

*Summary*

TROTSKYISM AND THE M. A.

his scurrilous  
 Regis Debray is as sharp in his attacks on Trotskyism as Stalin ever  
 was, but it all goes under the guise of being objective enough to  
 Trotskyist  
 restate the position fairly: "Let us for the moment decide to take  
 the Trotskyist conception seriously" - - then he hits you: "and not  
 as the pure and simple provocation that it is in practice." (pg. 30)  
 Then what we find is not a quotation of a Trotskyist text but Debray's  
 interlaced  
 "restatement" with such mild phrases as: "the imposition of", "the  
 underestimation of", "confusing of", "a total incomprehension of",  
 followed by a quotation again not of a Trotskyist text but of some  
 Castroite text which attributes to Trotskyism everything from "the  
 denial of the need for the military defeat of imperialism", "the  
 character of real provocations, causing defeats," plus phrases by  
 himself about "Trotskyism, in its final state of degeneration, is a  
 medieval metaphysic", "Trotskyism has nothing to learn from history"  
 "Trotskyism withers on the vine. Has it ever met with anything but  
 deceit?" "Those masses are the scapegoats. These fine theoreticians  
 lead them to suicide, singing hymns to their glory."

Now the Trotskyists are not the only ones whom Debray, the alter-ego  
 and theoretician of Castro, attacks. The Monthly Review, which publishes  
 this work is itself under attack. *In a recent issue* the  
 "progressive" North American  
 publication - *is not even* ~~characterizing~~ *metaphor*  
 such perservering naivette, bordering  
 on the fine art of misinformation, is more sinister or ridiculous!"  
 (pg. 59)

*Handwritten notes:*  
 M. A. Review  
 1/20/54  
 1/20/54  
 1/20/54

12665

comes under attack

That is not all, Mao, who is after all, the theoretician of guerrilla warfare, ~~an indomitable force~~ which is the beginning, the middle, the end, the body, the sole, the theory, the practice, the sum, the substance of all that Castro stands for. And again, it is not by quoting Mao's texts, it is by asserting that the Maoist line is just a lot of "noisy opportunism", "hypocritical sabotage of their own official line on the armed struggle"; "sterile and ineffective, dilatory, and contradictory in its alleged goals".

Here, too, Debray is his usual objective self and writes, I

"Even if we assume, by a violent exercise of the imagination, that a pro-Chinese group were to assemble fifty or so scoundrels, or renegades, in Guatemala or Venezuela, they would not last two weeks. There is no common language"

does not dare

And where this young French philosopher ~~dares~~ to attack a position that is Leninist, ~~he~~ he solves the problem simply by calling it Trotskyist. This he does with a question of spontaneity of the workers, dual power, formation of factory and peasant committees which would take power through the occupation of the land by the peasantry, insurrection as the eve of socialist revolution where the worker has control of the means of production.

Now we do not know what Mao's reaction has been but we do know that the Monthly Review has enthusiastically published this without a word in its own defense that a Trotskyist just as enthusiastically sells this and hold up Castro as very nearly the Lenin of our era and if, to any normal being, this sounds like 1984, the answer is neither that it is 1984 nor physiological but the intolerable impatience of people

*looking for contacts & results*