

THE BULLETIN

OF THE LENINIST LEAGUE, U. S. A.

(FORMERLY IN DEFENSE OF BOLSHEVISM)

FOR A NEW LENINIST INTERNATIONAL

The Dilemma of the Imperialists

The Change of the "Comintern" Line

Ham and Eggs "Bolshevism"

Mooney-Billings and the "Mass Liners"



THE LENINIST LEAGUE, U. S. A.
P. O. BOX 67, STATION D NEW YORK



Labor Donated

THE DILEMMA OF THE IMPERIALISTS
AND THE OPPORTUNISTS

By George Marlen

A CLOSE survey of today's situation in Western Europe brings out sharply the fundamental dissimilarity of the present moment and that of 1914-1918. The formidable combat known as the World War was a contest of two imperialist groups for the redivision of the earth for markets, colonies and spheres of influence. In order to gain their ends, it was necessary for them to fight to defeat each other. The war of 1914-1918 was the continuation by forcible means of the peace-time struggle for world supremacy between England and Germany and their respective allies.

Contrasted with that specific character of the World War of 1914-1918 of fighting to defeat each other and the years preceding it, the present historical setting in Europe represents the continuation of a policy of an altogether different nature. The British and the French imperialists though officially at war with Germany are not at all pursuing a policy of defeating the German imperialists; and Hitler does not seek victory over the British and the French. The policy of Chamberlain, Daladier and Hitler prior to the declaration of war was bent towards solving the intense crisis of German and world capitalism through the destruction and partition of the Stalin-ridden proletarian State. Only politically near-sighted people will fall victim to the bourgeois fraud that the British-French-United States policy of handing over to Hitler the small independent countries that separated one of the most powerful imperialist states in Europe from Russia was a policy of "appeasement." The aim was to forge Germany into a spearhead in the general imperialist attack upon Russia. The "war" in the West is the cover which gave Hitler the oppor-

tunity to march into Poland. This "war" represents the last phase in setting the stage for the major drama. The British and the French "allies" of the Polish landlords and capitalists consistently facilitated matters for Hitler. Taking its orders from London, the Polish government flatly refused to negotiate with Hitler. That furnished Hitler the necessary setting for delivering his savage thrust at Poland. Though Chamberlain had promised to assist Poland with all the means at his disposal, he withheld aid to his Polish "ally." Meanwhile the Polish army, following the "advice" of the British and French military leaders, abandoned the border defenses and retreated to the interior:

"The army, on advice of the British and French General Staffs, retreated, and in good order." (N. Y. Times, Sept. 10, 1939. My emphasis - G.M.)

This "advice" proved decisive for Hitler's lightning war in Poland. The outer shell of defenses was broken through with relative ease, and, once inside, the Nazis cut the Polish army like a knife cuts butter.

"After having broken through the shell of Polish border defenses the German found inside, in comparison with their own forces, little more than a soft yolk, and they have penetrated that in many directions without really determined general resistance by the Polish Army." (The N.Y. Times, Sept. 12, 1939.)

The imperialists accomplished their purpose, but they found themselves in an irksome and paradoxical

dilemma. They had fooled the masses with the idea that there was a real war on the Western Front. Now they were compelled to keep up the appearance of war and yet find a way of fooling the masses into accepting a "peace." To resolve this difficulty the imperialists are enveloping the minds of the workers in a fog of explanations. This war, say their editors, is not so much a war of arms as of diplomatic moves. The hardened professional butchers like General Gamelin suddenly go humane and become very much concerned about sparing lives — the lives of the peasants and workers in the capitalist armies.

Meanwhile the most powerful imperialist war machines in Europe face each other and remain inactive. Some of the bourgeois writers and speakers with a humorous streak have named the affair on the Western Front "The Alphonse-Gaston War." Concerning the true nature of this "war," the capitalist correspondents reveal some astounding facts. For instance, Duranty disclosed that, since Chamberlain declared that the British would come to the assistance of Poland with all the means at their disposal, the British planes that made periodical flights over Germany not only did not drop bombs but did not even carry a single bomb!

"The war has not progressed beyond the "kidding" stage. Of this there is authoritative confirmation, that not a single British bomber has yet carried or dropped a bomb over German territory." (Walter Duranty, N.Y. Times, Oct. 11, 1939.)

No less indicative are some remarks punctuating the long columns of reportage from the Western Front:

"At the front the general complaint is of boredom and the men clamor for footballs, checker boards and detective stories to while away the time. Yet two mighty armies continue to face each other. What does it all mean? It is not peace certainly. But neither is it war as war was understood until today." (New York Times, Oct. 23, 1939.)

Hugh Gibson, former Ambassador, described the affair abroad as "very curious war that was getting 'curiouser and curiouser.'" He cited a London paper which asked "Are we at war?" (New York Times, Oct. 26, 1939.)

Evidently the mere fact that Chamberlain is carrying a gas mask is not convincing proof that England is actually at war.

Nevertheless the semblance of war must be maintained until the dilemma is solved. Moreover, it is not the German but rather the British, French and American workers who must be impressed with the futility of continuing the "war" and the necessity of terminating it. Hence there is some activity on the seas, such as German attacks upon British naval bases in the course of which the British Admiralty is conveniently relieved of some old, obsolescent tubs like the Courageous and the Royal Oak. The intrinsic character of the situation is once again demonstrated in the attitude of the British. It is significant that—

".....while Germans have been bombing and torpedoing British war-ships, there has been no evidence here that Britain has even attempted retaliation." (N. Y. Times, Oct. 18, 1939.)

Amongst the German workers, no war spirit against France and England has been whipped up and so it is not necessary to spread terror amongst them to convince them of the desirability of peace. But the French and British workers, who have been given colorful "promises" about "destroying Hitlerism," have to have a wish for peace "scared into" them. Hence, the "attacks" on the sea are coming from Germany and not from England and France.

In the face of Hitler's advance to the East Stalin did not remain passive. Taking advantage of the mess the imperialists temporarily got themselves into, Stalin hastened to push forward the borders of the Soviet Union, and managed to create outposts in the Baltic States and improve in

general his military position. Though the bourgeois writers exaggerate beyond all measure Stalin's present amicable relations with German imperialism; and though the opportunists within the working class have invented "the Stalin-Hitler war bloc," the cornerstone of Stalin's moves rests upon the idea

of balking the future attack by German imperialists. This is patent in Stalin's demands upon the Baltic States, upon Finland especially:

"The Soviet demands, which clearly indicate fear of a future German offensive....." (The New York Times, October 18, 1939.)

THE OPPORTUNISTS CONCEAL REALITY

If during the conflict of 1914-1918 the crass opportunists denied its imperialist nature, then in the present situation the subtle opportunists seek to distort reality by painting the cover-war of Chamberlain-Hitler-Daladier as a battle to the death similar to the one of 1914-1918. The entire gamut of pseudo-Bolshevism, from the Stalinists through the Lovestone and Trotsky camps and down to the

tinest self-styled Bolshevnik groups in a chorus, though in different voices, raises the cry that the British and the German imperialists are locked in mortal imperialist combat.

Using this distortion as a springboard, all these fake Leninists issue the revolutionary-sounding pacifist slogan of STOP THE IMPERIALIST WAR and KEEP AMERICA OUT OF IMPERIALIST WAR.

THE STALINISTS

While Hitler with the aid of Chamberlain was steadily advancing eastward, the Stalinists concealed the true nature of the policy of international imperialism. Now they admit that "the Munichmen" were organizing an attack upon the Soviet Union, but they add the fake that Stalin through the understanding with Hitler succeeded in turning the guns of German imperialism upon the British and the French. The cover-war of Chamberlain and Hitler is painted by the Stalinists as the Second Imperialist War:

which the imperialists find themselves in their drive against the Soviet Union, the Stalinist renegades pretend that the Anglo-French-German imperialists are locked in a death-struggle, that they really intend to annihilate each other in the present period. This deception that the imperialists actually propose to defeat each other prior to destroying the Soviet Union is the dominant tune set up by the Stalinist bureaucrats and is faithfully sung by all the opportunists, from Trotsky to Oehler and Stamm, who stand historically within the Stalinist system.

"The war that has broken out in Europe is the Second Imperialist War." ("Keep America Out of the Imperialist War!" Declaration of the National Committee, Communist Party of U.S.A.)

The Stalinist clique, since its origin, has had the policy of entrenching itself in power by crushing the workers struggle throughout the world. To protect itself against the imperialist attacks, Stalinism depends upon the "Red" Army. The contradictions among the imperialists themselves have enabled Stalin to maneuver from one camp to another and form "pacts" with this or that imperialist power. To the workers Stalin palms off these pacts as a protection of the Soviet Union. Thus the Stalinist bureaucrats tell the workers that the Stalin-Hitler Pact has made the imperialists

"The present Second Imperialist War with its blood and iron and steel is the inescapable consequence of a collapsing capitalist system." (James W. Ford, "The Negro People and the Imperialist War," Daily Worker, October 23, 1939.)

Concealing the fact that the "war" on the west is a temporary dilemma in

drop their plans for an attack against the Soviet Union.

"But the British and French imperialists miscalculated. They staked on an anti-Soviet war but lost. The Soviet Union, conducting a socialist foreign policy, by concluding a non-aggression pact with Germany frustrated the insidious plans of the provokers of war, ensured peace between the two largest states in Europe and strength-

ened its influence over the entire course of international developments." (G. Dimitrov, Daily Worker, November 4, 1939, page 2.)

So shouting that German imperialists have been turned away from the Soviet Union to the West, the Stalinists deceive the workers with the fiction that the Franco-British and German imperialists are actually locked in mortal combat.

THE TROTSKYITES

Beclouding the minds of the workers with fundamentally Stalinist opiates the Trotskyites support the Stalinist and bourgeois pretense of a real war in the West, agreeing with the Stalinists as to its basic nature, that it is a "war for markets and colonies." Traditionally posing as opponents of Stalin they give an "anti-Stalinist" angle to their definitions. The political picture in Europe is given the following twist:

"...the war in Europe is an imperialist war, with the arch-reactionary Hitler on one side, backed at the moment by the treacherous Stalin regime and with the imperialist governments of Chamberlain and Daladier on the other." (Socialist Appeal, October 17, 1939.)

In essence this is support to the Stalinist deception that through the Stalin-Hitler pact the Stalinists diverted Hitler from East to West. Engrossed in their work of twisting reality out of shape, the Trotskyites lead the minds of their trusting readers into the domain of absurdity. They declare that Stalin, who is rushing with preparations to stop the future anti-Soviet attack by Hitler when the cover-war in the West is liquidated is earnestly helping Hitler. The Trotskyites even go to such lengths as to state that "A victory for Hitler is an essential part of Stalin's policy." (Socialist Appeal, Oct. 17, 1939.)

The Trotskyite leaders are so bent upon putting over their fakery

about Stalinist policies that they tell the workers the following:

"And, along the same line, the Stalinists have dropped all references to BOTH imperialist camps being 'equally guilty.' This radical formulation (used for but a few weeks) is now dropped; in its place one finds only the Anglo-French camp described as 'war-mongers'." (Socialist Appeal, Oct. 17, 1939. My capitals - G.M.)

Apart from the fact that Stalin is not in military alliance with Hitler, the line of the Comintern, which is not at all based upon Stalin's foreign policy, moving now in the direction of the regular Stalinist ultra-Leftism, must raise the "Leninist" cry about all imperialists. In the article by Stalin's flunkey Dimitrov, "The War and the Working Class of the Capitalist Countries" (Daily Worker, Nov. 4, 1939), the Comintern line about the situation in the west is presented not as the Trotskyite leaders paint it:

"In its character and essence, the present war is on the part of BOTH warring sides, an imperialist, unjust war, despite the fraudulent slogans being used by the ruling classes of the warring capitalist states in their endeavor to hide their real aims from the masses of the people." (My capitals - G.M.)

And again:

"BOTH sides plotted this imperi-

alist war for years, Communist International says, urging end of conflict." (Sunday Worker, Nov. 5, 1939. My capitals - G.M.)

However, despite the elaborately constructed deception about the cover-war, the Trotskyites, just as the bourgeois and the Stalinist writers let slip an occasional admission that the war is not real. Writing in the New York Times, October 4, 1939 issue, Trotsky says:

"France and Britain do not decide to violate the neutrality of Belgium and Switzerland -- their violation is absolutely inevitable in case the real war develops -- (Leon Trotsky, New York Times, Oct. 4, 1939. My emphasis - G.M.)

This is a clear implication that a real war is not there. Of course this half-admission of Trotsky's is drowned in a welter of distortions manipulated by his machine fraudulently misnamed the "Fourth International." It drums incessantly into the workers minds the Stalinist fabrication of the "Second Imperialist War." The Trotskyist magazine, The New International, for October 1939 discusses "The Second World War." The Trotskyist Socialist Appeal in a language almost identical with that used by the Stalinist swindlers speaks of "the holocaust that has been unleashed by the decay of the capitalist empires" (Socialist Appeal, Oct. 17, 1939). Cannon lectures on "The World in Flames AGAIN" (Ibid. My capitals - G.M.). Of course, the hard facts of reality show that there is no "holocaust" and that it is mainly the Trotskyite Cannon belching "flames."

Is it accidental that despite the outward signs of embitterment against Stalin, Trotsky and his followers politically support the basic features of the Comintern fakery? Not at all! Present-day Trotskyism is rooted in the Stalinist reaction. First as a direct participant with Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev in the crime of organizing collective bureaucratic sway over the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Union, and later as a loyal "opposi-

tionist," Trotsky was a party to all the Stalinist betrayals of the world proletariat. He is separated from Stalin organizationally only because Stalin in the process of accumulating and centralizing his personal power, crushed and eliminated Trotsky, despite all Trotsky's pleas for conciliation and reinstatement. There is a compelling reason why politically Trotsky must collaborate with Stalin. He cannot reveal the true nature of Stalinism, its origin and the zigzag method of betraying the workers, which it has been using since 1922, without exposing himself. Chiefly by means of a fake mass-line present-day Trotskyism diverts the minds of the anti-Stalinist advanced workers from discovering the damning facts about the degeneration of the Comintern and the Soviet Union. It is a calculated policy of Trotsky's to conceal the whole truth about the rise of the Stalinist reaction.

Throughout the entire period of its existence from 1923 on, present-day Trotskyism kept its trusting victims in a fog of illusions, riveting the anti-Stalinist workers to Stalinism and thus helping Stalin and the bourgeoisie to destroy millions of the best proletarians. Beginning with 1922 Trotsky embarked upon the sordid policy of working with Stalin, at first directly, later indirectly. He collaborated with the Trio -- Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev -- to fasten the opportunist noose called Workers Government upon the necks of the German workers in 1923. Together with Stalin he concealed Lenin's Testament. He supported Stalin's swindle of revolutionizing the Kuomintan. He tied the anti-Stalinist workers to the Stalinist machine in Germany in 1930-1933. He gave "critical" support to the Stalinist-Socialist Popular Front sabotaging government in Spain, thus collaborating with Stalin in betraying the Spanish toilers.

Trotsky always, from the day the Stalinist bureaucratic plot was hatched in Russia in 1922 politically collaborated with the arch-renegade Stalin and his blood-stained henchmen. Trotsky has no other choice for he must conceal his own crime of having parti-

cipated in the founding of the Stalinist order. That the old adage "politics makes strange bed-fellows" is true can be gleaned from Trotsky's declared position on collaboration with Stalin:

"You ask if I am ready to collaborate with Stalin and his closest collaborators? I have never repudiated such collaboration, and now, before the serious difficulties within and without the country, I am less disposed than ever to repudiate it. Politics knows no personal resentment nor the spirit of revenge. Politics knows only effectiveness. For myself, as well as my companions, it comes back to the question of program of the collaboration." (The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 171.)

The above statement is not accidental. Trotsky knows exactly that the only program that Usurper Stalin follows and can follow is that of betrayal of the masses. In this program, as records conclusively establish, Trotsky very effectively collaborates with Stalin, one of the basest enemies of the toiling masses. But this collaboration is meticulously covered up by Trotsky himself and his hangers-on, the Cannons and Shachtmans! Trotskyism's assistance to Stalin in befuddling the workers' understanding of the present "war" situation in Europe is only one aspect of this collaboration.

OEHLER — STAMM

The Trotskyites are not alone in peddling the fraud that Chamberlain's policy is to defeat Hitler and that Hitler is aiming to defeat the British Empire and that the cover-war is an imperialist conflict for plunder. Oehler and Stamm hang on to the coat-tails of the Cannons and Shachtmans and therefore to Stalinism. Stamm's REVOLT buries the present policy of the imperialists beneath the following misleading words:

"The war in Europe is an imperialist war. It is the direct result of the imperialist peace of Versailles. Like the war of 1914-1918 it is fought on all sides for imperialist ends." (Revolt, Sept. 16, 1939.)

The Oehlerites go beyond all reason and self-control and paint an amazingly unreal and utterly misleading picture. They write with reference to the "war" between the British, French and German imperialists:

"Events are moving at terrifying speed. What took months in the last war is compressed into weeks in the Second World War. Torpedoing of ships, bombings, are being seized upon to whip public sentiment into shape." (The Marxist, October, 1939.)

In 1914 within a few short weeks the German army overran Belgium, invaded France at a spectacular speed and was within sight of Paris. In the East the Russians invaded East Prussia and suffered a terrific defeat at Tannenberg. A furious, bloody battle was fought to turn the German army on the Marne. But all this is as pink tea compared with Oehler's picture of the "Second World War."

Are Stamm and Oehler crudely naive?

We have little doubt that they are informed as to the actual situation. Signs multiply to show that the imperialists are really not waging war among themselves. But Oehler and Stamm disregard those signs. The bourgeois correspondents almost every day let slip valuable admissions. What the Stalinists, Trotskyists, Oehlerites and other opportunists paint as an infernal battle between Germany and England and France is a purest fabrication of Chamberlain, Daladier and Hitler, with the Stalinists adding the fake that their master broke up the orientation of the imperialists. In the dispatch ironically headlined "38 War Reporters Search For a War," Harold Denny writes in the New York Times for October 22, 1939 —

"Hostilities between Britain and Germany are now well along in the second month and not a shot has yet been fired in anger by the British ground forces now firmly installed on this front. Nor, as far as we can learn, have the Germans made any serious gestures in this way. They have not even sent over reconnoitering airplanes."

Two days later the New York Times said: "Correspondents Find War in West, But it Took Place in April, 1918."

It will not be long before the opportunists will begin to repeat the capitalist "explanations" that this "war" is "fought" differently, that this is a war of "diplomatic maneuvers" — the deceptions the imperialists are setting afloat in their endeavors to extricate themselves from the present irksome dilemma.

To summarize. What are the vital facts which the opportunists avoid bringing to the minds of the workers and thus act to aid the imperialists?

Fact 1. Since the October Revolution the deepest contradiction among states has been not between England and Germany or America and England or Japan and the Western imperialists. The deepest contradiction is between Russia — the State based upon socialized property and all the other States based upon bourgeois private property.

Fact 2. While decaying capitalism was approaching the new revolutionary crisis, within the only proletarian State, most of the top leaders, having enjoyed personal power for a few years, entered into a conspiracy to entrench themselves in permanent bureaucratic control of the proletarian State. To insure the stability of their enterprise they transformed the Comintern into a counter-revolutionary trap and halted and betrayed the world revolution. The bureaucratic plot was headed by the alliance of the Troika—Lenin, Kamenev and Stalin — with Trotsky, and supported by Radek, Bukharin, Molotov, Rykov and other renegade leaders. As a result of the treachery capitalism received a new lease on life.

Fact 3. Due to the contradiction between socialized property, the ground upon which Stalinism has been thriving, and bourgeois private property in the capitalist world, the major imperialist powers have pursued the policy of avoiding engaging in a real war among themselves. They have been moving along the line attempting to solve the crisis of capitalism by planning to destroy the Soviet Union which would enable them to divide its huge territories. The central policy of all imperialist powers has been, since the invalidation of the Versailles Treaty, the organization of a common front against the bureaucratically crippled proletarian State.

Fact 4. The present situation in Europe represents the continuation of this policy. The "war" between Chamberlain and Hitler is the continuation of the Munich line of collaboration, by other means, and not at all an attempt of the imperialists to defeat each other. The "war" is a "fix" the imperialists got themselves into in the course of their game of bringing Hitler to the Russian border.

Fact 5. Taking advantage of the temporary dilemma of the British-French and German imperialists, Stalin strengthened his defenses. He pushes his outposts into Europe, lengthening the distance between Moscow and the imperialists. At the same time Stalin incidentally extends some of the remnants of October to hitherto bourgeois territory.

Fact 6. American imperialists are hastily preparing for war — not against Germany but against the Soviet Union. Among these preparations is the attack upon the Stalinist Party. It is not that the Roosevelt administration has any illusions that Stalinism represents a revolutionary movement. But Roosevelt, just as Daladier, understands that around the Comintern are gathered many honest workers who will blindly follow their bureaucratic leaders in all sorts of adventuristic enterprises.

The consequences of the Stalin-Trotsky betrayal of Lenin and the proletariat are about to run their course. The opportunists conceal the actuality

from the workers. They induce the workers to take things at their face value. The task of the true Leninists is to explain the policy of imperialism. The immediate problem is to expose opportunism, particularly the entire Stalinist system of which Trotskyism is an important branch, politically collaborating with the central

Stalinist body. Only in winning the most advanced political workers from supporting opportunism and building with them a new revolutionary Party can there be any hope of ousting Stalinism which is the chief cause of the present wave of reaction. Only thus can history be turned from world reaction toward world revolution.

November 5, 1939

CORRECTION OF AN ERROR

An article called "The Question of the Workers State," by J. C. Hunter (In Defense of Bolshevism, November 1938, p. 20) contains the following remark: "...the pacts between Stalin and the imperialists are a thing of the past, in light of the Munich accord ..." Obviously, the possibility of the formation of the Stalin-Hitler "pact" of August 1939 or of any other "pact" between Stalin and the imperialists was ruled out. This was clearly an error. The mistake committed in the above-mentioned article on this matter of "pacts" was caused by the League's taking these "pacts" between Stalin and the imperialists a little too "seriously." In light of the Munich situation in which the German imperialists, aided and abetted by the British and French, were swiftly pressing toward Stalin's homeland, it seemed that the day of Stalin-imperialist "pacts" was over for good. In a long-range, historical sense, this is true, for fundamentally the real world war of the present epoch will be that of world imperialism against the Soviet Union, despite the latter's distorted, Stalinist form. Meanwhile, the German imperialists, faced by a momentary exigency, form a "pact" with Stalin which, like the Franco-Soviet and Czecho-Soviet "pacts," is not worth the paper it is written on.

The basically anti-Soviet orientation on the part of the imperialists in terms of which they are submerging their own, i. e., inter-imperialist, conflicts, was however, a correct formulation in the above-mentioned article. The present mock "war" in the West is merely a cover with the aid of which the imperialists are camouflaging their preparations for a real war against the Stalinized Soviet Union. German imperialism has been brought to the borders of the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, prior to the liquidation of the fake "war" in the West, Hitler, who cannot permit himself even to seem to be in conflict on two fronts, formed a "friendship" with Stalin which he squeezes for all it's worth in the way of trade and military supplies. Stalin, of course, merely continues his policy of trying to balance as best he can one imperialist camp against the other.

Leninist League of the USA
November 8, 1939

THE CHANGE IN THE "COMINTERN" LINE

By J. C. Hunter

* * *

I.

THE PSEUDO-BOLSHEVIKS PROTECT STALINISM

EVERY OPPORTUNIST organization confuses the workers along two lines: first, in regard to the bourgeoisie and, secondly, with respect to the other opportunist tendencies. The latter aspect is our chief concern here. The foundation of the entire structure of present-day opportunism is Stalinism. An understanding of Stalinism is the basic prerequisite for the reconstruction of Bolshevism, and since all opportunists function to prevent the recreation of Bolshevism, we find every opportunist tendency bemuddling the workers on the nature of Stalinism. On the problem of the zigzag method of the Stalinized "Comintern," as on all elements of Stalinism, the pseudo-Bolsheviks - Trotsky, Lovestone and the Left-Trotskyites - have consistently filled the minds of their followers with harmful illusions.

The essence of the distortion spread by the pseudo-Bolsheviks consists of a concealment of the organic connection of the ultra-Rightist and ultra-Leftist "Comintern" zigzags. Harping on the Popular Front maneuver, the general story of the pseudo-Bolsheviks has been that "centrist" Stalinism has evolved to reformism. This alleged transformation of Stalin to a reformist is attributed by the pseudo-Bolsheviks to the necessities of his foreign policy, specifically, his late "friendship" with French imperialism. By attributing Stalin's Popular Front maneuver to his foreign policy - a dependence totally false, as will be shown - the pseudo-Bolsheviks have been concealing the true origin and role of Stalin's ultra-Rightist "Comintern" zigzag, its organic linkage to the preceding ultra-Leftist line of

1929-1934 and, through a series of alternating maneuvers, its roots in the first Stalinist utilization of the Comintern in 1922-1923 prepared officially at the Fourth Congress in November-December 1922. The pseudo-Bolsheviks have prevented the workers from understanding that the basic purpose of the Stalinist zigzags is and always was to prevent proletarian revolution rather than to support Stalin's foreign policy. And above all, the opportunists have blinded the workers to the new ultra-Leftist maneuver of the Stalinist which must inevitably - it has already started - follow the Popular Front line. Far from warning the workers that Stalin has an ultra-Left trap in store for them, the pseudo-Bolsheviks have fostered the harmful deception that the Stalinized "Comintern" will move farther to the Right.

It is essential for the workers not only to know the history of the past and the developments of the present but also to be able to foresee the general outline of events in the future. The course to be pursued by the opportunists must be clear to the advanced sections of the proletariat else the key to the struggle against capitalism today is lost. It is for this reason that the Leninist League has repeatedly warned that following the Rightist zigzag, a swing to the ultra-Left is imminent in the Stalinist "Comintern."

II

THE REAL NATURE OF STALINISM

The Leninist League analyzes Stalinism as the bureaucratic centralization of the workers state. Stalinism originated in a plot on the part of a section of the leaders of the Russian Communist Party to entrench themselves permanently in power by creating a vast bureaucratic political machine in the Party and Soviet organs on which to base themselves. The chief figures in this plot were Zinoviev, Kamenev and Stalin, known as the "Troika," and their collaborators and supporters, Trotsky, Bukharin, Radek, Kalinin, Voroshilov, Dzerzhinsky, Molotov, Ordzhonikidze and a number of other leading Party characters. This clique realized from the start of their machinations that it was necessary for them to prevent all revolutionary developments amongst the toilers if their scheme for bureaucratic entrenchment was to be successful. Hence, the Russian Communist Party and the Comintern were converted by them into counter-revolutionary traps for the advanced workers and the masses in general. We shall consider here only the Stalinist machinations in the Comintern.

The official Stalinist imprint was set upon the Comintern at its Fourth Congress in November-December 1922. At this Congress there was laid down by Zinoviev, the spokesman of the Troika, the ultra-Rightist policy of forming coalition governments with Social-democracy. In Germany in 1923, the Stalinist-Social-democratic coalition governments in Saxony and Thuringia prepared the way for the smashing defeats of the German toilers in that year. To cover up and distract the attention of the workers from this ultra-Rightist maneuver, it was topped off with an ultra-Leftist putsch in Hamburg in October 1923, a criminal escapade engineered by the Stalinist

agents in Germany. The ultra-Leftist line was continued for about six months along with much of the Rightist deception. A kind of "mixed line" pervaded the Stalinized "Comintern" for a while. The putschist features were gradually dropped and a "straight" ultra-Rightist maneuver was executed thereafter. The outstanding disasters caused by this ultra-Rightist zigzag were the crushing of the British workers in 1926 effected through the Stalinist collaboration with the reformist trade union bureaucrats (Anglo-Russian Committee) and the overwhelming slaughter of the Chinese toilers in 1927 brought about by the Stalinist cooperation with the bourgeoisie under Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang. This period of ultra-Rightism was covered up by a Stalinist-devised putsch in Canton in December 1927. From 1928-1929 on, the Stalinist pursued an ultra-Leftist line culminating in the betrayal of the workers to the German bourgeoisie in 1933 (accession of the Nazi regime). This in turn was followed by the ultra-Rightist zigzag called Popular Frontism.

The Stalinist zigzags are organically connected and run from the present one back to the first in 1922-1923. Their fundamental purpose has been from their beginning to prevent proletarian revolution and the establishment of another workers state, for the Stalin gang always recognized possible revolutionary victories by the toilers as the chief danger to their bureaucratic power. When each zigzag became untenable as a means of diverting the workers from the Marxist path, it was dropped and its fellow adopted. Flinging the workers back and forth between ultra-Rightism and ultra-Leftism, the Stalinist system has been the chief opportunist enemy in the proletarian ranks since 1922-1923.

III.

PREDICTION OF AN ULTRA-LEFT ZIGZAG

It is with this analysis as its basis that the Leninist League has consistently warned the workers that the Popular Front maneuver of the Stalinized "Comintern" would be fol-

lowed by an ultra-Left zigzag. We clearly foresaw that, since Stalinism through the Popular Front was leading the toilers through a series of colossal disasters — as it did through all

the foregoing Stalinist zigzag. — the Stalin gang would have to abandon it gradually in favor of a new bait for the workers. The workers were becoming disillusioned with the results of Popular Frontism. The possibility of the workers breaking away from its influence and seeking true Bolshevism faced the Stalin clique. Overwhelming defeats of the toilers in Spain, Czechoslovakia, France, Poland and imminent disaster in China, would inevitably rock the Stalinist system and cause an exodus of workers from the counter-revolutionary traps known as the "Communist Parties." An ultra-Leftist zigzag was the only salvation for the Stalin gang.

As long ago as May 1937, Marlen stated as a general proposition:

"And when the ultra-Rightist line of the 'People's Front' becomes untenable, an elaborate ultra-Leftist line, a hangman's rope to dispose of the British and the American revolutionary workers, will be handed down to the Harry Pollits and Earl Browders." (G. Marlen, STALIN, TROTSKY OR LENIN, p. 315.)

Stalinism still has the necessity of diverting the toilers from a correct

revolutionary line. The impending launching of an ultra-Leftist zigzag for this purpose was indicated by the Leninist League in November 1938:

"The danger of an imminent ultra-Left Comintern zigzag, the present ultra-right Stalinist line becoming of no more use to mislead the workers because its disastrous nature is growing too obvious must be impressed on the mind of the proletarian vanguard." (In Defense of Bolshevism, Nov. 1938, p. 23.)

In the April-June 1939 issue of this bulletin, this warning was repeated:

"When the disastrous results of the present Rightist zigzag, Popular Frontism, will become obvious to workers, Stalinism will have to abandon it and resort to some form of the Leftist zigzag as a means of covering up the previous betrayals and of continuing diverting the workers from revolutionary channels." (In Defense of Bolshevism, April-June 1939, p. 30.)

That this historical trend in the Stalinist system is an actuality, that the Leninist League's analysis of Stalinism is correct is being proved consistently by the course of events.

IV.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW ULTRA-LEFT MANEUVER

During the ultra-Right zigzag, Stalinism achieves its aim of diverting the workers from the revolutionary path chiefly by entering into coalitions with the Social-democrats and in some cases with the bourgeois-democrats and preaching confidence in liberals and reformists. The Stalinist bureaucrats succeed in holding the toilers under the heel of the capitalists by acting in unison with these "democratic" agents of imperialism. When, as has always been the case, this ultra-Right treachery brings disaster on the workers, the Stalinist renegades are faced with the necessity of covering up their criminality so as to retain their hold on the masses. Stalinism has to relinquish the Rightist zigzag and take on a different kind of decep-

tion, at the same time safeguarding itself against exposure. This it accomplishes by levelling a furious barrage of abuse against its former partners-in-crime, the "democratic" politicians. Social-democracy is made a target by Stalinism which "rages" against it to the extent of falsely identifying it with fascism. The period of abandonment of the latest Stalinist ultra-Rightist zigzag (Popular Frontism) was put in the offing toward the latter half of 1938 by the betrayal of the Spanish revolution entering its final phase. Coupled with this sell-out of the Spanish toilers by Stalinism and its opportunist allies were: 1) the Munich affair in which the bourgeois-democracies openly connived with German fascism and 2)

the Stalinist—Social-democratic betrayal of the Czechoslovak masses. This historical setting compelled the Stalinist bureaucrats to begin their ultra-Left denunciation of "democracy" in general and Social-democracy in particular with which Stalinism was working hand-in-glove. "All of a sudden," Stalinism "discovered" that French "democracy" is treacherous and that Social-democracy with which Stalinism had been in alliance since 1934 is an agent of the bourgeoisie.

"The Munich conspiracy could take place because the hypocritical advocates of French 'democracy' preferred cowardly capitulation to a policy of resisting the aggressor, because the capitulators broke the determination of the people to struggle by sanctimoniously preaching the pacifist creed of peace at any price. The Munich conspiracy was facilitated by the fact that the working class, as a result of the splitting, capitulatory policy of the leaders of the Second (Labor and Socialist) International was unable to muster its forces to frustrate the criminal conspiracy of German fascism and British reaction..... It is they who, after Munich, continue the same policy of splits and capitulation, the policy of disintegrating the labor movement. Without a resolute, day-to-day struggle against these enemies of working class unity, these agents of the bourgeoisie, it is impossible to achieve cohesion of the ranks of the proletariat." (Manifesto of the E.C.C.I., Daily Worker, November 7, 1938.)

Is "democracy" a bulwark against fascism? Assuredly not, cried the post-Munich Dimitroff, thereby reversing by 180 degrees his former "position." On the contrary:

"Why has this series of bloody fascist crimes become possible? It has become possible because the ruling circles of the so-called democratic states have systematically retreated before the fascist aggressors." (G. Dimitroff, Daily Worker, Nov. 14, 1938.)

.Thus, the keynote of the "Comintern" change in zigzag was sounded in November 1938.

The final defeat of the workers in Spain, a colossal disaster; perpetrated primarily by Stalinism, marked another milestone in the swing of the "Comintern" to the ultra-Left. A profound symptom of this was the putsch engineered by the Stalinist leading bureaucrats in Madrid in March 1939. After working hand-in-glove with the bourgeois-democratic gang of Azana, Caballero, Negrin, Miaja, Besteiro and the others of this stripe to betray the Spanish toilers to the bourgeoisie organized under the fascist forces of Franco, the completion of the treachery of the Popular Front government made it imperative for Stalinism to cover its tracks. The formation of the Miaja-Cassado dictatorship marked the determination of the Popular Front government to sell out the last portion of Spain still in its possession. The Stalinist clique, which created the Popular Front government, dominated it throughout its long and bloody career of crime against the workers. Participating in the plan to bring the civil war to a close through the maneuvers of Miaja-Cassado, Stalinism executed a putsch against the latter so as to give the appearance of coming out of the civil war with clean hands. This putsch method of pulling out of a Rightist zigzag is an old one with Stalinism. Even before the putsch in Madrid, we indicated plainly that Stalinism in the past concluded every ultra-Rightist zigzag with ultra-Left putschism:

"After the defeat of the proletariat in Germany in 1923, Stalin covered up the ultra-Rightist zigzag employed in causing this defeat by an ultra-Left zigzag. For about six months the Stalinist traitors shunted the workers into insane adventurist tactics. In Esthonia about 300 workers were led by the Stalinist bureaucrats to capture some police stations, a leftist farce which was paraded in the Stalinist publications as a proletarian revolution. In Hamburg similar tactics were used. After the disaster to

the workers in China in 1927, a putsch was engineered in December of the same year by the Stalinist leaders in Canton, where overnight a 'soviet' was manufactured and palmed off on the workers as a seizure of power." (In Defense of Bolshevism, Jan. 1939, p. 5.)

Knowing the organic connection between the ultra-Leftist and ultra-Rightist zigzag of Stalin's "Comintern," the Leninist League had clearly in view the conclusion of the Popular Front maneuver with some kind of putsch in Spain. Only the exact date and place of the precipitation of the ultra-Leftist adventurism could not be stated in advance. The Stalinist chieftains, utilizing their short-lived putschist assault on Miaja-Cassado as a cover-up of their more than two-years cooperation with these bourgeois-agents, make sure to let it be known that Stalinist leaders were at the head of it:

"There were indications that Hernandez, a member of the Political Bureau of the Spanish Communist Party, had played a prominent role in bringing about the counter-revolt." (i.e., against Cassado-Miaja - J.C.H.) (Daily Worker, March 9, 1939.)

Thus, the betrayal of the Spanish toilers was brought to a close. Pitched about from Stalinist ultra-Rightism to ultra-Leftism, Spain's working millions are completely crushed for the present.

The coming ultra-Leftist zigzag with its new wave of Stalinist scapegoat tactics has already been foreshadowed in Manuilsky's report at the 18th Congress of the Stalinist Party of the Soviet Union held in March 1939. Could the Spanish workers have been victorious, Manuilsky asks. Certainly, he answers:

"But the capitulators of the Second International did not want this to happen, because they fear the victory of the People's Front more than they fear the victory of fascism." (D. Z. Manuilsky, Daily Worker, March 13, 1939.)

No more united fronts with Social-democracy, Stalinism will howl. The Social-democrats are nothing better than fascists, as "our great comrade Stalin" warned the workers even in 1924. Stalin taught the workers that Social-democracy and fascism are twins (Communist International, 1924, #6, p. 4). Already in March 1939 the Stalinist bureaucrats spoke about annihilating their cohorts of yesterday, the Social-democratic leaders. Manuilsky threatened:

"Firstly, a resolute struggle against the capitulators carried to the point of unmasking them completely, isolating them and destroying their influence. The capitulators do not merely cooperate with the bourgeoisie but they cooperate with fascism. The capitulators are the agents of fascism in the labor movement, acting under the mask of 'pacifism' for the deception of the masses." (Daily Worker, March 13, 1939.)

The Stalinists always knew Social-democracy is the agent of the bourgeoisie. This bellowing against the Social-democratic "capitulators" aims to conceal the fact that during the Popular Front maneuver Stalinism not only formed a bloc with these "capitulators" and "agents of fascism" but even carried out together with them the line of supporting the bourgeois-democratic form of capitalist rule, which opened the door to fascism.

By the first quarter of 1939, the Stalinist system moved markedly toward the ultra-Left "line" which will be its form of deception in the ensuing period.

In France the course of the Popular Front "line" was run by about the end of 1938. Stalinism had to prepare to abandon it and substitute an ultra-Left zigzag. The tremendous damage inflicted on the workers by Stalinism through its Popular Front made that "line" untenable as a means of further misleading the toilers. Disillusioned by the harmful results of Popular Frontism, the workers had to be given a new bait. Above all, the opportunist of every stamp who parti-

icipated in the Popular Front maneuver are faced with the necessity of covering their tracks. Both Stalinism and Social-democracy have now to protect themselves and preserve their influence over their victims wherever possible. The mind of the masses has to be distracted from Popular Frontism lest by brooding on it they turn anti-Stalinist and anti-Social-democratic. The Stalinist and Social-democratic opportunists are pulling out of this tight situation by hurling furious abuse at each other. Social-democracy, since its basis is in capitalism, continues its historic policy of supporting bourgeois-democracy, while at the same time breaking with the Stalinist Popular Front. But Stalinism, whose base is the bureaucratically distorted workers state, utilizes its zigzag method, and dropping Popular Frontism, switches to the ultra-Left. It should be noted carefully that Stalinism's abandoning of Popular Frontism in France did not depend on any change in Stalin's foreign policy. Regardless of whether or not Stalin altered his foreign policy, Stalinism was forced to drop the Popular Front maneuver because of conditions in the French working class caused by the disastrous effects of Popular Frontism in France, Spain and elsewhere. The Popular Front outlived its usefulness as a means of binding the workers to the bourgeoisie, and since the sole purpose of the Stalinist zigzags—both Rightist and Leftist — is precisely to keep the toilers harnessed to capitalism, it had to be discarded.

The events in connection with the Hitler-Stalin Pact and the invasion of Poland by German imperialism merely accelerated rather than give rise to the swing of the Stalinized "Comintern" to the ultra-Left. Already well on the road to ultra-Leftism considerably before the Hitler-Stalin Pact and the Polish affair, this outburst marked the further lurch of the Stalinist "Comintern" to ultra-Leftism in certain fundamental respects. Since 1935, Stalinism has been shouting for a defense of "democracy" against fascism and, concealing the imperialist nature of bourgeois "democracy," has urged the workers to support the "democracies"

against the fascists in any military situation. The state of "war" between the "democracies" and Fascist Germany found the Stalinized "Comintern" in the process of abandoning its ultra-Right, Popular Front zigzag and adopting the ultra-Left maneuver to prevent revolutionary developments in the proletariat. With one sharp jump, the Stalinist bureaucrats have met this "war" situation by completely reversing their ultra-Rightist "position." This is especially to be noted in the propaganda of the American Stalinist Party. No longer calling for the support of the "democracies" against the fascist powers, the American Stalinists are now crying that the "war" is an imperialist one, that both sides, "democracies" and fascists, are predatory bandits and that the workers must not support either side.

"The war that has broken out in Europe is the Second Imperialist War. The ruling capitalist and landlord classes of all belligerent countries are equally guilty for this war. This war, therefore, cannot be supported by the workersIt is a war between rival imperialisms for world domination. The workers must be against this war." (Declaration of the National Committee, C.P.U.S.A., Daily Worker, Sept. 19, 1939. Our emphasis.)

What is more:

"The working classes of France and England must overthrow their governments, and turn the war into a true defensive one at the same time calling upon the German working class to overthrow their own Nazi government." (Daily Worker, Sept. 15, 1939.)

Social-democracy comes in for its share of condemnation for supporting the imperialists, especially in the "democracies."

"The leadership of Social Democracy is again playing the dastardly war role that it performed during the last imperialist World War. Only this time, if possible, it is more vicious, more treacherous..." (H. Gannes, Daily Worker, Sept. 16, 1939.)

It is clear that the Popular Front rigamarole in its fundamental aspects has been cast overboard by Stalinism.

Many workers, deceived by the Trotskyites, Lovestoneites and Left-Trotskyites, will imagine that this change in zigzag was dictated by the change in Stalin's foreign policy. Since Stalin has formed a "friendship" with Hitler, it seems logical, especially when so urged by such an influential figure as Trotsky, that the Stalinists had to drop their howling for the defense of "democracy." That this Trotskyite story of the change in Stalin's foreign policy producing the change in "Comintern" zigzag is a fabrication pure and simple is proved by the following. (1) The dropping of the Popular Front maneuver began, as we have shown above, a year ago. Already in November 1938, the Stalinist began its barrage against "democracy." With the final defeat of the workers in Spain in the Spring of 1939, the Stalinist "Comintern" had already reached the stage of putschism and of identifying social-democracy with fascism. In brief, considerably before Stalin formed his "friendship" with Hitler in August 1939, the Stalinist system, basically because of the needs of self-protection in the face of the ruin the Rightist zigzag brought on the workers, was already well on the way to ultra-Leftism. (2) In the U.S., as we have seen, the Stalinist bureaucrats are denouncing both sides in the "war" on the Western Front. But in France and England, despite Stalin's "friendship" with Hitler, the Stalinist bureaucrats continued for a while to support the "democratic" imperialists.

"Maurice Thorez, general secretary of the great French Communist Party, has presented himself for military service with the army of France. This, perhaps more than anything else, symbolizes the magnificent role of the French Communist Party in fighting the enemies of the French Republic. It has been the sword and shield of the French people uniting them against Hitler and his Cagoulard and de la

Roque agents." (Editorial, Daily Worker, Sept. 6, 1939.)

"The work of the Communist Party will go on under all circumstances to do everything in its power to help win this war against fascist aggression..." (Harry Pollitt, General Secretary of the C. P. G.B. quoted in the Daily Worker, Sept. 7, 1939.)

It is obvious that the change to ultra-Leftism has not proceeded at an even pace on the various sections of Stalin's "Comintern." In America it was possible to make the turn relatively rapidly, but in France and England, in view of the military dictatorship and the sentiment of the masses, it was not feasible for the Stalinist bureaucrats to switch their line so hastily. Stalinism has to adapt itself to every objective situation that it faces, and the Stalinist bureaucrats, highly skilled and capable politicians, know precisely how to maneuver when in a tight fix. (3) If Stalin's "friendship" with Hitler is the basis of the change in the "Comintern" maneuver, naturally the Stalinist bureaucrats should be showing a kindly attitude toward German fascism. But facts show that Stalin's flunkys throughout the world are howling as vociferously as ever "for the defeat of the Nazi aggressor." In France and England they were still actually participating in and supporting the imperialists in what they call the war against Hitler while in America the Stalinist tops called for the overthrow of the Nazi regime.

On the whole, it may be said that in its fundamental aspects the Stalinist system has already adopted an ultra-Left zigzag. Remnants of the Popular Front maneuver continue to exist in accordance with the exigencies of the objective situation. These remains of ultra-Rightism will gradually disappear and Stalinism will be perpetrating a full-fledged ultra-Left maneuver.

All the pseudo-Bolshevik organizations have been presenting a false analysis of Stalinism. Chief among them is the Trotskyite "Party," followed by the various left-Trotskyites, (Field, Oehler, Stamm, Mienov) and by Lovestoneism. Every one of these organizations conceals the true origin and nature of Stalinism in general and of the Stalintern zigzags in particular. The source of the deceptions practiced by these pseudo-Bolshevik tendencies is their historical attachment to Stalinism, direct in the case of Trotsky and Lovestone, and indirect in that of the left-Trotskyites. Trotsky and Lovestone have a vital interest in burying the organic connection of the Stalintern zigzags beneath a heap of deception. As direct co-workers of Stalin's in perpetrating several zigzags in the past, Trotsky and Lovestone would like their past to be hidden from the workers' view. They are forced to try to prevent the workers from being able to trace the Stalintern maneuvers from the present one back to the first in 1922-1923. Should the workers succeed in unraveling the true story of Stalinism, they would find that Trotsky, angling for partnership with the "troika" on an equal and permanent basis, directly collaborated with Zinoviev-Kamenev-Stalin in executing the first "Comintern" zigzag in Germany in 1923.* They would observe further the real effects of Trotsky's later establishing himself as a loyal "Opposition" of Stalin when he was openly converted by the "Troika" into its chief scapegoat. Trotskyism, the workers would realize, is only an adjunct of the Stalinist system, or, more precisely, an organic part of it, the track over which anti-Stalinist workers have been shunted back into the Stalinist trap. Lovestone would be seen by the workers to be an ordinary opportunist (like the hundreds of Brewders, Cannons, Dimitroffs, Olgins, Cackins and Ibarruris), the sort of power-greedy flunkies whom Stalin picked up for his "Comintern" by the carload, used as long as he needed and kicked out further to cent-

ralize his power. Lovestone's direct aid to Stalin in perpetrating the "Comintern" zigzags up to 1929 would be common knowledge amongst the workers. For these reasons it is vitally essential for Trotsky, Lovestone and their henchmen to turn the workers' mind away from the real story of the Stalinist system as a whole, away from the past "Comintern" zigzags, away from the organic connection existing amongst this procession of ultra-Right and ultra-Left maneuvers from 1922 to the present.

Trotsky, historically and irrevocably attached to Stalinism, assists it to carry out its "Comintern" machinations. This assistance has taken differing forms ranging from outright connivance with the Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev "Troika" in 1922-1923 to the indirect kind of aid given through "critical" support in the case of the Popular Front maneuver. The ultra-Rightist Stalintern line in every instance (1922-1923; 1925-1928; 1934-1939) was ushered in by an uproar originating in the Kremlin about the necessity of a "united front" with Social-democracy. Under the guise of a "united front," the Stalinist renegades entered into coalition with the Social-democratic agents of imperialism and in some cases with reformist, liberal and undisguised bourgeois politicians in order to bind the workers to capitalism. So, in the process of perpetrating the Popular Front maneuver, the Stalinist bureaucrats formed in 1934 a "united front" with the Social-democratic opportunists in France. Trotsky, adept at easing the path for Stalinism, eagerly "acclaimed" this fake "united front" so as to give the workers the impression that now at last the Stalin gang was acting in the interests of the masses:

"We are ever ready to sincerely acclaim every step the Stalinists take on the correct road."
 (L. Trotsky, Whither France, p. 26, footnote.)

* See IN DEFENSE OF BOLSHEVISM, April-June 1939, pages 2-3.)

According to Trotsky the "united front," in reality a prelude to the

complete ultra-Rightist maneuver, was simply dripping with wonderful things for the workers:

" We have already said that the united front of the Socialist and Communist Parties embodies immense possibilities. If only it wants it seriously, it will tomorrow become master in France." (Ibid., p. 43.)

But in order to become "master in France," the "united front" of these two counter-revolutionary gangs, sizzling with "immense possibilities," must not be bashful about the question of coming into power. To what kind of government, therefore, would Trotsky have the French toilers look with eager joy? To a Blum-Cachin ministry, no less!

"The aim of the united front can be only a government of the united front, i.e., a Socialist-Communist government, a Blum-Cachin ministry. This must be said openly. If the united front takes itself seriously — and it is only on this condition that the popular masses will take it seriously — it cannot divest itself of the slogan of conquest of power." (Ibid., p. 44.)

Let the followers of Trotsky recall what a certain "government of the united front, i.e., a Socialist-Communist government," a Negrin-Hernandez ministry meant for the toilers of Spain. And in light of this, let them realize the hideous import of Trotsky's "advice" to the French workers. This sort of criminality, intended to trick the workers into placing confidence in a Stalinist—Social-democratic coalition government, is nothing new with Trotsky. It is merely a repetition of his treachery of 1923 when, knowing thoroughly the Stalinist plot of the "Troika" to prevent a successful proletarian revolution in Germany in order to safeguard the bureaucratic usurpation of power, Trotsky as well as the other Stalinist leaders of the "Comintern" urged the workers to trust the Stalinist agents in Germany and their death-traps, the Stalinist-Social-democratic coalition government in Saxony and Thuringia. (See In Defense of Bolshevism, April-June 1939, pp. 2-3)

Whipped thus into the Stalinist clutches by Trotsky, even those advanced workers who subjectively broke with Stalinism as a result of the disasters caused by the ultra-Left "Comintern" maneuver of 1929-1934 looked with bright hope to the "united front" fakery perpetrated by Stalinism in 1934.

While, as has consistently been the case since the beginnings of Stalinism in 1922-1923, Trotsky pursued a basically Stalinist policy, he had to maintain his mask of "anti-Stalinism." (This mask has been Trotsky's chief stock-in-trade since 1923 when, in answer to Trotsky's efforts to work in cahoots with Zinoviev-Kamenev-Stalin, the plotters of the "Troika" converted Trotsky into their main scapegoat and whipping-boy.) The unfolding of the Stalinist—Social-democratic "united front" into a full-fledged ultra-Rightist zigzag (Popular Frontism) made it tactically impossible for Trotsky to continue openly "acclaiming" Stalinism's steps "on the correct road." Trotsky had to work out some sort of self-protective device. He had to give the impression that he was fighting Stalinism for its ultra-Rightist line. At the same time, in order to continue his historic role of political co-worker and protector of the Stalin gang, he had to avoid a genuine exposure of Stalinism. The tactic Trotsky devised for this specific problem was to "explain" the Popular Front "line" as being the result of Stalin's foreign policy.

The ultra-Rightist maneuver of 1934-1939 began historically with the advent of Hitler to power in January 1933. This disaster made the ultra-Leftist zigzag which had paralyzed the German — (as well as all other) — workers since 1929 untenable as a means of further preventing proletarian revolution. As early as January 22, 1933, the Stalin clique replied favorably to a "united front" proposal of the bureaucrats of the Second International. The change to the ultra-Rightist zigzag (Popular Frontism) proceeded cautiously from the moment Hitler came to power, for the Stalin gang realized immediately that it would have to employ a new bait to snare the workers. In the early period

of this change of "Comintern" zigzags from ultra-Leftist to ultra-Rightist, i.e., in 1933-1934, Stalin was repeatedly offering "collective security" and "friendship" pacts to Hitler in an effort to continue his "amicable" relations with German imperialism. In his foreign relations, Stalin, as he so clearly explained at the 17th Congress of the C.P.S.U., naturally does not care a hoot whether the imperialism he is dickering with is fascist or "democratic." "Fascism is not the issue here," Stalin said in laying down his foreign policy to his bureaucrats at the Congress (see Inprecorr, Feb. 13, 1934, p. 237.) If Stalin had been able to wheedle a "friendship" pact out of Hitler, then the change to the Popular Front zigzag would have taken place in the presence of a Stalin-Hitler "alliance." The change in zigzag grew organically out of the results of the ultra-Left line which had become untenable because of stirrings in the working class and had nothing to do with Stalin's diplomatic negotiations. It was the German imperialists, however, who changed their foreign policy and refused Stalin's offers. The renegade was therefore forced to turn to French imperialism. Thus it came about that incidentally during the alternation of "Comintern" zigzags Stalin formed an "alliance" with French imperialism.

Trotsky, fishing about for some device by which he could appear to be attacking Stalinism while at the same time actually protecting it, began to trumpet that the ultra-Right, Popular Front line was due to Stalin's new found "friendship" with French imperialism. Stalin actually changed the "Comintern" line to ultra-Rightism in order to be able, as ever since 1922-1923, to prevent successful proletarian revolution. Trotsky, however, because of his role of direct co-plotter with the Stalin gang in 1922-1923, always seeks for means to conceal the fact that Stalinism has always been consciously counter-revolutionary. Trotsky's fairy story of the dependence of the "Comintern" zigzag on Stalin's foreign policy made it appear that the Popular Front maneuver was simply Stalin's well-intentioned but errone-

ous way of defending the Soviet Union. The deception that the Stalinism zigzags were merely "mistakes" has been one of Trotsky's most potent means of camouflaging the real, pre-meditatedly counter-revolutionary nature of Stalinism. Trotsky's general "explanation" for the disasters Stalinism brought on the workers was that Stalin is fundamentally honest but rather stupid. The coincidence of the change of ultra-Rightism and the change in Stalin's foreign relations in 1934-1935 gave Trotsky an opportunity to spread a new piece of confusion. In this manner, there arose the fable that the "Comintern" zigzags are due to Stalin's foreign policy.

Trotsky, of course, kept quiet about the fact that in previous years Stalin had changed the "Comintern" zigzags from ultra-Rightism (1922-1923) to ultra-Leftism (1923-1924) to ultra-Rightism (1925-1928) to ultra-Leftism (1929-1934) without changing his foreign policy. During these alternations of Stalin's maneuvers through the "Comintern" from 1923 to 1934, Stalinism maintained a consistently "friendly" relation with German imperialism and a hostile attitude toward Franco-British imperialism. If Trotsky pointed to this fact, naturally his fabrication about the dependence of the "Comintern" line of Stalin's foreign policy would appear in all its deceptiveness. Like a competent opportunist, the verbose Trotsky knows when to keep mum.

Significantly enough, until recently the fish story about the "Comintern" zigzag being dependent on Stalin's foreign policy was hauled forth by Trotsky only during the ultra-Rightist maneuver. But, after all, Stalin had a foreign policy during the ultra-Leftist zigzag also. At all times, he has tried to win the "friendship" of one of the divided imperialist camps. During the years 1929-1933, Stalin had "friendly" relations with the German imperialists, but it was precisely during this period that the Stalinism perpetrated the wildest ultra-Left maneuver in its history. And, moreover, this wildest ultra-Leftism was carried to its utter-

most extreme precisely in Germany. Apparently, if we follow Trotsky, Stalin was endeavoring to retain the love of the German imperialists by having his henchmen yell "revolution" in the ears of the workers and by keeping the toilers in a constant Leftist uproar. And likewise, the Stalinist putsch in Canton in 1927, where overnight Stalin's agents concocted a "S o v i e t," must have been designed to make the imperialists ooze with affection for Stalin. We may go back even further to Hamburg in 1923 and Estonia in 1924 where the Stalin gang through its "Comintern" flunkys perpetrated military adventures. These also, obviously, were a bid for the imperialists' goodwill!

If we make an examination of the whole history of Stalinism since its origin we reveal the utter falsity of Trotsky's yarn. Stalinism has had a consistent foreign policy: to live at peace with all the imperialist powers, to win the "friendship" of one or the other camp of the major imperialists, to pit the imperialists against each other and thus render them incapable of launching a united attack on the homeland of Stalinism. But Stalin's "Comintern" has had a unique history of two alternating maneuvers, one of which, the ultra-Leftist, cannot by any stretch of the imagination be made to conform to Trotsky's nokum about the "Comintern" being merely an adjunct of Stalin's foreign office. We may rest assured that Stalin and his bureaucrats do not forget about their foreign policy periodically. For their foreign policy they use their diplomats who are armed with whatever bargaining cards are available to Stalin — trade pacts, non-aggression agreements, promises of military assistance, and the like. These alone are the weapons of Stalin's foreign office. The "Comintern" is a separate and distinct machine utilized by Stalin for the purpose of crushing any attempt of the workers to free themselves from capitalist bondage — and Stalinist bondage.

The Trotskyites have greeted the most recent Stalinist change of maneuver with a continuation of their newest fakery. As ever, Trotskyism

strives to conceal the real purpose of all the "Comintern" zigzags, the deliberate prevention of successful proletarian revolution. Trotskyism also strives as long as possible to divert the workers' attention from the fact that the Stalinist is dropping its current maneuver and adopting its complement. Long after the signal for changing the Popular Front maneuver had appeared in September 1938, the Trotskyite bureaucrats were shouting that the "Comintern" would move further to the Right, i.e., in the opposite direction from which it was actually travelling. When, with the Polish events, the change to ultra-Leftism had become too obvious to continue camouflaging it, the Trotskyite chieftains began to "explain" the alternation. Far from making it clear to the workers that the present change in the Stalinist "line," like all previous transformations, has as its purpose to enable Stalinism to continue its past policy of preventing successful proletarian revolution, the Trotskyite leaders parade their fable of the connection of the "Comintern" line with Stalin's foreign policy, with the Stalin-Hitler Pact.

"The bright yellow of recent years, which reflected the alliance, or attempted alliance of Stalin and the imperialist democracies, has been suddenly transformed, like the color of a chameleon on an autumn leaf, into the reddish-brown of the Stalin-Hitler pact..... The revolutionary phrase-mongering of the Stalinist bureaucrats is only a new deception, a transitional mechanism designed to bridge the abrupt change from a pro-democratic to a pro-axis policy and carry the workers along." (James P. Cannon, Socialist Appeal, Sept. 29, 1939 — our emphasis.)

The development of the ultra-Leftist zigzag since the last half of 1938 under Stalinism's necessity of self-protection in the face of the defeats of the masses wrought by the Stalinist Popular Front, as outlined above, gives the lie to this Trotskyist fabrication. Regardless of whether or not Stalin changed his foreign policy, the Popular Front "line" was finished for the pre-

sent period as a counter-revolutionary device and had to be abandoned for a new bait. The historic nature of Stalinism — today as in the past, back to 1923 — made a switch to an ultra-Leftist "Comintern" maneuver inevitable regardless of Stalin's foreign policy.

The importance to Trotsky of this aspect of his chicanery cannot be overestimated. Anything which diverts the workers' mind from the past history of the Stalinist system is of immense value to Stalin, Trotsky and all the renegades from Bolshevism who are guilty of fostering the bureaucratic strangulation of the first workers republic. Consider the case of an average Stalinist worker, who, becoming disgusted with Stalinism, follows the historic path into the clutches of the King of the "anti-Stalinists," Trotsky. Such a worker in the overwhelming majority of cases will of himself have little or no inclination and time to make a thorough investigation of the entire Stalinist movement. The adverse conditions of the average worker's life are not such as to impel him to the laborious study and search this requires. When he comes to Trotsky, he receives an "explanation" of Stalin's maneuvers which completely diverts his eye from past developments and the present reality. What was the Popular Front due to? Stalin's foreign policy! What is the now-unfolding Leftist "line" due to? Stalin's foreign policy! With such an easy "explanation" available, what compulsion will there be for this anti-Stalinist worker to look back and find out what Stalinism really is, how it originated and how it operates? This worker will therefore never discover Trotsky's role of collaborator of the "Troika," and Trotsky remains free to continue his historic function of chief divert-er of the anti-Stalinist worker from the path to a new Bolshevik Party. Trotsky's "explanations" of the Stalinist zigzags move further and further away from anything which points in the direction of the origin of Stalinism. In the past Trotsky used to "explain" the lurchings of the Stalinized "Comintern" is due to what

he called Stalin's bureaucratic centrism. Such a term, however, still has some power to evoke curiosity as to what Stalinism is, how it started and operates. Hence, Trotsky and his flunkys tend less and less to use it. Their present "explanation" is of such a character that it bears no relation to the whole story of the rise of Stalinism. One merely has to know Stalin's foreign policy and, following Trotsky, one immediately "understands" the reason for the current Stalinist zigzag. This is all very simple and very safe — for Stalin and Trotsky.

* * * *

While Trotsky was still using the term, bureaucratic centrism, he used to define Stalinism during the Rightist zigzag as reformism. This term — entirely false, for Stalinism is the bureaucratic centralization of the workers state, and nothing else — has been taken up, like all the fundamental Trotskyist deceptions, by the various left-Trotskyite groups. Thus the Oenlerite organ spouts:

"The social-reformists are in the United States represented by such parties and men as: The Socialist Party and Norman Thomas and the Communist Party and Earl Browder." (The Fourth International, Feb. 1938, p. 13.)

The passage of the Stalinist to an ultra-Leftist maneuver leaves these "left" camp followers of Trotsky stranded high and dry. It's a weird "reformist" who shrieks against imperialism and bourgeois-democracy as do Stalin's agents these days. It was

* This piece of Trotskyist fakery, which attributes Stalin's counter-revolutionary policies to his alleged believing in some "theory" of socialism in a single country, has as its purpose to conceal the criminal conspiratorial nature of Stalinism as a plot on the part of a section of the top leadership of the Russian Communist Party to usurp power in the workers state by bureaucratic machinations. Stalinism's origin is not in a theory but in a crime, in which Trotsky participated.

only by forcibly separating the Popular Front "line" from the whole historic structure of Stalinism that the left-Trotskyites could define Stalinism as reformism. Such a separation is, of course, Trotsky's game to the letter, since it acts to blot out the tracks to the origin of Stalinism. The Stalinist system is a brand new kind of opportunism which cannot be defined by any of the old terms. Reformism has its roots in capitalism, while Stalinism's foundation is the bureaucratically crippled workers state. Reformism and Stalinism are totally and entirely different. Only those who have a motive for distorting the workers' understanding of Stalinism or who are political ignoramuses will identify Stalinism with reformism.

Very likely, the pseudo-Bolsheviks will try to wheedle their way out of the ludicrous position they have put themselves into with their nocus-pocus about Stalinism being reformism by pleading:- Well, after all, Stalinist Popular Frontism in its internal anatomy was certainly similar to reformism, with its support of bourgeois-democracy and so forth. That's all we meant to say when we maintained that Stalinism became reformism. In other words, the pseudo-Bolsheviks, to rationalize their distortions, will have in one way or another to appeal to the fact that in its formal aspects Stalinist Rightist zigzag looked like reformism. For those who think seriously about the political problems of the workingclass, such an "argument" will hold no water. The Stalinist bureaucrats waving the Red Flag, singing the International, "Sovietizing" regions in Poland and shouting "Long Live Socialism" may look like Bolsheviks to many confused workers. But only a fraud or a fool will palm them off on the workers as disciples of Marx-Engels-Lenin. The Stalinist Popular Front was not reformism but was part of a policy which in its totality includes an ultra-Left zigzag. The Rightist maneuver cannot be separated from the Leftist without distorting the total nature of the Stalinist counter-revolutionary methodology. Reformism does not and never did have recourse to a Leftist zigzag.

The Leninist League never failed to indicate the totality of which the Popular Front was but a part and the Leftist maneuver which would organically be its outgrowth. Therefore, the Leninist League could correctly, to the extent of its influence, warn the vanguard workers far in advance that Stalin had in store an ultra-Leftist trap. But the pseudo-Bolsheviks? What kind of fore-warning did they give the workers? Let us see.

One of the most fantastic results of the deceptions originating with Trotsky appeared in the Oehlerite press. Precisely the final defeat of the workers in Spain which gave the Stalinists a tremendous impetus to the ultra-Left evoked from the Oehlerites the pronouncement that the "Comintern" was undergoing a swing to the Right.

"Out of this defeat only the Stalinists are not facing splits. Due to their bureaucratic 'homogeneity' they confront a turn-over in membership and a political swing to the right expressed in the most brazen social patriotism yet witnessed." ("The Movement After the Spanish Defeat," International News, September 1939, p.5. Our emphasis.)

The Stalinist putsch in Madrid and furious abuse of "democracy," both bourgeois and "socialist," which marked the final crushing of the Spanish toilers must, if we follow the Oehlerite brand of "Marxism," be taken as symptoms of a political swing to the Right. Thus to confuse Leftism with Rightism is in itself a menace of no mean proportions. But to befuddle the workers on the nature of Stalinism as a whole, when Stalinism is the chief opportunist danger in the workers' ranks, means to function entirely for the benefit of Stalinism and bourgeois reaction.

Politically advanced workers will judge for themselves the "value" of an organization which does not explain correctly the past disasters and does not forewarn the toilers of future dangers. Marxism has always maintained that, as is true of science in general, its correctness is proved in part by its power accurately to predict future

trends at least in outline form. For the toilers, the ability to see into the future is not a mere game or kind of magic but it is a matter of life and death. History moves on constantly either to the welfare or the detriment of the masses. It is the duty of Marxists to be able to warn the toilers in advance of impending dangers. Political tendencies like Trotskyism, Lovestoneism and left-Trotskyism do not warn the workers in advance of the new traps that Stalinism, the most powerful of all present-day forms of opportunism, has set for them. More, by distorting the truth about the rise, the nature of Stalinism and of the zig-zag method it has been employing for the past seventeen years to prevent the workers from establishing another proletarian state, they disarm the toilers before the assaults of their enemies.

The pseudo-Bolsheviks not only give the workers a false picture of the origin, nature and method of Stalinism, but also, to the extent of their influence, prevent the vanguard workers from combatting Stalinism. All these tendencies, fleeing from the task of destroying Stalinism, have buried their followers in a fraudulent "mass line." Trying to turn to the backward workers, rather than to the vanguard, these pseudo-Bolshevik organizations pretend to be able to attack the capitalist system directly at the present time without previously annihilating Stalinism and the other powerful opportunist forces. In this

way they leave the road clear for the vanguard workers, who are already finished with capitalism and who imagine they are Communists, to march straight into the Stalinist death trap, which to the mind of the masses represents the continuation of the Bolshevik Revolution.

When Stalinism fully develops its coming ultra-Left maneuver, the "mass line" pretensions of the pseudo-Bolsheviks will burst like a bubble. With Stalinism roaring "revolution" morning, noon and night and directing ferocious assaults against the other opportunist organizations operating in the proletarian ranks, the "mass liners" will appear with all their ludicrousness magnified a thousandfold. The leftist bellowing of Stalinism which will be heard in the coming period will make the mass line "Bolshevism" of the pseudo-Bolsheviks look like another case of bringing coals to Newcastle. While Stalinism employs the ultra-Right maneuver, the "Bolshevism" of the "mass liners" appears on the surface to be at least somewhat in order. With the ultra-left uproar of Stalinism occupying the center of the stage, however, it will become increasingly clear that "mass lineism" is a false orientation which leads far away from the path to the prime requirement of today, direct political exposure of the entire Stalinist system to the most advanced elements of the proletarian vanguard, so that of this vanguard a new Bolshevik Party and International can be built.

October 20, 1939.

HAM AND EGGS "BOLSHEVISM"

By Arthur Burke

NINETY ONE YEARS after the Communist Manifesto and twenty-two years after the great October Revolution, the American organization of Leon Trotsky, the "greatest living Marxist," advises all its members and sympathizers to vote YES on Proposition No. 1, (Ham and Eggs)" (Socialist Appeal, Nov. 3, 1939). The Trotskyite's support to this bourgeois fraud is given behind the old moth-eaten camouflage of "criticism." Thus the S.W.P. admits that "The plan will be financed by a higher cost of living for the poor, and will amount to the poor paying for the poor." (Ibid.) Yet "we urge YES votes without taking responsibility for the plan itself." (Ibid.) The involved sophistries of the medieval scholastics who broke their heads debating such problems as the number of angels able to dance on the point of a needle were mere child's play compared to the ever-recurring Trotskyist mystery of how to support reactionary movements and simultaneously refuse responsibility for such support.

The "Ham & Eggs" plan is more than a mere continuation of such middle class snares as the Townsend Pension Plan. Like the former Sinclair "Epic" movement, it aspires to remedy the maladies of capitalism as evidenced by its plans for a state bank, its insistence that the thirty dollar warrants issued every Thursday be spent within the week and made up by a stamp tax on scrip subject to the dictatorial control of an administrator.

The growing impoverishment of the petty-bourgeoisie and middle classes gives a material basis to mushroom theoreticians who professionalize the peddling of such reactionary pipe dreams. Failing determined and correct leadership by the proletarian vanguard in times of social crisis, the moribund widespread do these petty-

bourgeois crackpot panaceas become. The inevitable result — disillusionment and a consequent fertile feeding ground for reactionary demagogues.

The Trotskyite leaders are perfectly aware that this Ham and Eggs Plan is a reactionary scheme no matter from what angle a revolutionary looks at it. It must be borne in mind that they admit: "The plan will be financed by a higher cost of living for the poor, and will amount to the poor paying for the poor." This, however, does not prevent the Trotskyite chieftains from egging on their followers to support this reactionary will of the wisp — with the usual Trotskyite "criticism" and "without taking responsibility." The Trotskyite leaders, in other words, quite consciously tell the workers to put their neck on the capitalist block but "without taking responsibility" when the fatal axe falls.

What is behind this Trotskyite Ham and Eggs and similar "mass line" flimflam? Why do the Trotskyite burce-rats get their followers to cudgel their wits over all sorts of obvious bourgeois hokum such as the Ham and Eggs Plan, to sit up nights puzzling over how to support such chicanery without "taking responsibility" for it? If one knows the real nature of the Trotskyite system, the answer is simple.

If Cannon and Shachtman can get their victims to batter their brains speculating on the Ham and Eggs Plan, and other petty-bourgeois reformist schemes, then the workers won't be up to such mischief as, for example, thinking about why Trotsky helped Stalin to conceal Lenin's Testament. To philosophize over the Ham and Eggs Plan will never lead a worker to wonder why Trotsky should have voiced opposition to the removal of Stalin from the post

of General Secretary. There is clearly no path from thoughts on the Ham and Eggs Plan to ideas on why Trotsky supported the "Leninist Levy" which many years later Trotsky stated, dealt "a death-blow to the Party of Lenin."

Generally speaking, a worker can sit on the Ham and Eggs Plan from now till doomsday, and still never have the slightest suspicion that Trotsky has been the outstanding prop to Stalin and his henchmen since the origin of Stalinism in 1921-1922. No doubt, a Ham and Eggs diet is much more beneficial to the workers, from Trotsky's standpoint, than an accurate knowledge of Trotsky's role as an assistant to Stalinism.

Since Trotsky sets himself up as "the greatest disciple of Lenin" and the King of the "anti-Stalinists," he has to have some self-protective devices which will prevent his victims from realizing his role as a renegade from Bolshevism and a would-be partner of Stalin. The "mass line" he flings his followers into, serves precisely this purpose. Let the workers support, "without taking responsibility," the Ham and Eggs Plan, the A.L.P. agents of the bourgeoisie, the bourgeois proposal for a "referendum" on war or any other Rightist fakery, and, as far as

Trotsky — and Stalin — are concerned, they are "safe." They will never unearth the true story of the rise of Stalinism, and especially of Trotsky's role of assistant to Stalin and his bureaucratic clique. They may go down under the bourgeois axe the world over, but this is "merely" a "by-product" of Trotsky's need to camouflage his actual counter-revolutionary nature.

Support of the Ham and Eggs Plan by the Trotskyites is not at all accidental. It is part of Trotsky's present Rightist line which was introduced with the "French Turn" in 1934. It is crucially significant that the "French Turn" which involved a Rightist evaluation of Social-democracy coincided almost exactly in point of time and content with the Rightist zigzag of Stalinism which also commenced in 1934. At present the Stalinists are beginning a new ultra-Leftist zigzag, the third in the history of Stalinism. Inevitably the Trotskyists using their customary "anti-Stalinist" coloration will in time drop their present Rightist positions and will tail along with this third ultra-Left zigzag of Stalinism. The Trotskyites, however, are still engaging in what is one of the last flickers of their present Rightist course.

Nov. 9, 1939

SEND FOR

TROTSKYISM AND THE A.L.P.

IN DEFENSE OF BOLSHEVISM - AUGUST 1938

5¢/copy.

LENINIST LEAGUE, Box 67, Sta. D.
New York

MOONEY, BILLINGS and the "MASS LINERS"

IN RECENT years during the Stalinist ultra-Right zigzag of 1934-1939, the workers have been crushed and trampled on by the bourgeoisie the world over. In Spain, Czechoslovakia, Franco, Austria, England, Germany, Italy, China, fascism or a military dictatorship of "democratic" capitalism has been standing on the neck of the masses with both feet. In the U.S., the toilers are gradually, and without offering a spark of resistance, being engulfed by the war machine of Morgan, Dupont and Rockefeller. Throughout the world, this working class paralysis has been caused by the treachery of the opportunists, at the head of whom stand the Stalinist bureaucrats. In the U.S., the opportunist swindlers are practically legion. The workers who are still loyal to capitalism are tied to the stake by the huge reformist bureaucracies of the A. F. of L. and C. I. O. The anti-capitalist workers are led by the nose by the Browders, Norman Thomas es, Schachtmans, Lovestones and, last but not least, still significantly, by the Oehlers.

In this context of unsurpassed deception and cheating of the entire "Labor Movement" by the opportunists, two class war prisoners, Mooney and Billings, have been set free by the bourgeoisie.

Anyone who is sane and honest, will realize that Mooney and Billings were not freed by any "mass pressure." The opportunist scoundrels have bound the toilers to the bourgeoisie hand and foot. But if one has an axe to grind, it becomes very easy to shout about Mooney and Billings having been freed by "mass pressure." In the case of Mooney, all the opportunists from Browder to Oehler emitted a fraudulent

"Hurrah" for this alleged "mass pressure." We indicated at that time the precise origin and purpose of this deceptive opportunist cry of joy. (See "In Defense of Bolshevism" April-June 1939, pgs. 15-28.) With the recent liberation of Billings, many opportunists seized the occasion to repeat their hokum about the "Labor movement" shaking up the bourgeoisie. The Oehlerite press for example babbles about Mooney's liberation by the "efforts" of the "Labor movement":

"The Labor movement should be grateful that by its efforts it has been able to free this labor martyr." (The Fighting Worker, Oct. 15, 1939. Our emphasis.)

The "Labor Movement," a conglomeration of opportunist-dominated, counter-revolutionary organizations. "By its efforts" paralyzed the masses and left the bourgeoisie free to keep Mooney and Billings in prison until doomsday if they so desired. Billings, like Mooney, was freed because the American bourgeoisie, for the present utilizing "liberalism" to snare the workers, realize that these class war prisoners will be more useful to them free than in jail. Mooney, with strong Stalinist prompting, began to gush with enthusiasm for American "democracy" as soon as he set foot out of his cell. His liberation, and likewise Billings, was the result wholly of a deal with a gang of shrewd bourgeois politicians who understand that they have everything to gain and nothing to lose by dangling a "liberated" Mooney-Billings before the eyes of the masses. The opportunist-inspired paralysis of the toilers enabled the bourgeoisie to convert the Mooney-Billings case into pure profit for capitalist "democratic"

rule. The whole outrageous frame-up has been whitewashed and given a "decent" burial. For this the bourgeoisie can thank the opportunists.

The release of Billings too was in no way brought about by any pressure of the masses. Certainly in recent months hardly a finger was pressed against the fat belly of the bourgeoisie. Even Mooney, the Oehlerite point out, stopped working for his release. But Oehler, in order to keep up his fraud about "mass pressure," has to slur over the present and pretend that it was some alleged "class pressure" in the past that caused Billings' release at this late date.

"Governor Olson's 'pardon' of Billings is the result of years of class pressure." (The Fighting Worker, Nov. 1, 1939, p. 2. Our emphasis.)

No doubt the "years of class pressure" that Oehler has in mind is the fake rumpus raised in the past by those great "friends" of labor, the Stalinists, the Trotskyites, the Lovestoneites, the Liberals and other opportunist heroes of the class struggle. Unfortunately, these "treacherous gangs" which compose the "Labor movement" exert a "class pressure" wholly in the interests of the bourgeoisie. It is for this reason that the workers were unable to free Mooney-Billings while the bourgeoisie could turn them loose without having to pay a penny for its crime of framing them.

The "mass line" frauds, like Oehler, with their drivel about "mass pressure" forcing the liberation of Mooney and Billings are trying to create an illusory world in which they can practice their particular form of opportunism. This consists in endeavoring to turn the attention of the vanguard workers away from the chief danger in their midst, the Stalinist-led structure of opportunism. By talking of great victories for "mass pressure" and the "Labor movement," Oehler and his stripe deceive the vanguard workers into imagining that with their present leadership they can defeat the bourgeoisie. Should the workers believe this "mass line" fraud, they would become blind to the fact that with their present leadership, overwhelmingly opportunist as it is, only victories for the bourgeoisie are possible. Moreover, if the vanguard workers follow the Oehlers, they will commit the horrible blunder of failing to concentrate all their efforts for the present in a battle to destroy the influence of the opportunists, and primarily of Stalinism. Oehlerism offers the toilers only "victories" like the freeing of Mooney-Billings, i.e., "victories" which are victories for the bourgeoisie and defeats for the masses.

J. C. H.

October 27, 1939
