

FIVE CENTS

MAY -- 1941

T H E **BULLETIN**

Under the Cloak of the War

GEORGE MARLEN

The A. L. P. and the Trotskyite Line

ARTHUR BURKE

The Trotsky School of Falsification

Trotsky's "Advice" to the Russian Workers

THE RED STAR PRESS

P. O. BOX 67

STATION D

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
The Sham British Blockade George Marlen	1
The Shachtmanites "Explain" the Imperialists' Policy J.C. Hunter	9
Oehler's "March Separately and Strike Together" G.M. J.C.H.	16
Why Did Stalin Betray The Spanish Workers Arthur Burke	22
THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION	
I. The Political Nature of the Trotsky-Zinoviev Bloc	25
II. Tricky Phrases Cannot Hide the Truth G.M.	28

Address Communications to:

THE RED STAR PRESS
P.O.Box 67, Station D.
New York

T H E S H A M B R I T I S H B L O C K A D E

I N 1914 the big imperialist powers fought a desperate battle for markets, colonies, and for greater shares in the exploitation of the world toiling masses. The pseudo-Marxists of those days, the leadership of the Second International, aided the imperialists by hiding the truth about the robber nature of that war. There was only a small group of people led by Lenin who gave the correct evaluation of the war and laid down a correct policy for fighting it.

Much blood has run under the bridge of history since the treachery of the Socialist parties in August 1914. An entirely new opportunist force has arisen within the international proletariat. The first proletarian State became diseased, and this disease - Stalinism - has poisoned the international workers vanguard concentrated in and around the "Comintern." Since the birth of this new opportunist plague the revolutionary workers have been misled and blinded by the Stalinist perverters of truth.

Today, England and various small governments are officially at war with Germany and Italy. Officially the American imperialists are supposedly aiding England and other "democracies" against Germany and Italy. What is the appraisal of the situation given by the usurpers of the first prolet-

arian State, by the utterly corrupt, treacherous and deceitful Stalinist bureaucrats who disguise themselves as Leninists? Their evaluation is that today the big imperialist powers are engaged in a war of the same nature as the war of 1914. "The war that has broken out in Europe is the Second Imperialist War," shout the Stalinist bureaucrats (Declaration of the National Committee, C.P.U.S.A.). They speak of "...the scramble of the rivals, German and Anglo-American imperialism....." (Daily Worker, May 20, 1941).

We reject this "thesis" as a Stalinist swindle. We discern in the present situation not a war of the nature of 1914-1918 but a sham war under the cover of which all the imperialist powers are closely collaborating in rapidly exterminating the class-conscious workers and in planting the fascist form of capitalist rule in one country after another as a preliminary phase to the partitioning of the Soviet Union.

Let us examine a few points to ascertain the reality of this "war." No one possessing at least an average knowledge of war strategy will deny the importance of the weapon of the blockade. In a number of wars this weapon proved among the most formidable ones. In the war of 1914-1918 it was a powerful factor in the hands of England and her Allies. Owing to the

Clinging to their original thesis that the British and French imperialists have been fighting the German, as in 1914-1918, the Stalinists and Trotskyists found themselves confronted with the delicate task of giving a plausible explanation for what had occurred. The gist of their explanation was that the French imperialists were divided, that they feared revolution, that the generals in particular favored Hitler. At the same time the Stalinists and the Trotskyists continued telling their followers that the British imperialists went on fighting the German. The fact that during the march of the Nazis into the Lowlands and into France the military staff which directed the "Allied" armies was composed not only of French but also of British generals was carefully "forgotten." The fact that Churchill as well as Reynaud approved the "strategy" of retreat conducted by Weygand, later a member of Petain's government, was also omitted.

That the "quarrel" between the Petain and the Reynaud set was merely a show has been indicated to a great extent by the mockery of the so-called Riom trials. At first there was an outburst of pretended indignation by the Vichy set against Daladier, Gamelin, Corap and others. Then things began to take their normal course. Since all the top leaders of French imperialism pursued a policy of bringing the Nazis into France to establish a Fascist regime at the maximum speed, there could be no serious talk of real trials. The main organizers of the "defeat" were made quite comfortable by the Vichy dictator. Even the "chief" culprit, General Corap, was whitewashed:

"General Andre George Corap, whose Ninth Army collapsed at Sedan last May and opened the fatal hole in the Allied front, has been exonerated by the Vichy government, a reliable source said tonight." (New York Times, April 8, 1941.)

The French Empire has remained intact several years back before French imperialism was "defeated," there had been cries in Italy calling

for the incorporation of Nice, Savoy, Corsica and Tunisia into Mussolini's Empire. But now, when French imperialism is seemingly lying prostrate under the iron heel of the "Axis" none of these territories has been taken by Mussolini. It is a curious fact that the "defeated" French imperialists are preserving their armed forces both in France and in their colonies.

Points constantly spring into evidence to show that the French imperialists have not actually been defeated. A good illustration of the fact that the French imperialists are in reality as powerful and as independent as ever is furnished by recent occurrences in Nice. Some rumors must have been broadcast that Italy still coveted Nice. The French imperialist government at Vichy, supposedly an impotent puppet of Hitler and Mussolini, organized anti-Italian demonstrations as a warning to some unwise Italians at Nice who might really have believed that France was defeated by the "Axis":

"Anti-Italian demonstrations at Nice, on the French Riviera, were reported tonight in a dispatch of the Italian official news agency, Stefani, which charged complicity on the part of the Vichy government headed by Marshal Henri Petain." (New York Herald-Tribune, April 18, 1941.)

Insults were hurled by the "defeated" French against the "victorious" Italians. To make it more impressive the Petain government took an open hand in the matter by having the Prefect of Nice address the demonstration:

"Italians in Nice have been insulted and fist fights have occurred, the dispatch said. It asserted that the Prefect of Nice, addressing a great crowd in the city, declared: 'I give you my word of honor that this territory always will remain French.'

"Italians in Nice, according to the dispatch, have tried as best they could to remain serene despite great provocation, but disorders have taken place." (Ibid.)

The hypocritical British labor leaders and other false critics who pretend that there is a real war between the "democracies" and the Axis made a show of pressing Churchill for an explanation. Churchill covered up the fact that Franco is acting as an errand boy between the British imperialists and the Nazis by pretending that he was very much concerned about the starving workers and peasants of Spain:

"Parliament reflected today the feeling of many persons that this is not the time for extending credits of two million sterling to Spain, as contemplated by a loan agreement, or for feeding and helping Spain. There were demands today that the loan should be debated before it was completed, but Mr. Churchill refused such debate and said that the agreement would be published when it had been made. There were statements in the House that all this money would go straight to Germany, and there were severe criticisms of Sir Samuel Hoare, Britain's Ambassador to Spain, but Mr. Churchill remained unmoved, paid tribute to Sir Samuel, saying that he had improved Anglo-Spanish relations, and added: 'We consider that the starving position of Spain fully justifies this assistance being given by Britain and the United States, if they choose so to act, irrespective of whether any expression of gratitude is forthcoming or not.'" (Robert P. Post, New York Times, April 23, 1941. My emphasis - G.M.)

Not only do the British imperialists, and probably also the American imperialists, support the Spanish Fascists with capital, thus facilitating the flow of trade between Spain and Nazi Germany, but they go much further. They directly furnish the Nazis with iron ore from the British-owned and controlled Bilbao mines in Spain. The fraudulent and utterly irrelevant explanation for the shipment of ore from Bilbao to the Nazis, is that the British "successfully bombed the Ruhr"!

"British bombing attacks on the Ruhr have been so successful that Germany is now importing considerable quantities of iron ore from Bilbao and in addition is drawing heavily on Swedish ore, it was learned today." (T. J. Hamilton, New York Times, January 15, 1941.)

It is quite striking that in the same dispatch Hamilton lets slip the fact that "the most important mines in Bilbao are British owned or controlled."

* * *

The farce of the so-called blockade is further illuminated by the amazing news that the British government is sending cash - not "merely" to the dictator Franco, - but also, and what is most revealing, to the Hitlerites, into Germany direct! The dispatch inadvertently revealing this remarkable proof of the fraud of the "war" between the British and German imperialists is worth citing in full:

"The startling revelation that British money, after nineteen months of war, is still being sent into Germany by British government departments is made today by the newspaper 'Financial News.'

"In a special article, the newspaper's political correspondent states that British concerns pay to custodians of enemy property for the right to use German patents but that when the patent rights expire the renewal fees are actually remitted to the owners in enemy territory. The procedure is sanctioned under a general license under the Trading with the Enemy Act.

"British owners of patent rights argue that it is cheaper in many instances to maintain existing rights by means of renewals than to take out new patents, the correspondent said. They do not consider it is their business to know whether the money directly assists the war effort of an enemy engaged in a life-and-death struggle [sic!]

who might oppose fascisation. The "quiet" method, the Nazi method, is pursued, instead of the open method of military bloodletting employed by Galifet in the suppression of the Paris Commune and by Franco in Spain.

THE MEANING OF THE AFRICAL SEE-SAW

The recent Italian retreat in Africa presented a puzzling sight even to the eye of many military experts. Everything seemed to favor the Italians who nevertheless were to all appearances being hoplessly routed. That they outnumbered the British by more than two to one has been admitted even by Mussolini. (J. W. T. Mason, World-Telegram, February 24, 1941.) In normal conditions of warfare an attacking force must outnumber the defending force:

"It is usually estimated that an attacking force should outnumber a defending army by three to one if it hopes to achieve success." (Ibid.)

In a sham war, however, anything might occur, every basic principle might be disregarded by the imperialist manipulators:

"In Lybia, however, the defenders outnumbered the offensive British troops by more than two to one." (Ibid.)

A logical explanation for the "miraculous" victory of the British was never given. The British "conquered" a huge domain in Lybia, "defeated" an enormous army, and all that with a loss in killed that hardly exceeded the usual number of fatalities in a Fourth of July celebration in America!

"A British casualty list scarcely more than one per cent of the losses suffered by the Italians in the African campaign between Nov. 30 and Feb. 11 was announced to the

House of Commons today by Captain H.D.R. Margesson, the War Secretary.

"British Imperial land forces in that period lost only 438 killed, eighty-seven missing and 1,249 wounded, he said, as against 'the capture or destruction of the whole Italian Army in East Lybia, estimated to exceed 150,000 men.'" (New York Times, March 7, 1941.)

To give an inkling of the method of "fighting" that was pursued, we can cite an item from the dispatch by R.P. Post in the New York Times of March 9, 1941:

"The heavy-tank officer told an amusing story about one of the Sidi Barrani forts. The British sent a single tank ahead with an Italian officer to tell the garrison to surrender. The Commander of the fort said he could not surrender without fighting. So the British fired a few shots and disabled four Italian guns. Up shot white flags and out came a battalion. 'Their bags were packed,' said the officer."

Since our analysis is that the imperialists are cooperating to bring in the Fascists rather than to drive them out, we were not entirely clear as to the meaning of the British-Italian maneuver in Africa. There it seemed for the moment as if it was the "democrats" who were being brought in. In our article, "Mysteries of the Second World War," however, we propounded the possibility:

"Without question the imperialists are building up a feeling among the masses that Hitler is invincible. Be it remembered that one of the 'mysteries' is that he has not 'lost' a single 'battle.' Perhaps he will be brought into the Albanian and African pictures and made to appear to tip the scale." (THE BULLETIN, January-March, 1941, p. 23.)

This surmise has been fulfilled to the letter! All of a sudden reports came that German Panzer divisions had appeared in Africa. The British now

played the same game of "defeat" which the Italians had but just performed. The difference was in the speed with which both acts of the see-saw were carried out. If the British original advance was fantastic in speed, the German-Italian counter-advance is virtually a miracle. In little more than two weeks almost all the territory of nearly eight hundred miles was reoccupied by the "Axis."

The inevitable question arises: How did the Nazi divisions get into Africa? No one gives a clear and logical answer. General Wavell occupied Benghazi on February 6, 1941. That the Nazis were transporting mechanized divisions to Africa had been known to the British even before General Wavell had occupied Benghazi (Churchill's statement in the House of Commons, April 9, 1941.) Three weeks after the British occupation of Benghazi, the news was flashed that the Nazis scored the first "victory" in Africa:

"German mechanized Panzer troops have met and decisively defeated British armored forces in Libya in the first contact between Nazi and British land forces in North Africa, the Italian High Command said today." (Daily News, February 27, 1941.)

The Nazi advance went on, and, strikingly, "with the British not making much effort to hold the territory." (N.Y. Times, April 3, 1941.) The Nazi regime, for some "mysterious" reason during December and January did not send even a machine gun to the Italian forces in Africa. The suggested reason for ^{the} inactivity of the Italian air force had been the supposed "lack of fuel" (N.Y. Times, February 4, 1941). Presumably, the British Navy stood between Italy and the Italian forces in Africa. But then a "miracle" occurred. The Nazis have been able to establish an uninterrupted stream of troops and supplies across the Mediterranean to Africa. On March 6th, the N.Y. Times printed an astounding piece of information from Washington that the Nazis had brought over to Africa an army ^{with} more than a thousand tanks:

"According to information received through official channels, the German force includes not only dive-bombers and armored divisions but also divisions of regular troops. The force now totals more than 100,000 men and it is expected that it soon will be increased to twelve divisions, or close to 150,000 men. This contrasts with 110,000 British troops estimated to be in that region.

"The tanks in the German divisions are believed to number more than 1,000, or twice the number of British tanks. The strength of the air force is not yet known here.

"Just how the expedition is being transported has not been ascertained, but it is assumed that a route free from British interference through some islands of the Mediterranean has been found. The movement has been in progress for more than a week and has been steadily growing." (New York Times, March 6, 1941.)

At first, the British denied the Washington report. They pointed out that it would require a fleet of 50 sizable ships to ferry the men alone, not to mention the trucks, tanks and supplies. It was correctly argued that the Germans could not transport a large army over the Mediterranean without being observed by the British Navy:

"That German troops in anything like the numbers cited in the Washington reports have arrived there the British utterly deny.

"According to British figures it would have taken fifty ships of 5,000 tons each to transport the men alone, even allowing for the fact that on a short voyage the men could be packed in very closely..

"Of course, it is admitted here that the vessels might make ferry voyages, but even so it is contended that they could not do so without being seen.

"It is pointed out that the British Navy is patrolling all that area and would have seen any such extensive transports as would have to be employed in such a major

troop movement." (New York Times, March 7, 1941.)

But these denials were later refuted by facts. The Nazi forces in Africa grew in numbers. There had not been a single report of the British Navy sinking any Nazi transports to Africa until Churchill on April 9th declared in the House of Commons:

"The movement of German air forces and armored troops from Italy and Sicily to Tripoli had begun even before we took Bengasi and our submarines and aircraft have taken a steady toll of the transports carrying the German troops and vehicles.

"But that has not prevented, and could not prevent, their building up a strong armored force on the African shore."

Churchill tried to create the absurd impression that the Nazis had been employing so enormous a fleet of transports that the British simply could not sink them all, and so a few ships got through. It must be remembered that, according to the news reports, the Nazi Army in Africa had swelled to over a hundred thousand men or, in any case, to an army of major proportions capable of carrying out serious, large scale operations. If this is so, one can imagine the enormous number of transports and men that the Germans would have had to lose in transport before they could get the remaining major army to Africa. If Churchill's story of taking a steady toll of transports is true, the Nazis must have lost literally hundreds of transports and scores of thousands of men with their equipment to get the rest safely across. The utter incredibility of Churchill's story was apparently sensed, for a week after his speech, so influential a paper as the New York Times persisted in terming the arrival of the Nazi Army in Africa "still a puzzle":

"How they transported to Africa the armored divisions and supplies for the expedition against Egypt is still a puzzle..." (Editorial, N.Y. Times)

There are only two possible explanations of the landing of the Nazi Army in Africa: either it was landed at the cost of huge and frightful losses for the British Navy controls the Mediterranean, or it was simply permitted to go to Africa without opposition or with a mere pretense of opposition. The obvious incredibility of the first explanation in view of the lack of the slightest corroborating evidence leaves the second as the only acceptable one.

THE CASE OF GREECE AND JUGOSLAVIA

At this writing the imperialist plan in its Balkan phase has not yet been concluded. In the article, "The Case of Holland, Belgium and France," we showed how the British Command had sent a ridiculous handful of soldiers to Holland, reportedly 700 men, to "help" the Dutch Army stem the Nazi tide. The move was political, for the purpose of having the Dutch masses, as well as the British and others, imagine that the British imperialists really intended to help stop the Nazis. Something of this sort of political strategy had been performed also in France. Everywhere the British rulers took care to give the appearance of help, but no real help was actually given. This political strategy is also being applied in Greece. There is an interesting statement in a dispatch by Robert P. Post cabled some days after the German Panzer divisions had launched their attack upon Greece, that the British had no intention of using their army for military purposes:

"There is considerable speculation here as to what the British are up to. IT SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD THAT THE BRITISH DECISION TO SEND TROOPS TO GREECE WAS POLITICAL NOT MILITARY." (New York Times, April 11, 1941. My capitals - G.M.)

History was being repeated. Of course Post is puzzled, or pretends he is,

about the exact reason for the presence of the British troops in Greece. That they were there for the purpose of defending neither Salonika nor Yugoslavia, however, was obvious to him:

"What the comparatively small British forces in Greece are doing is not known. What they are designed to do is now known, except they obviously were not there to defend Salonika or the Greeks and Yugoslavs who have been cut off by the success of the German drive." (Ibid.)

In connection with the political strategy of the British imperialists in Greece, the Nazis and Italians showed remarkable cooperation. It was necessary, of course, to bring British troops into Greece. Anyone familiar with the map knows that there were two routes the British could have taken to get from Egypt to Greece; one, between Crete and the Greek mainland through Greek waters; and the other, past the Dodecanese Islands through Italian waters. Peculiarly enough, the British chose the latter route, which though somewhat shorter, lay through the heavily fortified Italian areas. But still more peculiarly, the British passed through the "bomb alley" of the Dodecanese Islands without receiving as much as a scratch. It must have taken some days for the British convoys to thread the Dodecanese "bomb alleys." Only some British planes and Italian anti-aircraft guns did a bit of sham battling obviously for mere show purposes, but the main task of bringing the British troops and supplies to impress the Greeks was carried out unhindered:

"Eye-witness reports of long British convoys moving UNMOLESTED along the route from Alexandria, Egypt, to Greece, WITHIN TEN MILES of the Italian Dodecanese Islands, were published in morning papers today.

"W. F. Hartin of the Daily Mail writing from Alexandria, described traveling in a convoy of British, Norwegian and Danish merchant vessels through the strait between

Crete and the Dodecanese island of Scarpanto, on the direct route between Egypt and Piraeus, the port of Athens.

"Mr. Hartin wrote:

"For more than a fortnight I have been watching the work of the navy in the Eastern Mediterranean. I can state from my own experiences that never have units of the Mediterranean fleet have been busier.

"I have been a confidential witness of ^{much of} this work, but even now the time has not yet come to give a full picture of the scene and the scope of what is being undertaken."

"The Daily Sketch published an almost identical dispatch under the headline, 'Silent navy tackles biggest job; convoys go through Dodecanese.'

"A similar story appeared in The Daily Telegraph.

"Mr. Hartin said he had watched from a British escort craft while British, Norwegian and Danish merchant vessels passed UNSCATHED WITHIN EASY STRIKING DISTANCE OF ENEMY TERRITORY.

"He said that on one occasion he was aboard a British warship while the fleet air arm heavily bombed Scarpanto, which lies across the Caso Strait off the east end of Crete, on the principal route between Alexandria and Piraeus.

"The ships we were escorting were not mere silhouettes. We had to get through those straits, do or die,' he wrote. 'Then came sparks from bombs ten miles away. Twinkles of anti-aircraft fire dance in the sky, but we got through unmolested and arrived at our base with the precision of ferry service'

"Mr. Martin said that during these voyages he had seen long lines of cruisers steaming out to their routine tasks 'as we chugged along with our stores of munitions and supplies.'" (New York Times, March 18, 1941. My capitals - G.M.)

Next day an A.P. dispatch was published in the New York Times, indicating that the cooperation between the British and the "Axis" was perfect:

"ABOARD A BRITISH CRUISER IN THE

MEDITERRANEAN, British and Allied forces, daring the SILENT guns on Italy's Dodecanese Islands and Axis aerial scouts, have safely taken to Greece important war supplies in some of the largest convoys ever assembled.

"(The British censorship apparently did not permit more direct confirmation of advices from excellent Balkan sources that the first 100,000 men of a British army of 300,000 had landed on the Greek mainland with all implements of war.)

"The crews of this and other British cruisers, battleships and destroyers were constantly at the 'ready' and several times precautionary raid alarms were sounded, but the gigantic flotilla passed from central to eastern Mediterranean ports into the Aegean WITHOUT INCIDENT.

"The vessels, including tankers and freighters of every sort, moved at times WITHIN A FEW MILES of the Italian batteries on the Dodecanese Islands. As the ships zigzagged through the Island-dotted passages known as the German and Italian 'bomb alleys', some Axis planes flew near by, then rocketed away WITHOUT DROPPING A SINGLE BOMB.

"No Italian surface ships were sighted." (N.Y. Times, March 19, 1941. My capitals - G.M.)

The very fact that the British flotilla "ventured" to use the heavily fortified Italian passages, and without any opposition at that, proves that there is a secret understanding between the "democracies" and the Axis. The cooperation between the British and the "Axis" extended to the destination of the British troop transports which had passed the "bomb alleys" of the Dodecanese Islands. Hansen W. Baldwin, the New York Times war expert, expressed wonderment that the German bombers, not a great distance from Salonika, did nothing to interfere with the landing of the British troops in Greece:

"If the British have landed troops in Greece - and it now seems quite probable that they have - why did not the Germans interfere with

the operations? Why have not the German bombers, poised on Bulgarian fields, smashed at the convoys in the narrow reaches of the Aegean Sea, bombed the docks at Salonika and Piraeus and one or two other usable Greek ports - striking the British when they were most vulnerable?" (N.Y. Times, March 19, 1941)

The German command knew that the British troops were being brought to Greece, and no doubt knew that they were being brought for political, not military purposes. Hitler was informed as to the exact landing places and the number of British troops arriving in Greece. While the "Axis" was battling the Greek soldiers, the Nazi military attache in Athens spent his time openly counting the landing British troops:

"The landing of British troops in Greece, admitted for the first time last night, was called today the worst-kept secret of the war.

"Diplomats said that the German military attache at Athens had been passing his days at the ports of British disembarkation, dangling his legs over the side of docks and counting the British troops as they descended gangplanks." (N.Y. Herald-Tribune, April 8, 1941)

The turning over of Salonika and the eastern Greek army to the Nazis sheds some light on the "aid" the British imperialists gave to Greece. In 1939, we cited reports that the British-French Military Staff "advised" the Polish Army to retreat from its border fortifications. Later we quoted various sources to show that a "retreat" plan had been worked out by the British and French High Command and applied in Holland, Belgium and France. It seems that very much the same tactic has been pursued in Greece. The Greek soldiers, who doubtless fought like lions against the Nazis, were sacrificed as "suicide" soldiers and left in a trap in Salonika and eastern Macedonia. The British naturally withdrew as they had done in other similar cases. Joseph S. Evans Jr. wrote from London:

"The carefully planned Allied

defense against the powerful Nazi force was believed to have foreseen the sacrifice of eastern Macedonia, so that the Greek troops fighting so heroically in that section, and now reported to have capitulated, in reality were suicide soldiers.

"The PLAN was thought to include A SLOW FALLING BACK to a new defensive frontier, roughly on a line from the junction of the Yugoslav-Albanian-Greek border, southeast to Thermopylae, the only point of entrance to southern Greece for an army advancing from the north and famed since the time of the Spartans as a strategical point relatively easy to hold.

"This might explain the fact that no British troops have gone into action as yet, and why there were none in the sector to the east of the River Vardar, down which the Germans advanced." (N.Y. Herald-Tribune, April 10, 1941. My capitals - G.M.)

Could Salonika have been defended had British imperialism chosen to do so? Without a doubt. Some experts said so a few weeks before the surrender of Salonika:

"Some British strategists say Britain could defend Salonika, key to Greece from the east, with a relatively small force because of the vulnerability of German lines of communications to British bombing." (N.Y. Times, February 26, 1941)

And after the surrender military observers in London declared that there had been sufficient opportunity to defend Salonika:

"These observers said that if any grave importance had attached to the defense of Salonika, the British Army would have defended it, as there was ample opportunity to install there Australian and New Zealand veterans of the Libyan campaign." (N.Y. Times, April 10, 1941)

Salonika, of course, is of immense strategic value in a military sense. The obvious plan was to let the Nazis occupy Salonika as rapidly as possible so that both the Yugoslav and the

Greek armies could be speedily smashed. The significance of Salonika has not been missed by some military writers:

"It is difficult to agree with the viewpoint presented in some London dispatches that the fall of Salonika to the Germans is of little real consequence. That position could be maintained only on the theory that the defense of the Greek peninsula was all that really mattered. Once Yugoslavia becomes involved, Salonica becomes of the greatest importance in maintaining Yugoslav supply lines; and in German hands, with the railways open, it will become an air and submarine base which will enable the Germans to do a great deal of damage in Greece and the Aegean area generally. Moreover, the swift German capture of Salonika cuts off a Greek army which was really holding up a German advance, and the loss of these seasoned troops is of no small importance both from the intrinsic military viewpoint and also as to its effect on Greek morale. Finally, it makes any Greek-Turk co-operation impossible." (Major George Fielding Eliot, N.Y. Herald-Tribune, April 10, 1941)

Thus it was within the plan of the British, German, American and other imperialists to bring the bloody Nazis into Greece and quickly establish the "new order" which no force, it seems, is capable of establishing with such thorough effectiveness.

And what of the "democracies" "aid" to Yugoslavia? Here is what Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen wrote from Washington on April 5, 1941:

"The new Yugoslav Government, after the first flush of enthusiasm, this week began to take stock and began to ask its allies about concrete military support.

"Since U.S. Minister Arthur Bliss Lane has been delivering encouraging messages patting the new Government on the back, the Yugoslavs asked the Greeks how seriously Roosevelt's encouragement should be taken, what the U.S. had given them. And they received the dis-

couraging reply that until then, (March 29) the U.S. had come across with not one piece of military equipment.

"NOTE-- On March 31, probably as a result of this, Roosevelt suddenly announced some 75-mm. field artillery being sent to Greece."

Everybody has witnessed the extensive campaign carried on by bourgeois organizations to "aid" Greece. That the campaign was a huge fraud is pretty obvious when one reads the following, radioed from Athens:

"The bitterest complaint of the Greeks, as the German army nears the capital, is that America's help was not forthcoming.

"Although millions of dollars of defense equipment had been ordered by Greece and at least two shipfuls of Red Cross material have left America, nothing whatever has arrived here." (N.Y. Post, April 24, 1941. My emphasis - G.M.)

Of course, many in Greece begin to wake up to the fact that Greece, like other small countries has been double-crossed by the British-American imperialists. A dispatch in the N.Y. Times, April 23, 1941, gives an indication to that effect:

"Various Greek friends faced the future with sad courage. One prominent Athenian said:

"How can Britain and America expect to win the war this way? On Oct. 28 Roosevelt pledged America's complete aid to Greece, but not a single cartridge has yet arrived from the United States. Britain sends a tiny army to help our defense. Brave as her soldiers may be, they cannot stand forever.

"If Britain gives us only such support, how can she expect us to resist against two great powers? How can America count on us to hold out long enough to receive her aid if after six months we have not received it?

"We have done our part in this war. I may say we have done it doubly. What more can we do?"

Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen

in the dispatch of April 5, said something about the reason for not sending supplies to Greece - "we had not had much to send" - and when the Greek Minister pressed the State Department, the British slapped him down:

"One reason for not sending supplies to Greece is, first, we have not had much to send, but even more important, when Greek Minister Diamantopoulos asked the State Department about munitions, the British Embassy called him down. Britain would handle all arms purchases here, he was told, and would allocate part of the captured North African arms to Greece."

The same sort of story was repeated in London for Yugoslavia:

"This week the Simovich Government asked London friends ^{munitions} what they could get ~~direct~~ from Britain. This had been asked also by Prince Paul, and the British answer was one reason for his capitulation to Hitler.

"Bluntly, the British replied that the Jugoslavs could capture Italian munitions after driving Mussolini's army out of Albania. The Jugoslavs retorted that their guns had a different bore; that it might take time to capture Italian munitions dumps, and they understood the Italian arms had been promised to the Greeks." (Ibid.)

BREAK WITH OPPORTUNISM TO SMASH IMPERIALISM

Today the guiding policy of the world capitalist class is to transform on an international scale their political rule into a Fascist form. It is only thus that in the present epoch they can save their imperialist system of exploitation of millions of workers and peasants. Previously, in each country individually, the capitalists attempted to solve their immediate crisis by introducing Fascism. Now the general world situation makes it

obligatory, on peril of collapse of the entire world system of capitalism, to introduce international Fascism. The method of installing Fascism has been different at different times. In Germany it had a wide base thus permitting it to enter through the parliamentary door. Hindenburg, who swore to uphold the Weimar Republic, called in Hitler who swore to destroy it. In Spain Fascism was established after a bloody slaughter of almost three years' duration; in Holland, Belgium and France, by opening the gates to the Nazis who function today as the universal Fascist police force.

The imperialist "democracies" are not fighting German imperialism, contrary to what the Stalinists, Trotskyists, Oehlerites and Stammites would make the workers believe. The British and the American magnates of finance are planning a political transformation from "democracy" to Fascism. It has been reported that Gerald P. Nye on March 13, 1941 quoted in the Senate the words of Churchill who, sometime after Hitler had occupied Austria and the Sudetenland, declared:

"I have always said that if Great Britain were defeated in war I hoped we should find a Hitler to lead us back to our rightful position among the nations."

Such are the people who pretend they are fighting Hitlerism!

It so happens that neither England nor America has a mass Fascist movement. It takes years to build one up, and time is pressing. There is no other means left to the "democratic" imperialists than that of bringing in Hitler, who performs the job efficiently and rapidly. The trick is simple. Under the cloak of a sham war the "democratic" generals order the armies to fall back, the Nazi tanks roll in, followed by the Gestapo. Then prisoners, concentration camps, "suicides" of large sections of the population,

and the "new order", for which the Lindberghs clamor openly and the Wall Street magnates secretly, can be securely established. Then no more "labor troubles"; instead, an industrial-military slavery with huge, secure profits.

If the international imperialists succeed in securing their rear by saddling a world fascist order on the masses in the capitalist countries, they will have a relatively free hand for assaulting the Stalinized Soviet Union with a view to restoring capitalism therein. The last remains of the October Revolution, the system of state property in the Soviet Union -- of historic significance even though for the time being it has been usurped by a criminal, reactionary bureaucracy -- will thus be liquidated to the immeasurable detriment of the toiling classes whose epochal struggle and sacrifice gave birth to it.

An ideological struggle must be carried on to awaken the workers and stop the Fascist avalanche. It is necessary to nail the deception of the Stalinists, the Cannonites, Shachtmanites, Oehlerites, and Stammites. Fake explanations can be given galore. The Nazi occupation of France has been "explained"; if the imperialists succeed with England, then the Nazi occupation of England will also be "explained." The British imperialists were "divided," they preferred Hitler, etc. But a limit to fake explanations must be reached somewhere. And when that limit is reached the workers will come out of their Stalinist-Trotskyist and Socialist ether and will recognize reality. They will break with all their deceivers, will frustrate the "democratic"-fascist plot to establish universal Hitlerism, will establish one universal republic of labor and will build the socialist system of society.

George Marlen
April 25, 1941

* * * * *
* * * * *
* * * * *

THE A.L.P. AND THE TROTSKYITE LINE

THE LABOR PARTY IN THE
STALINIST SYSTEM

THE idea of a Labor Party appears in a dual light in the Stalinist System. The Stalinized "Comintern" operates to mislead the workers by utilizing ultra-Leftist and ultra-Rightist maneuvers. Hence, the Labor Party idea appears in the Stalinist System now in ultra-Left, now in ultra-Right colors. During an ultra-Leftist zigzag, the Stalinist bureaucrats shout that the Labor Party is a social-fascist concept:

"Does the Trade Union Unity League [i.e., the Stalinist trade union organization of past years — A.B.] support proposals for a labor party? No, it rejects social fascist proposals for launching a labor party, which would be only another capitalist party." (Labor Unity, December 1933.)

Thus, during the ultra-Leftist zigzag of the "Comintern" the Labor Party — in reality a bourgeois "Labor" reformist organization — is lumped together with fascist outfits. In this manner, the Stalinist bureaucrats distort the workers' understanding of the true character of the Labor Party.

During the ultra-Rightist phase of the "Comintern" line, the bourgeois reformist Labor Party is painted by the Stalinist bureaucrats as a genuinely anti-capitalist party, the workers' own party:-

"Toward a Labor Party. The

workers must have a political party of their own." (Daily Worker, Mar. 18, 1937.)

The Labor Party is defined thus by Browder during the Popular Front maneuver of the "Comintern":

"Such a Party could be neither Socialist nor Communist, but it also could be neither anti-Socialist nor anti-Communist; it could be a genuine anti-capitalist Party." (What Is Communism, p. 106.)

Not only anti-capitalist, but, indeed, the only political power against Wall Street, wrote the Stalinist bureaucrats during a previous ultra-Rightist zigzag:-

"... A Labor Party defending the interests of the wage workers and appealing to the impoverished farmers is the only political power that can challenge the cynical tyranny of Wall Street." (Editorial, Daily Worker, May 27, 1924.)

Thus, — social-fascist or genuinely anti-capitalist — appears the bourgeois-reformist Labor Party in the maneuvers of the Stalinized "Comintern." In both cases the workers are the victims of deception, for the Labor Party is neither of a fascist character, nor is it genuinely anti-capitalist. It is a reformist device for trapping workers who are becoming class conscious and tying them to the bourgeoisie.

The dual light in which the

Labor Party appears in the Stalinized "Comintern" is reflected in its offshoot, the Trotskyist movement. The Trotskyist Party also has a two-fold line on the Labor Party. In one phase, the Labor Party is denounced by the Trotskyist leaders:-

"... as all history proves, a Labor party, even when it has a genuine trade union base, is a reformist party and nothing else can be expected from it." (The New International, August 1935, p. 146.)

The Trotskyist leaders in this phase of their line vehemently deny that Marxists should help to organize a Labor Party:

"For, it is not the business of the revolutionary Marxists, above all in the present stage of the relationship between capitalist disintegration and social reformism, to initiate or to help organize and found in addition to their own party another party for the 'second class citizens,' for the 'backward workers,' a 'Labor' party, i.e., a third capitalist party, even if composed predominantly of workers."
(The New International, March 1935, p. 36. Emphasis in the original.)

In this phase the Trotskyist leaders denounce the idea of giving any support whatever to a Labor Party. But when they pass into the other phase of their line, they present the exactly opposite position:-

"... we are positively in favor of the political organization of the American workers as a class, that is, of a Labor party." (Ibid. August 1938.)

The Labor Party which was previously repudiated by the Trotskyist leaders as a reformist party from which nothing else could be expected is now said by them to be the workers' own party. In an article called "The Question of a Labor Party," the Trotskyists write:

"We say to the workers: You want to break from the capitalist parties, to form a party of your own? Excellent! That is a step forward, it is progressive." (Ibid. August 1938, p. 229.)

While before the Trotskyist leaders were writing that the formation of a Labor Party is a detriment to the workers who want to break with the capitalist parties, a means of dampening and sidetracking their growing class consciousness, now it is termed "a step forward."

At the present time, this latter position is the course pursued by the Trotskyist S.W.P. Contradicting their previous assertions that the Labor Party can be nothing but a reformist party, i.e., a politically bourgeois party, the Trotskyist leaders are now painting the Labor Party as a workers' party without repudiating their previous declarations. As the Trotskyist leaders well know, the Labor Party's class character is not determined by its membership-composition or following. These latter elements may be chiefly proletarian, but it is the political line of an organization which determines its class character, and the political line of the Labor Party is and can only be bourgeois-reformist. This was said in the past by the Trotskyist leaders themselves, but is now conveniently "forgotten" by them.

THE NEW YORK A.L.P.

AND THE S.W.P. MANEUVERS

THE maneuvers of the S.W.P. with regard to the New York section of the A.L.P. serves as a touchstone for viewing the concrete application of the S.W.P. line on the Labor Party.

One month after the September 1939 declaration of war, the Antonini-Rose clique in the A.L.P. introduced a resolution condemning the Stalin-Hitler Pact, thus precipitating a split within the A.L.P. The October 13, 1939 issue of the Socialist

Appeal condemned both factions:

"The ALP leaders are partisans of Anglo-French imperialism and of Roosevelt's proposals to begin aligning America with that camp. The Stalinists are partisans of the Hitler-Stalin bloc. The antagonisms of the two warring camps in Europe are reflected in this fight in the ALP, each side serves one of the camps." (p. 4.)

At the time of this split in the A.L.P., the Stalinists were already employing anti-war-sounding phraseology. The S.W.P. spoke against the "anti-war" demagoguery of the Stalinists as well as against the demagoguery of the Antonini-Rose clique. The next issue of the Socialist Appeal accused both factions of deliberately spreading confusion around the war resolution of the A.L.P.:

"Both the pro-Ally and pro-Hitler camps, as we explained in our last issue, are deliberately spreading confusion on the issue involved in the A.L.P. resolution. Each dubs the other war-monger and attempts to conceal its own pro-war stand. The pro-Hitler camp employs ultra-radical phraseology against its opponents, and the pro-Ally camp is defended on its flanks by a 'left wing' [i.e., the Lovestone and Thomas groups - A.B.] which also employs anti-war language." (Socialist Appeal, October 17, 1939, p. 1. My emphasis—A.B.)

In issue after issue, the Socialist Appeal breathed fire and brimstone against both A.L.P. factions. The editorial in the October 27, 1939 issue condemned both factions again:

"The capitalist politicians and candidates, and the official candidates of the American Labor Party, are already committed to one of the imperialist camps — the Anglo-French. They are committed to support of American imperialism's plans and ambitions. The Stalinist candidates, with their belated and pretended opposition to 'imperialist war,' are in actuality support-

ing the Kremlin bureaucracy in its alliance with ^{the} Hitlerites, who represent the second of the two imperialist camps at war. The Socialist Workers Party says with complete impartiality: A PLAGUE ON BOTH YOUR HOUSES! Down with both imperialist gangs!" (p. 4. My capitals — A.B.)

Thus it would appear to an ordinary observer that the Trotskyite leaders were set for a life and death struggle against both reactionary cliques in the A.L.P. But inexhaustible, it seems, is the store of surprises which the Trotskyite leaders have for the ordinary observer. The very next issue of the Socialist Appeal tendered the following amazing advice to the workers of New York:

"In the New York City councilmanic elections, we are asking the workers in the Bronx and Manhattan to give first place on their ballots to Max Shachtman (Bronx) and George Lyman Paine (Manhattan), the candidates of the anti-war party, the Socialist Workers Party. For all other councilmanic and other posts, we ask the workers of New York to vote for the candidates of the American Labor Party." (Socialist Appeal, October 31, 1939, p. 4. My emphasis - A.B.)

But, according to the Trotskyite leaders themselves, there were two "imperialist gangs" claiming to represent the A.L.P. The Trotskyite leaders blandly asked the workers to support the "pro-Ally" faction, thus dropping their mask of "independence."

"... in the present fight between the pro-Ally and pro-Hitler-Stalin camps in the A.L.P., we recognize the pro-Ally camp — the leadership of the needle trades unions — as the official representatives of the ALP." (Ibid. My emphasis - A.B.)

Thus with cynical brazenness the S.W.P. leaders made a 180 degree turn and urged the workers to support what only yesterday the Socialist Appeal denounced as a pro-imperialist gang.

Such is the "revolutionary struggle" of the Trotskyite leaders! While the Trotskyite leaders indulged in a verbal outburst, "a plague on both your houses," in actuality, they urged the workers to support the Rose-Antonini house.

THE TROTSKYITE LEADERS

SWITCH HOUSES

THE recent campaign to elect a Congressman in the 17th Congressional district in New York provides an even more revealing example of the real Trotskyite line. Originally, the S.W.P. began to campaign for its own candidate, but in the March 1, 1941 issue of its organ it announced that it had withdrawn its candidate in order to support the candidate of the A.L.P., Eugene Connolly.

Connolly was known by many to be a tool of the Stalinist wing in the A.L.P. The World-Telegram issued what was purported to be an interview with Arthur Burch, a Trotskyite leader, in which Burch was quoted as having said: "Connolly and the American Labor Party are Stalinists." The Militant of March 8, 1941, i.e., three days before the election, accused the World-Telegram of falsely quoting Burch:

"This story also falsely quoted Arthur Burch as having declared that 'Connolly and the American Labor Party are Stalinists.' This headline in the press was merely a deliberate attempt to smear Connolly as a Stalinist and to drag in issues which have nothing to do with the campaign." (p. 2. My emphasis - A.B.)

The point here is not whether or not Burch stated that the Connolly wing of the A.L.P. is Stalinist. The Trotskyite paper simply left the above quoted denial stand without making an explicit, unequivocal admission that, regardless of what Burch may or may not have said, the Connolly A. L. P. wing was Stalinist.

After the elections were over,* The Militant explicitly and unequivocally admitted that the Connolly faction which they supported was Stalinist:

"Many well-meaning people are horrified at the idea that we are supporting a Stalinist-controlled party." (Albert Goldman, "Why We Supported the ALP," The Militant, March 15, 1941, p. 4.)

During the election campaign, however, the question of whether or not Connolly was a Stalinist stooge was left up in the air by The Militant, the chief propagandistic organ of the S.W.P.

WHITEWASHING THE

STALINIST CLIQUE

IT must be remembered that the pseudo-leftist "opposition" to imperialist war and the declamations against the war-mongering of the Antonini-Rose faction still remained the chief stock-in-trade of the Stalinist A.L.P. faction. The Trotskyite leaders, in calling for support to the Stalinist candidate, bank on the short memory of their followers, for it was somewhat more than a year ago that the S.W.P. leaders branded the same Stalinist faction, which had the same line as in the November 1939 councilmanic elections, as one of the "imperialist gangs," which were "deliberately spreading confusion."

In order to get the Trotskyite workers to support the Stalinist stooge, Connolly, the S.W.P. leaders palmed him off as a candidate opposed to the candidates of the American imperialists:

"Connolly stands in the election as an independent labor candidate OPPOSED to the war-mongering candidates who represent the Sixty Families." (The Militant, March 8, 1941. My capitals - A.B.)

* The elections were held on March 11, 1941.

Moreover, the A.L.P. which Goldman himself admitted is Stalinist-controlled; i.e., dominated by the supporters of the Stalin-Hitler Pact, was painted by the Trotskyite leaders as having an anti-war program:

"A factor of importance in our decision to support the ALP candidate was the ANTI-WAR program of that party." (The Militant, March 15, 1941. My caps.- A.B.)

With bait such as this, the Trotskyite workers were lured into throwing support to an agent of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

The Trotskyite leaders, of course, did not believe a single word of their own drivel about the A.L.P. program being "anti-war." In the very next issue of The Militant, the S.W.P. leaders let slip an admission that Connolly did not offer a real alternative to the war plans of American imperialism:

"Connolly campaigned merely on the basis of negative opposition to the lend lease bill. He did not offer a real alternative to the war plans of the Sixty Families." (The Militant, March 22, 1941, p. 5. My emphasis - A.B.)

The Trotskyite rank-and-filers were told to campaign for Connolly on the basis of their leaders' line that the Connolly wing had an "anti-war program." On the other hand, they discovered from their leaders that Connolly had no real alternative to the war program of the American imperialists. This hodge-podge of self-contradiction is the leadership which Cannon and Company present to their followers as Leninist!

THE TROTSKYITES OFFER

SOME "EXPLANATIONS"

THE Trotskyite leaders had to offer their followers some sort of explanation for the line taken in the

Connolly affair. In an article entitled "Why We Supported The ALP," Albert Goldman presented the workers with the official Trotskyite "explanation." Goldman blandly "explained" that the S.W.P. had supported Connolly because the workers who supported Connolly THINK he will be a fighter against imperialist war:

"I can hear the sectarians shout that Connolly is not really against the imperialist war; his program is an isolationist and pacifist program. To that we answer that the workers supporting Connolly THINK that he actually will be a fighter against the imperialist war. We don't like the program and we have not hesitated to say so. But the fact remains that the ALP is CONSIDERED by the workers as an anti-war party." (The Militant, March 15, p. 4. My capitals - A.B.)

Goldman's "explanation" is really an evasion. Do not thousands of workers think that Browder is against imperialist war and do not thousands of workers consider the same to be true of Norman Thomas? Do not millions of workers think that the "Comintern" parties are parties of proletarian revolution? Did not many thousands of the German workers think that the Kautskyists were anti-war? Did not many of the Spanish workers think that the Cabelleros, the Hernandezes, the la Pasionarias were against the imperialists?

Goldman's formulation is a justification for urging support to any "labor" demagogue in whom the confused workers happen to believe. Goldman's position is not Marxism, but the sheerest sophistry. Marxism aims to destroy the illusions of the workers, not to encourage them. Instead of working to destroy the illusions of the workers, however, the S.W.P. leaders actually worked to foster them and this was expressed concretely by dressing up Connolly as a candidate who had an "anti-war program."

We have shown that, while on the one hand the Cannonite leadership at-

tributed an anti-war program to the Connolly gang, on the other hand it "criticized" Connolly and "attacked" his program. Since Connolly and Company cannot, according to the latter position of the S.W.P., provide the workers with a genuine leadership against the imperialists, what benefit would voting for Connolly bring to the workers? The S.W.P. answers:

"Separate and apart from the specific program which Connolly stands upon, the fact that he has been presented by the American Labor Party as an anti-war candidate makes it possible for the worker-voters who oppose the imperialist war to register that opposition by voting for him at the polls." (The Militant, March 1, 1941, p. 6.)

That is, according to the S.W.P., Connolly could serve as a symbol of the workers' sentiments against the imperialists, and voting for him, a means of voicing the anti-imperialist animus of the workers. But in October 1939, when the Trotskyites were crying A Plague on Both Houses in the A.L.P., they specifically denied that either of the cliques could serve as a medium for registering or expressing the anti-war sentiments of the workers. In October 1939, the Stalinists, as has been shown above, were already using "anti-war" demagogy. They were describing the situation in Europe as an imperialist war for plunder and were raising an outcry against all the participants. Yet, the S.W.P. stated:

"The genuine anti-war sentiments of the masses in the New York needle trades cannot find expression through either the ALP bureaucrats or through the Stalinists. If these anti-war sentiments are not to be perverted — to Hitler's service by the Stalinists, to Chamberlain's service by Rose and Antonini — the anti-war forces in the unions must express themselves independently of either of the two warring cliques." (Socialist Appeal, October 13, 1939, p. 4. My emphasis - A.B.)

Here we observe that the S.W.P.

proclaimed that to throw support behind the "anti-war" Stalinists would be a perversion of the workers' anti-war sentiments. The workers were told to express themselves independently of both A.L.P. cliques if they wanted to voice their enmity to the imperialists. In March 1941, however, conveniently "forgetting" what it had written previously, the S.W.P. presented the self-same Stalinist clique as the medium for expressing the workers' anti-war sentiments. Twisting and turning, contradicting today without repudiating what it said yesterday, the Cannonite leadership in true opportunist style cuts its story to suit its opportunist needs of the moment.

SHACHTMAN AND THE A.L.P.

FOR a long time, the Trotskyite deception centering about the Labor Party directly involved Max Shachtman who was a leading light in the official Trotskyite organization. Shachtman participated with Cannon and Company in every zigzag on the Labor Party question. In addition, it must also be borne in mind that Shachtman fully participated in the fraudulent Trotskyite maneuvers with the New York A.L.P. in the councilmanic elections of November 1939 when the S.W.P. urged workers to support the Antonini-Rose clique in the voting for secondary posts.

Now that Shachtman has been kicked out by his former colleague, Cannon, he must necessarily find some points of difference with the S.W.P. line so as to appear to have a political basis for his "independent" existence. Thus in the S.W.P. campaign for Connolly, Shachtman "criticized" the Cannonites for their share in this campaign. Wherein was the gist of Shachtman's "criticism"? Did Shachtman see anything wrong in supporting a Stalinist candidate? Perish the thought! For, says Shachtman, no principle is violated in supporting a Stalinist candidate:

"Now, no revolutionary or working class principle is violated in

endorsing a Social-Democratic or Reformist or Stalinist candidate for office in an election. Given certain conditions, it is right and necessary." (Labor Action, March 17, 1941, p. 2. My emphasis - A,B,)

Given what conditions, may we ask? When supporting a Stalinist candidate would advance the interests of the working class? But history shows that the primary function of Stalinism is to thwart the interests of the working class, to prevent it from pursuing any genuine revolutionary development. Support to Stalinists is support to counter-revolutionaries, no matter how much it is covered up with phrases of "criticism." Only those who really struggle for the liberation of the proletariat from the bondage of wage slavery can genuinely advance the interests of the working class. Clearly, Shachtman shows that "in principle" (i.e., in lack of principle) he stands together with Cannon.

Well, what, then, was Shachtman's "criticism" of the Cannonite support to the Stalinist candidate in this election? No more than that the Cannonites did not admit that Connolly was a Stalinist:

"But not one single word about the fact that Connolly is a Stalinist... Not one single word about the fact that Connolly is the candidate of the Stalinist wing of the ALP." (Ibid. Emphasis in the original.)

Shachtman then goes on to accuse the Cannonites of deliberately hiding the Stalinist issue:

"Why does the Appeal so deliberately hide the fact that it is the Stalinists who are involved in this case? What purpose is served?" (Ibid.)

Thus, picking a single point in the Cannonite maneuvers, Shachtman gives himself the appearance of exposing Cannon's opportunism. Shachtman, however, remains on the same unprincipled political grounds as Cannon, that is, the permissibility of supporting be-

hind a smoke-screen of so-called "criticism," the agents of Stalinist counter-revolution. This is the crux of the question, and not the incidental point that Shachtman raises. By this maneuver, the Shachtmanite workers, while accepting the same opportunist line of building and supporting a Labor Party and of supporting a Stalinist flunkey, as do the Cannonite workers, are made to imagine that they are dealing death blows to Cannon and his clique.

THE INVARIABLE OUTCOME OF THE TROTSKYITE MANEUVERS

THE Trotskyite rank-and-filers imagine that they are part of an organization which has a Leninist line of combatting the Stalinist bureaucrats. It is a remarkable fact, however, that ever since the Trotskyite tendency came into existence, the Trotskyite workers have found themselves in the position of giving support, in one form or another, to the Stalinist bureaucrats, and of receiving from their leaders various "explanations" for this support. In the days when the Trotskyites proclaimed themselves a faction of the Stalinized "Comintern," the Trotskyite workers found themselves voting for Stalin's Fosters and Thaelmanns. The "explanation" given to the Trotskyite rank-and-file at that time was that the "Comintern" was a revolutionary organization whose leaders were making mistakes and had to be corrected. Today, the Trotskyites no longer call themselves a faction of the "Comintern." They admit that the Stalinized "Comintern" is a counter-revolutionary organization which cannot be corrected. The Trotskyites represent themselves as an independent political party combatting Stalinism. Yet, the Trotskyite rank-and-file still find themselves supporting Stalinist bureaucrats, in one way or another. Today, the Trotskyite workers are called upon to support Connolly, a more or less disguised Stalinist agent. As a matter of fact, Goldman indicates that the Trotskyite leaders leave the door open to direct their misled followers into supporting an open Stalinist bureaucrat -- naturally, with "criticism":

"We can even whisper to our critics that if we deemed it advisable and of benefit to our party and consequently to the working class we would not hesitate to give critical support to Browder running on the Communist party ticket." (The Militant, March 15, 1941, p. 4.)

There is no mystery behind this essentially pro-Stalinist line of the Trotskyite leaders. It is a continuation, under new conditions, of Trotsky's general policy of political collaboration with Stalin.

The Bolshevik-minded anti-Stalinist workers who are in the clutches of the Cannons and Shachtmans constitute the historical nucleus for the building of the new revolutionary party. The sooner these workers arm themselves with Marxist truth, the sooner will they break with the Cannonite and Shachtmanite supporters of Stalinism and proceed to fulfill the historical mission of their class.

Arthur Burke
March 27, 1941.

FREE COPIES

1. TROTSKY AND THE SUPPRESSION OF LENIN'S TESTAMENT.
2. WHITHER SHACHTMAN
3. THE SPLIT IN THE S.W.P.
4. AFTER SIXTEEN YEARS OF SILENCE (On Trotsky's article: "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?")
5. THE MURDER OF TROTSKY AND THE FIGHT AGAINST STALINISM
6. DID TROTSKY COLLABORATE WITH STALIN
7. THE CANNONITES "ANSWER" THE SHACHTMANITES

Read these articles for concrete, documentary evidence proving that Trotsky was a political collaborator of Stalin's and the Trotsky movement in all its parts and aspects is a disguised political prop of Stalinism.

ADDRESS:
P.O. Box 67
Station D.
New York

ORDER BY NUMBER
as indicated above.

A "CORPSE" THAT WON'T STAY DEAD

HOW MANY TIMES in the past have the Cannons and Shachtmans assured the workers that this or that Stalinist Party is liquidating itself, only to see it leap like a monster and crush a developing revolutionary upsurge of the masses. One of many such instances, for example, occurred on the eve of the Peoples Front period. In March 1935, The New International (p.37) in an article signed M.S. stated:

"Having liquidated all the theories of revolutionary Marxism, the C.P. is now engaged in liquidating itself."

In actuality, at the very time the above statement was made, the very opposite of the self-liquidation of the C.P. was taking place. An unprecedented growth of Stalinist forces and influence on a world scale was occurring. The "Comintern" Rightist line, which came to be known as Popular Frontism, was then already in swing. For the nth time, the Stalinist Party, "liquidated" in the pages of the Trotskyist press, lived stormily to help crush the toilers.

* * * * *

When one wishes to avoid or prevent a struggle against a certain force, one can always create the illusion that that force does not exist or is going out of existence. This is not a decisive method, but it helps, to an extent, to prevent the struggle. And the Trotskyite leaders use it for what it is worth. As the late Spanish Civil War grew to a crucial stage, the Trotskyite leaders lulled the vigilance of the workers with rosy stories intended to minimize the power and deadly significance of Stalinism in Spain:

"Fortunately for the world pro-

letariat Stalinism in Spain does not command the forces it held in leash in Germany - precisely because the lessons of Germany have entered the consciousness of the Spanish proletariat." (F. Morrow, The Civil War in Spain, p. 62.)

The Trotskyite leaders dinned into the ears of the workers, "the lessons of Germany have entered the consciousness of the Spanish proletariat." What was the lesson of Germany? Stalinism is the main enemy within the ranks of the working class. If Stalinism is not eliminated from the proletariat and a genuine Bolshevik Party created, the workers will be incapable of overthrowing the bourgeoisie. The Spanish workers were not only infinitely removed from this understanding, but actually believed that Stalinism is Bolshevism, the force that created the first successful proletarian revolution. The Spanish radical workers in huge numbers fell directly and indirectly into the Stalinist trap and were placed by the Stalinists under the fascist axe. By reassuring the workers that the Spanish proletariat had learned the lesson of Germany, the Trotskyites deadened the vigilance of the proletariat, contributing to the betrayal of the Spanish toilers.

* * * * *

With the unleashing of the popular Front zigzag of the "Comintern," the Stalinist bureaucrats began to palm off the reactionary Second International as an organization that functions in the interests of the workers. Indeed, in order to strengthen this deadly illusion, the Stalinist leaders even went so far as to talk about merging the Second and Third Internationals. This talk went under the slogan of "organic unity." The noise about "organic unity" was, of course, pure deception, for Stalin and his henchmen

had not the slightest intention of relaxing for a moment or in any way their iron hold over the bureaucratic machine known as the "Comintern." But this talk helped greatly to spread illusions about the character of the Second International, and so the Stalinist bureaucrats indulged it a great deal of it since it fitted in with the "Democracy" fakery of the Popular Front maneuver.

In May 1937, our group clearly exposed the fraudulent nature of the rumpus about "organic unity". This exposure is contained in the very first document we published:

"Shrewd Stalin, motivated only by the need of perpetuating the bureaucratic political and economic domination of the Soviet Union, in introducing the fake of organic unity of his own forces with Social Democracy, again scored a success. The masses want united front? Stalin goes them one better and talks organic unity, which never will and never can take place anyhow. The interests of the loosely connected national parties of Social Democracy are rooted in the aristocracy of labor and the bourgeoisie of each capitalist country. Stalinism is an entity separate and distinct from every other existing tendency. The interests of every existing Stalinist "Party" are rooted in the Soviet bureaucracy. But what harm can there be in leading the masses by the nose through the talk of organic unity? On the contrary, talking about it makes the Trotskyites, the Lovestoneites, the Socialists, every class-conscious worker, talk about it, criticize, discuss the possibility. Meanwhile Stalinism lives on." (George Marlen, STALIN, TROTSKY OR LENIN, pp. 186-7. My emphasis - H.M.)

As we have said, this analysis was written back in May 1937. It proved correct to the letter, history shows. The deceptive talk about "organic unity" remained a fraud and today, the "Comintern" having been again shunted on an ultra-Leftist course, the Stalinist bureaucrats are again shouting that the

Second International is fascist or an agency of fascism.

But how did Trotsky and his lieutenants react to the treacherous rumpus about "organic unity"? Did the Trotsky tendency expose the rank deception spread by Stalin's agents? Did Trotsky and his henchmen make it clear that Stalin would never in the slightest release his grip on his international machine of counter-revolution precisely because it renders his bureaucracy invaluable services in working to prevent revolution?

How far Trotsky was from clarifying the workers on this matter can be learned from this:- Trotsky actually told the workers that the unification of the two criminal internationals under certain conditions would be a step forward for the working class. In speaking of the talk about "organic unity" of the French Socialist Party (S.F.I.O.) and the French Stalinist Party, Trotsky wrote in March 1935:

"Some comrades will ask us, not without indignation, 'Would you be against organic unity?' No, we are not against unity....If the S.F.I.O. should unite this very day with the Communist Party, that would not guarantee victory any more than the United Front guarantees it: only correct revolutionary policies can bring victory. But we are ready to grant that unification, under present conditions, would facilitate the regrouping and reorganization of the genuinely revolutionary elements now scattered throughout the two parties. It is in this sense, and in this sense only, that unification would be a step forward." (WEATHER FRANCE, p. 108. My emphasis - H.M.)

Trotsky not only presented "organic unity" as a possibility, but even pretended that through "organic unity" of the Second and Third Internationals there could be born the Fourth International, of which Trotsky wrote earlier:

"It may be born - theoretically it is not excluded - out of the un-

ification of the Second with the Third, by means of a regrouping of the elements by the purging and tempering of their ranks in the fire of struggle." (New International, Sept.-Oct. 1934)

Thus, according to Trotsky, that utter myth, "organic unity" of the Stalin-tern with the Second International was not only presented as a possibility, but as a possible path to the Fourth International!

* * * * *

While thus palming off the chimaera of "organic unity" as a possibility which could be in the interests of the workers, the leaders of the Trotsky movement also used the hullabaloo about "organic unity" to propagate more illusions about the "Comintern" liquidating itself. A Socialist Appeal headline of October 30, 1937 reads:- "Secret Paris Meeting Decides For Early Liquidation of the Comintern." The article goes on to allege that the Stalinist bureaucrats were contemplating two paths along which to liquidate the "Comintern":

"On April 21, 1937, there was an historic conference of the 17 leading Communist Parties of the world, in Paris.... The secretaries of the 17 leading Communist Parties were informed... that if British, French and American imperialism demanded, as the price of a military alliance against Germany, Italy and Japan, that the Comintern be eliminated from the international arena, that must be done." (Ibid.)

But suppose this path did not materialize? Then -

"An alternative must be found in case the British Tories refuse to shake the hand of friendship proffered by Stalin." (Ibid.)

At this point, the Trotsky paper introduces its fable about "organic unity":

"This alternative is the capture of the Second International.... In line with this perspective, negoti-

ations were pushed more energetically for organic unity of the French, Spanish and Italian CP and SP." (Ibid.)

In this article in the Socialist Appeal written six months after we had presented our thesis that all talk of "organic unity" was a Stalinist fraud, the phantom of "organic unity" was again presented as something which would clear the path for the new international. Reinforcing the illusion that the Stalin-tern was undergoing self-liquidation, the Trotskyite leaders actually dangled this alleged self-liquidation before the workers as a means whereby the path to the new international would be cleared:

"The demise of the Third International will cause no heartaches among revolutionists. It will only remove the greatest barrier to the formation of a new International - and thousands of sincere revolutionists still deluded by Stalinism will join in this historic task." (Ibid.)

Hypnotized by the Trotsky-created phantasy of the self-liquidation of the "Comintern," the anti-Stalinist workers clustering around the Trotsky tendency lived in a fools-paradise, imagining that the great day of liberation from the Stalinized "Comintern" was just around the corner. But the "corpse" proved to be very much alive. This "corpse" managed to slaughter thousands of Spanish revolutionary workers not long after Trotsky and his lieutenants so glibly "buried" it. Its great betrayals go on to this day and will continue to have world-wide ramifications.

The Stalinist bureaucracy preserves itself by its ability to pass before the eyes of the workers as the inheritors of Bolshevism and the October Revolution. It maintains its power over the workers through its sections' disseminating these fraudulent ideas. Through its International and its sections, Stalinism steers the workers to destruction in order to prevent them from overthrowing their capitalist masters, and with them, the Stalinist bureaucrats themselves. The "Comintern"

sections, posing as Leninist Parties, work with might and main to prevent the rise of a genuine Leninist current. Yet the Trotskyite leaders would have the workers believe that Stalinism would liquidate this most valuable instrument for its self-preservation. Repeatedly, the Trotskyite leaders have told the workers that Stalinism would dissolve its "Parties" and pass off the stage, apparently to allow a new Leninist Party to arise without hindrance. Stalinism, the Trotskyite fairy tales imply, would release its death grip on the throat of the workingclass and freely allow it to breathe in a fresh revolutionary air, would allow the workingclass to revive and resume its revolutionary march! That is exactly what is meant by Stalinist "self-liquidation." This, of course, Stalinism will never do. The history of Stalinism subsequent to the "secret meeting" in Paris proves nothing so much as that.

* * * * *

The leading disciples of Trotsky continue to confuse the workers and to disorient them from a true understanding of the Stalinist menace. In Shachtman's The New International of October 1940 there can be found two separate and conflicting concepts of the Stalinist machine in the United States. On page 182, the Stalinist Party is described as a sect, "a large sect, a very large sect but still a sect..." Now, to Marxism, a sect in politics is an organization which, regardless of its size, detaches itself from the living issues confronting the masses of the workers, which detaches itself from the class struggle. Is that "very large sect," the Stalinist

Party of the U.S.A. really of such a character? Listen to page 184 of the same issue of The New International: -

"At the time of the Soviet-Nazi Pact, it looked as though the C.P. had once for all committed suicide (What, again?! - H.M.) but now it is clear that the C.P. is far from through. They still control the American Youth Congress; they have a new peace "front;" the Daily Worker and New Masses appear, and there is also Friday. Above all, the hold of the Stalinists on influencing the CIO unions has not been broken." (My emphasis - H.M.)

A most peculiar "sect"! It injects itself into every phase of the class struggle, it insinuates itself into numerous branches of the political situation, its influence extends far beyond its numerical forces, it holds entire trade unions by the throat, and most remarkable of all, its Russian parent is in control of one sixth of the surface of the earth!

Stalinism is not dead, the Stalinist Party is not a sect, and it does not liquidate itself. Stalinism can be liquidated only by Marxism, by an aggressive political struggle for a complete unmasking of this counter-revolutionary force. The first step in that direction to be taken by workers who want to defeat Stalinism is to break with the Cannons and Shachtmans who feed them periodically with stories that Stalinism is becoming, or is already a political corpse.

Harry Millen
April, 1941

* * * * *
* * * * *
* * * * *
* * * * *
* * * * *

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

TROTSKY'S "ADVICE" TO THE RUSSIAN WORKERS

No revolutionary worker will deny the importance of studying Lenin's writings. The works of that revolutionary leader light up every vital corner of the political struggles of the classes in capitalist society. Lenin fought every form of opportunism existing or arising in his time. Without knowing those writings which bear upon his struggle against opportunism, the workers are considerably handicapped. Especially is this true with respect to their struggle against Stalinism. Unless the revolutionary workers, who have perhaps empirically arrived at the understanding that Stalinism represents a deadly plague, become familiar with Lenin's anti-Stalin writings, they will hardly grasp the problem of Stalinism. Many of those writings have been suppressed by Stalin and his collaborators. Some of the documents, however, due to the intricacies of the inter-bureaucratic convulsions of Stalinism, leaked out and became known to a few workers.

In October 1917 Lenin wrote letters dealing with the treacherous behavior of Zinoviev and Kamenev. Those letters were addressed, one to the members of the Bolshevik Party, another to the Central Committee of the Party. The documents were well known to the Party leaders, including Trotsky. Infuriated against Zinoviev and Kamenev for their opposition to the seizure of power and their disclosure of the Bolshevik plans to the enemy, Lenin insisted on their expulsion. However he was overruled by the majority of the Central Committee (see The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 76). During Lenin's

illness, Kamenev collected Lenin's works and published them (1922). By then Kamenev, Zinoviev and Stalin had organized their conspiracy for the seizure of power. In order to hide their political past they withheld Lenin's letters from publication. It appears that when Lenin had demanded the expulsion of Zinoviev and Kamenev, he had at that time felt keenly that there was something basically opportunistic in those two men. The sharpness of the moment passed, the Soviet Republic was established and survived the attack of the counter-revolution. Zinoviev and Kamenev appeared to have completely reformed and made good their ignominious behavior in October 1917. But, as history reveals, the men showed themselves opportunist seekers of bureaucratic power. They had opposed the seizure of power when it was on the order of the day, and after it had been firmly established they sought to usurp it. Had the letters not been suppressed, the workers, who in the beginning reacted quite aggressively against the bureaucratic rule of the Trio - Zinoviev, Kamenev, Stalin - would have perhaps derived a feeling that Zinoviev's and Kamenev's opportunism had not died but had broken out in a different form.

When the Trio gathered strength and proceeded to bring under its sway all the Republics that composed the Soviet Union, Lenin, though ill, perceived this opportunist policy and attacked it vigorously in a whole series of documents on the national question. Those documents were handed to the Central Committee and to Trotsky, and

some of them to him alone. Most of those documents have remained suppressed to this day, and only very few have been published outside the Soviet Union and their content remains unknown to the Russian masses. Had the Russian workers known the contents of those important anti-Stalin documents at the time they were written, documents in which Lenin urged holding Stalin and his collaborators responsible for anti-Marxist policies, the workers might have received a correct ideological orientation in opposing Stalin.

Another vital anti-Stalin document was Lenin's Testament, in which he laid down outright the policy for the Communists to remove Stalin from power. The Testament, according to Trotsky, was read in his presence in a secret session of the Stalinist bureaucrats on May 22, 1924. All these anti-Stalin documents constituted a powerful ideological instrument of struggle against Stalin.

Knowing of all these documents of Lenin's, Trotsky also knew all the time that they were being suppressed. And while they were being suppressed, Trotsky not only did not reveal this criminal secret, but did something far worse. Almost six months after Lenin's death and a few weeks after the Testament was read, Trotsky in one of his speeches said to the Russian workers about Lenin's writings:

"YOU HAVE NOW THE OPPORTUNITY TO READ EVERYTHING THAT LENIN WROTE. I advise you, — it is very beneficial, — to note especially in these books, those places in which he heeded the mass, what it wants, what it needs,— not only what it wants, but what it did not learn yet to want.... " (Leon Trotsky, Pravda, July 10, 1924. My capitals — G.M.)

Trotsky was of course fully con-

scious of the fact that the workers were not given the opportunity of reading everything that Lenin wrote. Trotsky was fully conscious of the fact that precisely those writings of Lenin which could have helped the workers to combat the deadly malady of Stalinism, Lenin's writings on the national question, Lenin's Testament and other important documents, were being deliberately withheld from the workers. The Russian workers could follow Trotsky's advice and read those of Lenin's writings published by the Trio, but they would have never suspected that Lenin's life was to remove Stalin, to expel his henchman Ordjonikidze and generally to break up the whole Stalinist bureaucracy. Even when exposures appeared outside the Soviet Union revealing that Lenin left a Testament in which he laid down the line to remove Stalin, Trotsky declared:

"Comrade Lenin has not left any 'will'.... All talk with regard to a concealed or mutilated 'will' is nothing but a despicable lie... It suffices to ask: 'If we assume that the malicious characterization of our leading party comrades given by Eastman is only partly correct, how is it possible that this Party should have emerged from long years of illegal struggle, how could it stand at the head of masses of millions, carried through the greatest revolution of the world, to further the formation of revolutionary parties in other countries.' There is no sincere worker who will believe in the picture painted by Eastman." (Leon Trotsky, Inprecorr, Sept. 3, 1925, pp. 1005, 1006.)

Trotsky collaborated with Stalin in hiding Lenin's anti-Stalin documents, and deceived the workers in Russia and in the Comintern.

G . M .

April 4, 1941

A STATEMENT ON THE R.W.L. PRESS RELEASE

A press release (undated) sent out by the Revolutionary Workers League, headed by Hugo Oehler, states that the F B I is conducting a virtual witch hunt against the R.W.L.

We are not in a position to verify independently the statements contained in this press release to ascertain whether they are true to fact. However, we, as Marxists, are unreservedly opposed to bourgeois oppression and persecution whether it is directed against revolutionists or opportunists. Bourgeois persecution of the opportunists only serves to strengthen the illusion among the workers that the persecuted are true revolutionists, and hampers the winning over of the workers to the authentic revolutionary current. The classical example is the bourgeois persecution of the Stalinist bureaucrats. The belief prevalent among the deceived victims of Stalin and his Browders and Thaelmanns that the leaders of the "Comintern" are sincere and loyal Leninists, becomes more deeply imbedded in the minds of the Stalinist workers when they see that the bourgeoisie imprison and even murder Stalinist bureaucrats.

Only a free, thorough and all-sided polemic can enlighten the workers and lead to a decisive swing of the proletariat toward Marxism. The only power which has the historic right to weed out the counter-revolutionary tendencies from the midst of the workingclass, indeed from society as a whole, is the proletariat itself through the agency of its revolutionary government, and that, when the masses through their own experience recognize the need for such action.

We regard the R.W.L. an opportunist organization, but we are unqualifiedly opposed to capitalist or any other repressive attacks upon the R.W.L. We are for complete freedom of its press and condemn every attempt to suppress it as an act which strength-

ens capitalist reaction through strengthening the illusion among some workers that the R.W.L. is a revolutionary organization. We are for polemics free of bourgeois interference, in the course of which we believe we shall convince the workers that the policies of the R.W.L. are anti-Leninist and consequently anti-proletarian.

Due primarily to opportunism within the camp of the world proletariat capitalism has escaped destruction, surviving a series of the most profound revolutionary crises. During the world war and immediately after, it was Social Democracy that saved the bourgeoisie. With the inception of Stalinist bureaucratic degeneration of the Comintern, Stalinism became the main force that has been preventing the proletariat from smashing capitalist reaction. Paradoxically, the Stalinists and other opportunists suffer persecution from the bourgeois monster which they themselves nourish and protect.

Since the entire working class is today in the grip of various opportunist forces, revolutionists can pit themselves against the organized might of the bourgeoisie and counteract capitalist persecution only by wresting the workers from opportunism and setting them upon the path of struggle against the bourgeoisie. The success of combatting reaction is in direct relation to the success of rescuing the proletariat from the pernicious influence of the pseudo-Bolshevik political organizations. Only when the proletarian vanguard is wrested from the sham Bolsheviks will a genuine resistance to bourgeois reaction unfold — which resistance can be no other than the struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie.

Editorial Committee
THE BULLETIN
March 14, 1941