the USSR, is bound up with the fate of the revolutionary movement of the world proletariat. This is the source of greatest hope and the justification of highest revolutionary courage.

The cause of the international revolution is the cause of the Chinese revolution. The cause of the Chinese revolution is the cause of the international revolution.

En la fase imperialista, la burguesía ya no posee capacidad revolucionaria. La única clase revolucionaria es el proletariado. Subordinar el proletariado a la burguesía es una traición, sea a la burguesía de los países dominados, encargada por los estalinistas (y ciertos centristas) de conquistar la independencia, o sea a la burguesía imperialista, encargada por los socialdemócratas (y por otros centristas) de otorgar la democracia a los países dominados.

Los epigonos de la 4ª Internacional, para revisar su programa y edulcorar la estrategia de la revolución permanente, explican que Trotsky apoyaba las reivindicaciones democráticas, que aprovechó el entrismo del PCCh en el Kuomintang y que nadie en aquella época rechazó el “frente único anti-imperialista” con sectores de la burguesía. Aunque ningún documento de la Oposición de Izquierda Internacional (bolcheviques leninistas), ni tampoco de la 4ª Internacional, menciona el FUA, el reciente “Comité de Enlace por la Cuarta Internacional” (LC Brasil, SF Gran Bretaña, TMB Argentina) persiste en falsificar la historia y el programa de la difunta Internacional trotskista:

“Incluso después del primer golpe de Chiang Kai-shek, Trotsky llamaba a mantener un bloque político con algunos sectores del Kuomintang” (Marut, “The AIUF is the tactic, Permanent Revolution is the strategy”, *Socialist Fight* N° 8, invierno 2011-2012, p.34)

Los neo-healistas no pueden probarlo. El redactor del artículo “El FUA es la táctica, la revolución permanente es la estrategia” (sic) no cita a Trotsky, pero sí al articulista Stuart King. King es una autoridad... en la confusión. Además de fundador de WP Gran Bretaña, King escribió sobre el partido del bonapartista Chávez:

“El PSUV puede ir hacia tres direcciones potenciales, ninguna estando determinada ya y todas dependientes de la influencia de la lucha de clases y de la intervención activa de los revolucionarios. La primera es que el PSUV puede volverse un partido obrero revolucionario...” (*Permanent Revolution* n° 7, invierno 2007-2008, p.49)

Sin embargo, Marut tiene en su biblioteca el libro *Leon Trotsky on China*; debería leer la carta de Trotsky a Max Shachtman en la página 490.

Sus contorsiones se explican por su apoyo, a nombre del anti-imperialismo, a las burguesías árabes y persa contra sus propios trabajadores y jóvenes, una herramienta que usó el revisionista VWRP. Así, no hay la menor convocatoria en su periódico hacia los obreros y los estudiantes de Siria o Irán que enfrentan a los Chiang y los KMT contemporáneos. La “4ª Internacional” del CECI es la contrahechura pro-burguesa de Pablo, Mandel, Posadas y Lora en 1951 o las contrahechuras de Lambert en 1954, Moreno en 1956 y Healy en 1976. No es la de Trotsky. El documento que publicamos lo demuestra.

Desde 1923, en muchos países, los comunistas se oponen a la dirección del Partido Comunista Ruso y de la 3ª Internacional. Desde 1927, el triunfo de la burocracia en Rusia rompe el internacionalismo (“socialismo en un solo país”) y lleva la Internacional al oportunismo en Gran Bretaña (alianza con la dirección del TUC), en China (adaptación al nacionalismo burgués del Kuomintang) o en Rusia (rechazo del plan y concesiones a los kulaks)...

Frente a las consecuencias catastróficas (fracaso de la huelga general en Gran Bretaña en 1926, aplastamiento del proletariado en China en 1927, colectivización brutal del campo en Rusia en 1928...), Trotsky escribe polémicas contra el estalinismo para reorientar a la Internacional Comunista (*La Revolución permanente*, 1928; *La 3ª Internacional después de Lenin*, 1928-1934). En ambas, nunca utiliza la expresión “frente único anti-imperialista”.

Los bolcheviques leninistas constituyen la Oposición de Izquierda Internacional en abril de 1930. Uno de los primeros textos de la OII (BL) es el Manifiesto sobre China de setiembre de 1930, redactado por Trotsky. Claro, las reivindicaciones democráticas no son una etapa separada, se incorporan a un programa revolucionario y pueden ser realizadas por los soviets:

“Desde el comienzo mismo del ascenso revolucionario instamos a que se iniciara la construcción de soviets de obreros, soldados y campesinos; instamos a los obreros a que ocuparan su lugar a la cabeza de la insurrección”

ción campesina. (...) Los estalinistas afirman que la dictadura democrática, próxima etapa de la revolución, se convertirá en dictadura proletaria en una etapa posterior. Esta doctrina corriente en la Comintern, no sólo para China sino también para todos los países de Oriente, es una desviación total de las enseñanzas de Marx sobre el estado y de las conclusiones de Lenin respecto de la función del estado en una revolución.” (Manifiesto sobre China)

Sin embargo, a pesar de la acusación de SF (CECI) contra Trotsky:

“Desde el principio, nosotros, representantes de la Oposición de Izquierda Internacional (bolcheviques leninistas), nos opusimos al entrismo en el Kuomintang.” (Manifiesto sobre China)

En la época del declive del capitalismo, los comunistas proponen el frente único a las otras organizaciones obreras, a las organizaciones campesinas, a las organizaciones estudiantiles, pero son hostiles a todo “bloque político” con la burguesía:

“La idea fundamental de los estalinistas consistía en transformar a la burguesía china en líder de la revolución nacional contra el feudalismo y el imperialismo. Los resultados de esta estrategia política fueron fatales para la revolución. (...) La insurrección proletaria china sólo puede desarrollarse, y se desarrollará, como revolución dirigida directa e inmediatamente contra la burguesía...” (Manifiesto sobre China)

BURÓ POLITICO DEL COLECTIVO REVOLUCIÓN PERMANENTE



Manifiesto sobre China

Oposición de Izquierda Internacional, setiembre de 1930

En los últimos meses ha vuelto a surgir un movimiento campesino de cierta envergadura en algunas provincias del sur de China. Los ecos de esta lucha colman la prensa mundial, no sólo la del proletariado sino también la de sus enemigos. La revolución china, traicionada, derrotada, exhausta, demuestra que aún está viva. Confiamos en que muy pronto volverá a levantar su cabeza proletaria. Y con el fin de estar preparados para ello, debemos poner los problemas de la revolución china en el orden del día de la clase obrera del mundo.

Nosotros, la Oposición de Izquierda Internacional (bolchevique leninista), consideramos que es nuestro deber elevar la voz, ahora mismo, para atraer la atención de todos los comunistas, de todos los obreros revolucionarios de vanguardia, hacia la tarea de liberar a este gran país del Asia oriental y a la vez prevenirles de que la fracción dominante en la Internacional Comunista aplica una política errónea, que amenaza con socavar la revolución china que se avecina así como destruyó la revolución de 1925-1927.

Los síntomas de resurgimiento de la revolución china en el campo son un índice de sus fuerzas internas y de sus inmensas potencialidades. Pero la tarea consiste en transformar esas potencialidades en realidades. La primera premisa del éxito es comprender qué está ocurriendo, vale decir, hacer un análisis marxista de las fuerzas motrices y una caracterización justa de la etapa actual de la lucha. En ambos terrenos, la camarilla dominante de la Comintern se equivoca.

La prensa stalinista está repleta de comunicados sobre un "gobierno soviético" instaurado en vastas provincias chinas bajo la protección de un ejército rojo. Los obreros de muchos países reciben esta noticia con alborozo. ¡Desde luego! La instauración de un gobierno soviético en una extensión importante del territorio chino y la creación de un ejército rojo chino sería un éxito colosal para la revolución internacional. Pero debemos decirlo abierta y claramente: esto todavía no se ha realizado.

A pesar de la poca información que llega

del extenso territorio chino, nuestra comprensión marxista del proceso en curso nos permite rechazar con certeza la caracterización stalinista de los acontecimientos por falsa y sumamente peligrosa para el desarrollo posterior de la revolución.

Desde hace siglos la historia de China es la historia de formidables insurrecciones de un campesinado desposeído y hambriento. En no menos de cinco ocasiones, en los últimos dos mil años, los campesinos lograron efectuar un reparto total de la propiedad terrateniente. En cada caso, el proceso de concentración recommenzó y siguió hasta que el crecimiento de la población provocó una nueva explosión parcial o general. Este círculo vicioso reflejaba el estancamiento económico y social.

Sólo la inserción de China en la economía mundial abrió nuevas posibilidades. El capitalismo foráneo invadió a China. Su atrasada burguesía se convirtió en intermediaria entre el capital extranjero y las masas implacablemente explotadas de su propio país. Los impe-

rialistas extranjeros y la burguesía china combinan los métodos de explotación capitalistas con los métodos de opresión y esclavización feudales a través de la usura.

La idea fundamental de los stalinistas consistía en transformar a la burguesía china en líder de la revolución nacional contra el feudalismo y el imperialismo. Los resultados de esta estrategia política fueron fatales para la revolución. El proletariado chino pagó un precio sumamente elevado para aprender que su burguesía no puede ni quiere combatir, ni jamás lo hará, al llamado "feudalismo", que constituye el elemento principal de su sistema de explotación, ni al imperialismo, puesto que es su agente y opera bajo su protección militar.

Apenas resultó claro que el proletariado chino ya estaba dispuesto, a pesar de todos los obstáculos que la Comintern sembró en su camino, a seguir una senda revolucionaria independiente, la burguesía, con ayuda de los imperialistas extranjeros, aplastó al movimiento obrero, empezando por Shanghai. En cuanto se evidenció que la amistad de Moscú no podía paralizar la insurrección de los campesinos, la burguesía aplastó al movimiento campesino. En la primavera y el verano de 1927 la burguesía china cometió sus más horrendos crímenes.

Asustada por las consecuencias de sus errores, a fines de 1927 la fracción stalinista trató repentinamente de compensar sus torpezas de años anteriores. Se organizó la insurrección de Cantón. Los líderes stalinistas suponían que la revolución seguía en auge, pero, en realidad, ya había entrado en reflujo. El heroísmo de la vanguardia obrera no podía impedir el desastre provocado por la aventura de estos líderes. La insurrección de Cantón fue ahogada en sangre. Así se destruyó la segunda revolución china.

Desde el principio, nosotros, representantes de la Oposición de Izquierda Internacional (bolcheviques leninistas), nos opusimos al entrismo en el Kuomintang y nos pronunciamos a favor de una política proletaria independiente. Desde el comienzo mismo del ascenso revolucionario instamos a que se iniciara la construcción de soviets de obreros, soldados y campesinos; instamos a los obreros a que ocuparan su lugar a la cabeza de la insurrección campesina y llevaran a término la revolución agraria. Se rechazó nuestra política. Nuestros parti-

darios fueron perseguidos y expulsados de la Comintern; a los que estaban en la URSS se los arrestó y exilió. ¿En nombre de qué? En nombre de un bloque con Chiang Kai-shek.

Después del golpe de estado contrarrevolucionario de Shanghai y Wuhan nosotros, los militantes de la Oposición de Izquierda Internacional, advertimos insistentemente que la segunda revolución china había terminado, que la contrarrevolución triunfaba temporalmente, que ante la desmoralización y fatiga general de las masas todo intento de insurrección de los obreros de vanguardia provocaría nuevos golpes criminales contra las fuerzas revolucionarias. Exigimos que se pasara a la defensiva, que se fortaleciera la organización clandestina del partido, la participación en las luchas económicas del proletariado y la movilización de las masas con consignas democráticas: la independencia de China, el derecho de las distintas nacionalidades de la población a la autodeterminación, una asamblea constituyente, la expropiación de la tierra, la jornada de ocho horas. Con esa política la vanguardia comunista hubiera podido remontar gradualmente la derrota, restablecer sus vínculos con los sindicatos y las masas no organizadas de la ciudad y el campo y armarse para el momento del nuevo ascenso revolucionario.

La fracción stalinista repudió nuestra política por "liquidacionista" y, mientras tanto, y no por primera vez, pasó del oportunismo al aventurerismo. En febrero de 1928, cuando la revolución china se encontraba en su punto de máximo reflujo, el Noveno Plenario del Comité Ejecutivo de la Internacional Comunista proclamó una política de insurrección armada para China. El resultado de esta demencia fue una derrota más de los trabajadores, el asesinato de los mejores revolucionarios, un cisma en el partido y la desmoralización de las bases obreras.

El reflujo de la revolución y un atemperamiento temporal de la lucha entre los militaristas dio lugar a un reanimamiento económico parcial. Hubo nuevas huelgas. Pero éstas se desarrollaron independientemente del partido que, al no comprender la situación, fue absolutamente incapaz de ofrecer una nueva perspectiva a las masas y de unificarlas bajo las consignas democráticas del período de transición. El Partido Comunista, como fruto de sus errores, de su oportunismo y de su aventurerismo, sólo cuenta con unos pocos miles de obreros. Según las

estadísticas proporcionadas por el propio partido, los sindicatos rojos agrupan alrededor de sesenta mil obreros. En la época de ascenso revolucionario agrupaba aproximadamente tres millones.

La contrarrevolución afectó más directa e implacablemente a los obreros que a los campesinos. En China, los obreros son pocos y están concentrados en los centros industriales. Los campesinos están protegidos hasta cierto punto por su número y por su dispersión sobre vastos territorios. Los años de revolución educaron a buen número de dirigentes rurales locales, y la contrarrevolución no los eliminó a todos. Una cantidad importante de obreros revolucionarios se ocultó de los militaristas en el campo. En la década pasada se distribuyeron grandes cantidades de armas. En los enfrentamientos con los administradores o las unidades militares locales, los campesinos obtuvieron esas armas y organizaron grupos guerrilleros rojos. En los ejércitos de la contrarrevolución burguesa surgieron focos de agitación que en algunos casos desembocaron en verdaderas rebeliones. Los soldados armados desertaban al bando campesino, a veces en grupos y a veces en compañías enteras.

Por tanto, es natural que, a pesar de la derrota de la revolución, las oleadas de movilización campesina hayan seguido recorriendo las diversas provincias del país hasta desembocar en la actualidad en una vigorosa arremetida. Los grupos de campesinos armados expulsan y exterminan a cuanto terrateniente encuentran en su región, sobre todo a la llamada aristocracia del campo y a los tuchuns (gobernadores militares o señores de la guerra), y a los representantes locales de la clase dominante: los burócratas-propietarios, los usureros, los campesinos ricos.

Cuando los stalinistas afirman que los campesinos han instaurado un gobierno soviético en una extensión importante del territorio chino, no sólo revelan su credulidad y superficialidad, al mismo tiempo confunden y tergiversan el problema fundamental de la revolución china. El campesinado, por revolucionario que sea, no puede crear un gobierno independiente; sólo puede apoyar al gobierno de otra clase, de la clase dominante urbana. En todos los momentos críticos el campesinado sigue a la burguesía o al proletariado. Los llamados "partidos campesinos" pueden disimular este hecho, pero no eliminarlo.

Los soviets constituyen los órganos de poder de una clase revolucionaria opuesta a la burguesía. Esto significa que el campesinado es incapaz de organizar por sus propios medios un sistema soviético. Lo mismo es cierto también en relación al ejército. La historia de China, de Rusia y de otros países, registra más de una ocasión en que el campesinado organizó ejércitos guerrilleros que combatieron con valentía y tesón sin par. Pero jamás fueron más que ejércitos guerrilleros, vinculados a una sola provincia, incapaces de realizar operaciones estratégicas centralizadas en gran escala. Sólo el predominio del proletariado en los centros industriales y políticos decisivos sienta las bases necesarias para la creación de un ejército rojo y la extensión del sistema soviético al campo. Para quienes son incapaces de asimilar este concepto la revolución es un libro cerrado con siete sellos.

El proletariado chino apenas comienza a remontar la parálisis de la contrarrevolución. En la actualidad el movimiento campesino avanza, en gran medida, independientemente del movimiento obrero, siguiendo sus leyes y ritmo propios. Pero el meollo del problema de la revolución china radica en la coordinación política y la combinación organizativa de los ascensos proletario y campesino. Aquellos que hablan de la victoria de la revolución soviética en China, a pesar de limitarse a algunas provincias aisladas del sur y enfrentarse a la pasividad del norte industrial, ignoran el doble problema de la revolución china: la alianza de obreros y campesinos y el papel dirigente de los obreros en dicha alianza.

Es indudable que la gran ola de revueltas campesinas puede servir de impulso para el reanimamiento de la lucha política en los centros industriales. Contamos firmemente con ello. Pero esto no significa que el despertar revolucionario del proletariado podría conducir inmediatamente a la conquista del poder, ni siquiera a la lucha por el poder. Las primeras manifestaciones del nuevo ascenso del proletariado podrían consistir en luchas económicas y políticas defensivas y ofensivas parciales. ¿Cuánto tiempo necesitará el proletariado, y su vanguardia comunista en particular, para ponerse a la altura de su papel de dirigente de una nación revolucionaria? En cualquier caso, más de unas cuantas semanas o meses. El mando burocrático no sustituye el crecimiento independiente de la clase y su partido.

En esta coyuntura los comunistas chinos necesitan una política a largo plazo. No deben dispersar sus fuerzas entre las llamadas aisladas de la revuelta campesina. El partido, débil y pequeño, no podrá controlar este movimiento. Los comunistas tienen que concentrar sus fuerzas en las fábricas y talleres y en las barriadas obreras para explicar a los obreros el significado de lo que está ocurriendo en las provincias, para levantar el ánimo de los cansados y los descorazonados, para organizar la lucha de los grupos obreros por la defensa de sus intereses económicos, para levantar las consignas de la revolución agraria y democrática. Sólo este proceso de activación y unificación de los obreros permitirá al Partido Comunista asumir la dirección de la insurrección campesina, es decir, de la revolución nacional en su conjunto.

Apoyando las ilusiones del aventurerismo y para ocultar la debilidad de la vanguardia proletaria, los stalinistas afirman que el objetivo de la lucha es una dictadura democrática, no una dictadura proletaria. En este problema crítico su aventurerismo se basa totalmente en las premisas del oportunismo. La experiencia del Kuomintang no les bastó; ahora los stalinistas están inventando una nueva fórmula que sirva para adormecer y encadenar a la clase obrera en la revolución que se avecina: la "dictadura democrática".

Cuando la vanguardia obrera china levantaba la consigna de soviets, decía: queremos hacer lo que hicieron los obreros rusos. Hasta ayer los stalinistas respondían: no, no deben hacerlo, tienen al Kuomintang, que hará lo necesario. Hoy los mismos dirigentes, más cautelosamente, responden: deben organizar soviets, pero para una dictadura democrática, no para una dictadura proletaria. Con esto le dicen al proletariado que la dictadura no estará en sus manos, que existe en China otra fuerza, aún no descubierta, capaz de instaurar la dictadura revolucionaria. Así, la fórmula de la dictadura democrática le permite a la burguesía engañar nuevamente a los obreros y a los campesinos.

Para justificar la consigna de "dictadura democrática", los stalinistas chinos caracterizan la contrarrevolución china como "feudal-militarista e imperialista". De esa manera, excluyen a la burguesía de la contrarrevolución, o sea que, igual que antes, idealizan a la burguesía. En realidad, los militaristas expresan los intereses de la burguesía china, que son

inseparables de los intereses y relaciones feudales. La burguesía china es demasiado hostil al pueblo, está demasiado atada a los imperialistas extranjeros, le tiene demasiado miedo a la revolución como para querer gobernar en su propio nombre con métodos parlamentarios. El régimen militar-fascista chino expresa el carácter antinacional, antirrevolucionario de la burguesía china. La contrarrevolución china no es una contrarrevolución de barones feudales y esclavistas contra la sociedad burguesa. Es una contrarrevolución de todos los propietarios -y en primer término de los burgueses- contra los obreros y los campesinos.

La insurrección proletaria china sólo puede desarrollarse, y se desarrollará, como revolución dirigida directa e inmediatamente contra la burguesía. La revuelta campesina china, mucho más que la rusa, es una revuelta contra la burguesía. En China no existe una clase terrateniente como clase independiente. Los terratenientes y la burguesía son lo mismo. La aristocracia del campo y los señores de la guerra, contra los cuales se moviliza el campesinado, son el último eslabón de la burguesía y también de los explotadores imperialistas. En Rusia, la primera etapa de la Revolución de Octubre fue el enfrentamiento de toda la clase campesina con toda la clase terrateniente, y sólo después de varios meses comenzó la guerra civil en el seno del campesinado. En China toda insurrección campesina es, desde el comienzo, una guerra civil de campesinos pobres contra campesinos ricos, es decir, contra la burguesía aldeana.

El campesinado medio chino es insignificante. Casi el ochenta por ciento de los campesinos son pobres. Ellos, sólo ellos, desempeñan un papel revolucionario. No se trata de unificar a los obreros con el conjunto del campesinado, sino solamente con los pobres de la aldea. Tienen un enemigo común: la burguesía. Sólo los obreros pueden conducir a los campesinos pobres al triunfo. Su victoria común no puede conducir a otro régimen que la dictadura del proletariado y únicamente ese régimen puede instaurar un sistema soviético y organizar un ejército rojo, que será la expresión militar de la dictadura del proletariado apoyada por los campesinos pobres.

Los stalinistas afirman que la dictadura democrática, próxima etapa de la revolución, se convertirá en dictadura proletaria en una etapa posterior. Esta

doctrina corriente en la Comintern, no sólo para China sino también para todos los países de Oriente es una desviación total de las enseñanzas de Marx sobre el estado y de las conclusiones de Lenin respecto de la función del estado en una revolución. La diferencia entre la dictadura democrática y la proletaria es que aquélla es una dictadura democrático-burguesa. La transición de dictadura burguesa a dictadura proletaria no puede ser un proceso de "transformación" pacífica de la una en la otra. La dictadura del proletariado sólo puede remplazar a la dictadura de la burguesía, sea democrática o fascista, mediante una insurrección armada.

Esta "transformación" pacífica de la revolución democrática en socialista sólo es posible bajo la dictadura de una clase: el proletariado. En la Unión Soviética la transición hacia las medidas socialistas tuvo lugar bajo el régimen de la dictadura proletaria. Esta transición será mucho más rápida en China porque sus problemas democráticos más elementales tienen un carácter mucho más anticapitalista y antiburgués que el que poseyeron en Rusia. Aparentemente, los stalinistas necesitan otra derrota, pagada con sangre obrera, para llegar a decir: "La revolución ha alcanzado su etapa más elevada, cuya consigna es la dictadura del proletariado."

A esta altura no se puede descubrir en qué medida, combina la insurrección campesina en curso los últimos coletazos de la segunda revolución con las primeras manifestaciones de la tercera. Nadie puede pronosticar por el momento si los hornos de la revuelta campesina se mantendrán encendidos durante todo el largo período que necesitará la vanguardia proletaria para reunir fuerzas, llevar a la clase obrera a la lucha y coordinar su lucha por el poder con la ofensiva general de los campesinos contra sus enemigos más inmediatos.

Lo que caracteriza la movilización rural en curso es el deseo de los campesinos de darle forma soviética, al menos de nombre, y de conformar en lo posible

sus ejércitos guerrilleros de acuerdo al modelo del Ejército Rojo, lo que revela el ansia de los campesinos de hallar una forma política que les permita superar su dispersión e impotencia. Con este punto de partida, los comunistas pueden proceder con éxito.

Pero debe comprenderse desde ya que para la conciencia del campesino chino la consigna general de soviets de ninguna manera equivale a dictadura del proletariado. Los campesinos no pueden hablar a priori en nombre de la dictadura proletaria. Sólo se los puede conducir a la misma mediante una experiencia de lucha que les demuestre en los hechos que sus problemas democráticos no tienen solución fuera de la dictadura del proletariado. Esta es la razón fundamental por la que el Partido Comunista no puede conducir al proletariado a la lucha por el poder sino a través de las consignas democráticas.

Aunque lleve el nombre de soviets, el movimiento campesino sigue siendo disperso, local, provinciano. Sólo se puede elevar a la altura de movimiento nacional si vincula la lucha por la tierra y contra los impuestos y el agobiante peso del militarismo con los ideales de la independencia china y la soberanía popular. Una expresión democrática de ese vínculo es la soberana asamblea constituyente. Con esa consigna la vanguardia comunista podrá unificar a su alrededor a las grandes masas obreras, a la clase media urbana oprimida y a los cientos de millones de campesinos pobres para la insurrección contra los opresores extranjeros y nativos.

Sólo se puede intentar la organización de soviets sobre la cresta de una revolución en ascenso en las ciudades. Mientras tanto, podemos prepararnos. Prepararse significa reunir fuerzas y en la actualidad sólo podemos hacerlo si levantamos consignas democrático-revolucionarias consecuentes y valientes.

Y debemos explicarles a los elementos de vanguardia de la clase obrera que la asamblea constituyente es solamente un paso en la senda revolucionaria. Nos orientamos hacia la dictadura del prole-

tariado bajo un régimen soviético.

No soslayamos el hecho de que esa dictadura le planteará al pueblo chino los más arduos problemas económicos e internacionales. El proletariado chino constituye un sector de la población menor que el que constituía el proletariado ruso en vísperas de la Revolución de Octubre. El capitalismo chino es más atrasado de lo que lo era el ruso. Pero las dificultades no se superan con ilusiones, con una política aventurerista, confiando en Chiang Kai-shek o en una "dictadura revolucionaria". Las dificultades se superan con un pensamiento claro y una voluntad revolucionaria.

El proletariado chino no tomará el poder para reconstruir la Muralla China y, a su amparo, construir el socialismo nacional. Al conquistar el poder, alcanzará una de las posiciones estratégicas más importantes para la revolución internacional. El destino de China, como el de la URSS, está ligado a la suerte del movimiento revolucionario del proletariado mundial. Este es la fuente de las mayores esperanzas y del más alto coraje revolucionario.

La causa de la revolución internacional es la causa de la revolución china. La causa de la revolución china es la causa de la revolución internacional.

Secretariado Internacional de la Oposición de Izquierda Internacional: Rosmer, Landau, Markin (León Sedov)

L. Trotsky, por la Oposición rusa; A. Rosmer, Liga Comunista de Francia; K. Landau, Oposición de Izquierda Unificada del Partido Comunista Alemán; J. Andrade y J. Gorkin, Oposición española; A. Hennaut, Oposición belga; M. Shachtman, Liga Comunista de Norteamérica; D. Karl y C. Mayer, Izquierda Comunista de Austria; J. Frey, Partido Comunista de Austria (Oposición); Frank, "Grupo Internacional" del PC austriaco; W. Krieger, Oposición checoslovaca; Candiani, Fracción de Izquierda Italiana; Santini y Blasco (Pietro Tresso). Nueva Oposición Italiana; R. Negrete, Oposición mexicana



Partido de la Revolución Socialista PRS

<http://prsprueba.blogspot.com/>



Colectivo Revolución Permanente CoReP

<http://www.revolution-socialiste.info/CRP.htm>