

FIVE CENTS

MARCH-APRIL 1945

T H E **BULLETIN**

THE SECOND "BATTLE" of the PHILIPPINES

-J. C. HUNTER

**IN THE TRADE UNIONS:
LEWIS FACES A NEW CRISIS
CLASS COLLABORATION ON THE "LEFT"**

-ARTHUR BURKE

**THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION
SOME LIGHT ON A CROOKED DEAL**

**THE RED STAR PRESS
P. O. BOX 67 STATION D
NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
The Second "Battle" of the Philippines - J. C. Hunter	1
Lewis Faces a New Crisis	13
Class-Collaboration on the "Left" - Arthur Burke	16

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

Some Light on a Crooked Deal	32
------------------------------	----

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO:

The Red Star Press
P.O.B. 67
Station D
New York City

THE SECOND "BATTLE" OF THE PHILIPPINES

THE ANTECEDENTS OF THE PRESENT

EACH succeeding phase of the "Second World War" must be viewed in the context of the whole development of events since September 1939. The re-occupation of the Philippines by the U. S. forces now in progress bears a direct relation to the past series of circumstances involving the big capitalist powers.

In so far as the major capitalist powers are concerned, an examination of the entire post-1939 unfolding of events reveals a remarkable succession of unopposed landings, occupations and re-occupations of great and important territories in the heart of Europe, in the Pacific and in Asia. A study of what actually occurred among the big imperialists at each crucial moment brings out a host of the most fishy military features whose essence is a strange lack of real war.

The initial phoney military situation that had to be covered up was the "Sitzkrieg" of September 1939-May 1940, that keynote to the ~~entire~~ subsequent development of the "Second World War." The term "covered up" is used deliberately, for among the ticklish things they had to talk away was the point that the "democracies" which were alleged to be at war against the fascist powers for world domination did not lift a finger to interfere with the Nazi attack on Poland. Later, during the "Sitzkrieg" there occurred the unopposed Nazi landing in Norway, a maneuver which, among other things, involved the Nazis traversing waters under British control with the enormous British navy mysteriously absent from the scene. The unopposed Nazi occupation of France following the "Sitzkrieg" is still being explained away on occasion by the capitalist flunkys and by the pseudo-Marxists. The remarkable lack of opposition to the Nazi crossing of the British-controlled Mediterranean to land in North Africa required a good deal of ingenuity on

the part of the official "explainers." The unopposed Nazi occupation of the Balkans falls into the same category. The bare pretense of resistance to the Japanese occupation of mighty Singapore kept the propagandists busy for some time. In general, what required a mountain of "explanations" was the glaring "democratic" policy of opening the path for the fascists into one country after another.

While the Nazi attack on the Soviet Union was rolling ahead, i. e., up to the Battle of Stalingrad, the "democracies" continued the game of giving a free hand to the advance of the "Axis" forces. With the Battle of Stalingrad, at which point it became clear that the Nazi Army had failed in the task assigned to it, the imperialists began to reverse their territorial manipulations. Territories which had been opened up to the fascist forces were reoccupied by the "democracies"—this time the fascists pursuing the policy of no opposition. To date the outstanding situation in this category is the unopposed "Allied" landing in and re-occupation of France in 1944. The character of that event was such that the experienced reporter, Herbert L. Matthews, after several days of first-hand observation wrote of the phase in Southern France in this vein: "It was beginning to seem like a phoney war." (The New York Times, August 18, 1944)

Apropos of this term Phoney War, Matthews, of course, was harking back to an earlier period, the very start of the "Second World War." It is a fact not to be forgotten that the "Second World War" appeared on the historical scene under the almost official title "The Phoney War." In certain standard bourgeois publications this term is entered solemnly and even with definite dates. Thus, the latest edition of Webster's New International Dictionary in its historical supplement

gives the following information: "The so-called 'phony war' lasted through 1939 and the first part of 1940." (Current History Section, p. 310/34) The important point in this connection, however, is that precisely at the stage where the Dictionary's statement leaves off there began the phoniest series of unopposed occupations and re-occupations of territories that the world has ever seen. In this article we bring the record of this series up to the present moment.

AGAIN, THE "SURPRISE" STORY

I N the case of the American landing on Luzon, the chief island of the Philippines, on January 9, 1945, the "explainers" have quite a job on their hands. For one thing it is almost impossible to make a convincing story that the Japanese were surprised by the landing. Readers of THE BULLETIN will recall that in almost every major situation in the past the excuse of "surprise" was given to cover up the lack of resistance to the landings. The Luzon affair as described in the capitalist press, however, fairly bristles with reports to prove that it was ruled out that the Japanese could be surprised. A day by day account of the reporting will amply illustrate this. The initial landing was made in the area of Lingayon Gulf. Most valuable of all in predicting a landing in that area were the Japanese spokesmen themselves. On January 6, 1945, at the very start of the operations, the following report arrived from Washington and was printed the next morning:

"Tokyo reported tonight that Gen. Douglas MacArthur's forces were preparing to invade the Philippine island of Luzon and that one of three great invasion fleets already had reached the Lingayen Gulf area north of bloody Bataan, where the main Japanese force landed more than three years ago." (The New York Times, January 7, 1945)

In a review of the numerous public statements made by the Japanese, the newspaper PM reported:

"Apparently the enemy is looking

for the main thrust to be launched in the Lingayen Gulf area where they say more than 70 warships are lined up single file and sending salvo after salvo into the shore defenses." (PM, January 8, 1945)

It should be recalled that the area of Lingayen Gulf was where the Japanese themselves had landed in December, 1941. This area is known as the best possible landing place, and no one knows it better than the Japanese commanders. Hanson W. Baldwin who naturally writes as if he were dealing with a real war among the imperialist powers declared just prior to the official announcement of the landing:

"Lingayen Gulf from Sual to Santo Tomas anchorage is the best area for an amphibious landing on the island of Luzon, and for this reason is certain to be heavily defended." (The New York Times, January 9, 1945)

His colleague on the New York Herald-Tribune, Major Eliot, wrote in a similar vein also before the landing was announced:

"Possibly the easiest approach from the sea, the one the Japanese used and the one which, according to Japanese reports, General MacArthur may again be trying to use, is from Lingayen Gulf. Here there are beaches on which troops can land in considerable numbers, and there are roads and a railway which lead southward to Manila. But the Japanese are perfectly aware of all this, and, if they have prepared to meet an American landing anywhere, it is certainly on the shores of Lingayen Gulf." (January 10, 1945)

When the whole world already knew of the United States landing, the New York Herald-Tribune carried the front page headline, "JAPANESE KNEW LINGAYEN GULF BLOW WAS NEAR." The finger pointed at Lingayen Gulf because the United States naval forces ran past Manila Bay and continued northward obviously heading for Lingayen:

"The Japanese must have known last Friday that we intended to at-

tack at Lingayen Gulf for that afternoon the spearhead of Allied battleships, some of them raised from the mud of Pearl Harbor, ran past the entrance of Manila Bay and kept going northward with a screen of American and Australian cruisers, escort vessels and destroyers under the command of Vice-Admiral Jesse B. Oldendorf, whose ships were known as the bombardment and fire support group of the naval forces." (January 11, 1945)

When the details of the Japanese reaction began to pour in, the chief point that had to be accounted for was the utter lack of opposition. Hanson W. Baldwin, while taking note of the unopposed nature of the landing, continued to reject the "surprise" explanation:

"The lack of opposition on the beaches cannot be explained by surprise." (The New York Times, January 11, 1945)

It was quite clear that in this situation the "surprise" yarn would cut very little ice. Nevertheless, the imperialist leaders made a try at it. Undoubtedly, they figured that it had worked in the past, why not use it again. General MacArthur was the original source of this "explanation" in this case. Its hollow sound is felt in the editorial comment of The New York Times:

"According to General MacArthur, the enemy was apparently taken completely by surprise, which is all the more remarkable because the Tokyo radio has been announcing the impending invasion for days." (January 11, 1945)

How "surprised" the Japanese commanders really were is obvious from the editor's remark that "the Tokyo radio has been announcing the impending invasion for days."

Remarkably enough, even after Mac Arthur made a stab at the "surprise" story, The New York Times editors were constrained to confess —

"For the invasion convoy, strateg-

ic surprise was not possible." (January 14, 1945)

What had happened was that the commentators of The New York Times — and of other papers for that matter — had come out with the plain truth before the landing, namely, that surprise was out of the question. When MacArthur, however, resorted to the "surprise" fable, all these bourgeois propagandists were caught short. It was their unpleasant duty to have to wriggle out of the truthful statements they had been constrained to make earlier in the game. On a later occasion, Baldwin, for example, had to concoct a "scientific" appearing lot of hocus-pocus to make his readers believe that somehow, in some vague way, the Japanese were surprised after all.

NO OPPOSITION

THE story of "surprise" is plain bunk. What, then, was behind the lack of opposition to the American landing at Lingayen Gulf? Evidently it was a matter of pre-established policy. The policy of the imperialists was not to oppose the landing. This is clearly shown by the material in the capitalist press itself proving that the Japanese, who were there from December 1941, a period of three years, never fortified the crucial Lingayen Gulf landing area and manifestly had no intention of putting up any resistance whatever to a landing:

"What the Japs have been doing here the past three years I cannot imagine. Yesterday when Gen. Mac Arthur examined our beachheads, I went with him. He found no beach defenses worthy of the name. And when I stopped and talked to the natives they told me that the Japs had fled inland three days ago when our naval shelling started." (G. C. Folster, PM, January 10, 1945. My emphasis — J. C. H.)

It is clear that if the "Second World War" in its inter-imperialist phases were a real conflict, like that of 1914-1918, for world empire, as the self-styled Marxists maintain, the Jap-

anese rulers would at least have made an attempt to fortify the chief landing place in the main island of the Philippines. They had three years in which to do so. Over a long period of peace, it is true, the imperialists might not necessarily fortify such a strategically important point, but certainly during three years in which a war for world supremacy is supposed to be on among the capitalist powers, they would not fail to build defenses. Yet the very opposite appears in the numerous reports. Another sample:

"At no place did we run into any organized resistance, and we found little evidence that the Japs ever intended to offer any." (C. Y. McDonald, New York Post, January 10, 1945)

In connection with the imperialist policy of having an unopposed landing on Luzon, there is a remarkable circumstance which throws light on the utter fakery of the official pretense that the Japanese were surprised. It is recorded in the capitalist press that at least three days before the landing, the American forces showered leaflets on the Gulf area addressed to the Filipino inhabitants warning them to evacuate the beachhead area. In other words, the American authorities themselves informed everybody in Lingayen of impending action at least three days in advance. According to the reports, the Filipinos, obeying the leaflets, left the beachhead area--and following them the Japanese forces left also!

"We knew when you were coming," said one villager.

"Obeying our propaganda leaflets, the natives left the beachhead area three days before the invasion and the Japanese followed them the next day." (The New York Times, January 11, 1945)

Admiral Oldendorf himself is quoted to the effect that after January 6, when the naval bombardment of the beaches and the movement into Lingayen Gulf began, three days prior to the actual landing on the shores, his observers saw no Japanese there:

"He said that after Jan. 6 his force saw no Japanese on the beaches." (The New York Times, January 10, 1945)

Hence, the picture was as follows:

"The Japs had pulled out. Furthermore, there was no evidence that they had ever intended to fight at Lingayen." (Newsweek, January 22, 1945, p. 28)

Without doubt the imperialist hokum of "surprise" is no accident, but is evidently used to cover up certain facts in the long series of unopposed landings, occupations and re-occupations.

A TERRIFIC BOMBARDMENT —
OF EMPTY BEACHES

Let us put together a few facts of this peculiar affair of the landing on Luzon. First, as we have already shown, there was nothing on the beaches that could seriously be termed defenses. Secondly, after January 6, there were no Japanese on the beaches either. Yet, the papers are full of reports of a three-day bombardment of the beaches, from January 6 to January 9 when the actual landing occurred. Here is a report of the bombardment of the beaches:

"Vice Admiral Oldendorf's bombardment force of battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and small carriers had pounded the beaches for three days in advance." (Newsweek, January 22, 1945, p. 28)

"For three days in advance" — this is from January 6 to January 9. When the facts are placed in their true sequence, it becomes clear that for three days the American naval and aerial forces were bombarding empty beaches!

"WE DIDN'T FIGHT THE FRONT LINE
BECAUSE THERE WAS NO WAR"

WITH such a background the natural order of events (really, lack of events) was this:

"The landing itself was complete--

ly uneventful. Not a shore battery fired as the hundreds of American vessels steamed into the gulf before dawn." (The New York Times, January 10, 1945)

Naturally, the capitalist propagandists understand that it is their paid job to make the ludicrous plausible to the masses, to cover up the basic criminal policy of imperialism in all cases. Hence, The New York Times editors pretended to give a military rationalization for the utter lack of war in the landing on Luzon:

"General Yamashita may believe that this first American landing in Lingayen Gulf is not the main American effort." (Editorial, January 12, 1945)

The question arises:— Assuming that the Japanese commander on Luzon, Yamashita, is a plain idiot, even such a numbskull would realize, after he saw thousands of American troops moving many miles inland with huge equipment, that something was brewing. We are writing for the moment as if a real war be in progress among the imperialist powers. But the pattern of no war continued far past the initial landing. Let it be said, parenthetically, that the workers should take absolutely no stock in the "explanation" that the imperialist masters are fools or lunatics; the rulers know quite well what is going on and what they are up to. In a short time, the landing was no longer just a landing, but evolved into a mass military movement down Luzon. Still — no war:

"For the third day, the American troops on Luzon pushed down the road from Lingayen Gulf to Manila without a contact with the enemy." (New York Herald-Tribune, January 12, 1945)

The Agno River on the road to Manila is known to be a natural and powerful defense barrier where "everybody expected" a terrific stand would be made by the Japanese. The no war game continued, however:

"The Japs, whom they had expected to make a strong defense of the Ag-

no River, gave it up without a struggle. The Americans likewise crossed other river barriers on the plain without having to force them." (Newsweek, January 29, 1945, p. 33)

A few years ago when it was the imperialist game to have the fascist forces advance and without opposition occupy various territories, the story given out to cover up the underlying inter-imperialist machination was that the Japanese are masterly jungle fighters. This was the drivel officially spread in connection with the unopposed Japanese advance through Malaya toward Singapore and also in regard to the Japanese advance in 1941-42 from Lingayen Gulf to Manila. Now, on the other hand, when the imperialists' game is reversed, it would seem that the Japanese never heard of jungle fighting or even of taking advantage of such natural defenses as swamps, rivers and bogs. A high-ranking American officer is quoted as follows:

"These swamps, rivers and bogs could have been the bloodiest battlefield in the world, and they are letting us get through it without fighting." (Newsweek, January 29, 1945, p. 33)

The ruling gang turns its fakery on and off to suit its needs.

With the order of events reversed, familiar phrases re-appear in the reports. When the ruling clique on both sides of the so-called "front" worked together to bring the Nazis into France, they contrived to keep the French air force of some 5,000 first-line planes completely out of sight. Where is the French air force, was the cry that was raised by the soldiers, the populace and the reporters on the scene. Now with the unfolding of the new stage, the fascist air force is kept hidden. When the "Allies" re-occupied France last year, the cry was that the Luftwaffe was mysteriously absent. With the American re-occupation of Luzon, here is what is heard:

"Everybody is wondering where the Japanese air force is. In the past three days there has been virtually

no enemy air activity and the American troops on Luzon have yet to undergo bombing and strafing." (The New York Times, January 16, 1945)

"The enemy's nonappearance in the air and on the sea at Luzon is still a mystery." (The New York Times, January 17, 1945)

The city of Tarlac is the main center on the road from the north to Manila. The chief "opponent" met by the American forces in the advance to Tarlac consisted of — mosquitoes and heat!

"Gains right and left of the expanded Lingayen Gulf beachhead were reported by Gen. Douglas MacArthur today as his main spearheads pointing toward Manila approached the important city of Tarlac, fighting nothing much worse than mosquitoes and heat." (New York Sun, January 18, 1945)

In the movement around Tarlac, a reporter got into a jeep to see if he could find a war somewhere. He was grievously disappointed:

"We boiled southward in a jeep driven by Pfc. Clifford Johnson of Birmingham, Ala., looking for the front lines and the war.

"We didn't find the front lines because there was no war. Or maybe it was vice versa. Anyway, the Japanese had declared a holiday on fighting and our troops were rolling southward unimpeded along beautiful two-line cement highways." (G. E. Jones, The New York Times, January 23, 1945)

Tarlac itself was occupied by the United States forces without a fight. Like during the "Sitzkrieg" when the lack of activity and resulting boredom led to some wiseacre's calling the "Second World War" the "Second Bore War," the troops marching on Tarlac complained of ennui:

"The march of Link's men into Tarlac, the only important town between Lingayen and Manila, resembled a summer maneuver more than an important seven-mile gain against the Jap-

anese."

* * *

"There was no sign of Japanese."

* * *

"There was absolute quiet on this strangest of beachheads. Some front-line troops had been marching for ten days without firing a shot."

* * *

"This war is making me sleepy," yawned Staff Sergeant Robert V. Quinn, of Utica, N.Y." (New York Herald-Tribune, January 23, 1945)

A "GALA" HOLIDAY

ON January 29, 1945 a second United States landing was made on Luzon. By then the affair had been well established; the yarn of "surprise" had been laid on thick and people were already accustomed to reading about the lack of fighting in the Philippines. In this second landing, of smaller magnitude than the initial one at Lingayen, the game did not even include a preliminary bombardment of the empty beaches. The area chosen was the strategically-situated, excellent landing place, Subic Bay, northern key to Bataan. A vivid description of the landing is given by the eyewitness, Wm. J. Dunn, C. B. S. correspondent, under the headline, "NEW LANDING GALA HOLIDAY"!

"I have just witnessed the most amazing amphibious operation in more than three years of covering this Pacific war, the landing of more than a division of American troops on the west coast of Luzon and just above Subic Bay without the firing of a shot.

"What might have been a bitter battle turned out to be a gala holiday for the Filipinos of Zambales Province who swarmed to the beaches to greet the landing elements of the 11th Corps with cheers and songs.

"It was the first major landing ever made in this area without any preliminary shelling." (PM, January 31, 1945)

This correspondent goes on to remark that the American forces had already moved "11 miles inland to capture primary objectives without a shot being fired."

Placed were being captured without a fight which in a real war would have been centers of powerful and effective resistance. Two such points were taken unopposed in the unfolding of the Subic Bay landing. One is "the former American base at Olongapago, which fell without a struggle." (PM, February 3, 1945) This place is described as follows:

"Olongapago, which lies at the head of a naturally sheltered harbor, further protected by a concrete breakwater, was a naval and repair station second only to Manila before the war." (The New York Times, February 1, 1945)

The other place is Grande Island in Subic Bay. The above report carries this description of Grande Island:

"The island is a mass of rock, approximately half a mile square, which controls the narrow mouth of Subic Bay overlooking the mile-wide western channel, which is the only entrance for large ships.

"Before the Japanese invasion the island was a military reservation with a fort that mounted ten inch guns." (Ibid.)

A highly revealing story is told about these ten inch guns. It is claimed that their breach mechanisms were removed by the Americans before evacuation in 1941. The Japanese, it must again be recalled, had three years in which to prepare defenses of this key point. Yet such is the peculiar nature of the "Second World War" in which the imperialist powers, according to certain alleged Marxists, are contending for possession of world empires as in 1914-1918, that the Japanese did not even bother to repair the huge guns on Grande Island:

"The Americans removed the breach mechanisms of the guns before they went to Bataan. The communique did not mention Japanese resistance nor

any indication that the enemy ever attempted to repair the big guns, which would outrange any artillery in our possession in this area except the sixteen-inchers of the battleships of the Seventh Fleet." (Ibid)

In connection with this Subic Bay landing, the utterly fraudulent way the imperialist flunkies are using the "surprise" fairy tale was again strikingly brought to light. The dispatch by Lindsay Parrott to The New York Times of January 31, 1945 informs the reader that the Japanese had not permanently occupied this area since 1942:

"Later, when we went ashore, Filipinos informed us the enemy had not permanently occupied the district since 1942 though occasional parties had foraged there, seizing food, scrap iron and a few automobiles. The Filipinos said that the last they had seen were 300 who passed southward two weeks ago along the coastal road, the northern end of which is firmly in the grasp of the Sixth Army."

The same information is contained in the Associated Press dispatch in the New York Post of the same day. It is obvious that since for a couple of years at least the Japanese had no permanent installations in the important Subic Bay area, they had not the slightest intention of opposing a landing. It is legitimate to talk of surprise in a situation where the defending force has the intention to defend the given area but is caught napping contrary to its intentions. On the other hand, when there is no intention of defense to upset, there can be no legitimate talk of surprise. Nevertheless the United Press dispatch of the same day "forgot" to mention that there had been no Japanese installations in the region in question for at least two years and resorted to the "surprise" hokum to "explain" the complete lack of opposition to the landing;

"So complete was the surprise that the Japs were unable to put up the slightest resistance on the beaches or anywhere ashore in the first day, eliminating all prelim-

inary shore bombardment by the planes and warships of the big amphibious force." (New York World-Telegram, January 31, 1945)

With this type of deception the imperialist propagandists cover up the real basis of the unopposed landings, occupations and re-occupations of important territory marking the course of the "Second World War" supposed to be in progress among the big capitalist powers.

January 31 marked a third landing on Luzon. This was at Nasugbu on the west coast Batangas Province where three years ago the Japanese had landed on their route to Manila. The general description of the United States landing on Batangas is as follows:

"The first wave hit five miles of Batangas beach from landing ships Wednesday morning without firing a shot and speared quickly inland through the town of Nasugbu without meeting serious opposition." (New York Herald-Tribune, February 2, 1945)

THE RE-OCCUPATION OF MANILA

THE advance on Manila was described by the reports as literally a race staged between advance units identified as the 1st Cavalry Division and the 37th Division. Resistance by the Japanese was noteworthy only for its absence. The movement of the United States forces involved only the time required to march, with no time out for "fighting":

"It's definitely a race between forward elements of the First Cavalry and Thirty Seventh, a press dispatch said, while a Blue Network correspondent reported that, 'strange as it seems, everything points to the fact that we should get to Manila in just the space of time it takes us to move the men and equipment on the road.'" (The New York Times, February 3, 1945)

Manila is the most important military center in the Philippines. In a real war, it would be the site of an enormous, major conflict. Its situa-

tion is thus described in the capitalist press:

"The Japanese have been there more than three years and have made Manila one of their most important defense bases, with a big garrison, great stores of supplies and extensive facilities of all kinds." (Editorial, The New York Times, January 14, 1945)

By February 5 the United States troops occupied half of Manila and the only "resistance" mentioned in MacArthur's dispatch was considered "little more than sniper fire." (New York Post) In the first few days of the entry into Manila the lack of anything resembling a real defense was such that the military writer of the New York Herald-Tribune declared:

"The Japanese Army has chosen to yield up the city of Manila without making a fight for it." (Eliot, February 7, 1945)

In subsequent days it appeared that a few thousand Japanese troops had been left behind scattered over Manila. A good deal of shooting back and forth occurred, buildings were burned, raids on prison camps, "heroic liberations," etc. took place. In no way could this activity be considered an actual battle for Manila. MacArthur himself publicly indicated that the Japanese activity was not of a military nature, but as falling into the category of vandalism. Clearly, the noise created and continuing to a lessened degree up to now served to cover up the basic features of the United States re-entry into the Philippines as shown in the foregoing material.

MORE "SURPRISE" YARNS

AFTER the entrance into Manila, the United States forces effected two more landings. By this stage, the moves are so rapid and the lack of features of real war so flagrant that the imperialists are apparently completely at a loss even to try to invent some new fakery to cover the real basis of the entire affair. They can do no more than tirelessly repeat the stale drivel about "surprise."

Thus, when the United States forces landed at Mariveles on the southern tip of Bataan, the headlines read: "SOUTHERN BATAAN CAPTURED IN SURPRISE BLOW FROM SEA." (The New York Times, February 17, 1945) A few days later a landing was made on the island fortress of Corregidor. "ENEMY IS SURPRISED," declared The New York Times headline of February 18, 1945.

HOW THE IMPERIALISTS COVER UP REALITY

MEANWHILE, the whereabouts of the Japanese army in the Philippines — it was reported to be over 200,000 strong — still remains one of those "mysteries" which have been so liberally sprinkled over the picture of this fantastic "war" among the biggest capitalist powers in the world.

It is possible that later reports will be coming in alleging the occurrence of big battles. The imperialists cannot continue without camouflage. Since they have matters under their control, they can stage a battle here and there, create destruction and casualties, without any danger to their basic plans. In fact, they have done so on a number of occasions. In connection with the landings on Luzon, the Japanese imperialists have invented the most fantastic hokum in pretense that they offered herculean resistance to the United States forces. It is reported that the Japanese papers and radio were full of Munchausen tales at the time of the initial Lingayen landing to the effect that the American forces had been blown virtually to bits. It is worth quoting these bedtime stories for they provide a concrete instance of how the imperialists fool the working class into thinking that they are conducting a terrific struggle among themselves:

"'Super-heavy' guns firing from the Japanese fortresses of San Fernando, Bauang, Damortis and other points on the Lingayen Gulf coast were 'sending up a terrible barrage,' Tokyo said, in 'the hottest reception ever recorded in the annals of war on the oncoming enemy convoys.'" (The New York Times, January 9, 1945)

The reader will recall the reports in

the American press to the effect that not a shore battery fired at the landing parties. The Japanese rulers are compelled to resort to outright invention of formidable resistance to the landing since they appear for the moment as the "defeated" party and they must avoid severely jarring the masses at home. The American rulers, on the other hand, appear as the "victors" and so — at this point — they have not had to concoct fables about huge battles on Luzon.

As every politically enlightened worker understands, the imperialists of all national stripes are birds of a feather. They differ only in degree of power and skill in deceiving and oppressing the masses. Such lies as cited immediately above from the Japanese rulers have their source not in some so-called national characteristics but in the basic policy of international imperialism which since September 1939 has been to cover a pretense of war.

THE BASIC VERSUS THE SUPERFICIAL

SOME general observations on the character of the American landings and re-occupations in the Philippines will bring out an interesting pattern of maneuvers engaged in by the imperialists. The initial entrance was made on Leyte Island in October 1944. This island is a smaller one, relatively unimportant, located some 300 miles from Manila. The claim was made that on Leyte a great deal of fierce fighting occurred. This gave the masses the impression that a big war was occurring for the Philippines. Then the pattern typical of the "Second World War" began to unfold. The closer the moves came to the real heart of the Philippines, namely, Luzon, the more absent became the features of real war. On December 15, 1944, a United States landing was made on Mindoro Island. This is one of the larger islands and is immediately adjacent to Luzon. "U. S. FORCE LANDS UNOPPOSED ON MINDORO WITHIN 135 MILES OF PHILIPPINE CAPITAL," declared the banner headline of The New York Times on December 16, 1944. A United Press dispatch in the same issue carried this typical piece of information:

"American assault waves went ashore this morning on Mindoro Island without meeting a single enemy rifle shot on the beaches, and ninety minutes thereafter the most forward elements have driven more than a mile inland through dry sugar cane and rice fields and scattered cocomat groves."

While a dispatch two days later stated resistance had been met from the Japanese on Mindoro, the character of this resistance (it should really be put in quotation marks) was such that the same dispatch in the very next sentence stated: "The enemy has not yet reacted to the invasion 155 miles south of Manila." (The New York Times, December 18, 1944)

The next place still closer to Manila re-occupied by United States forces was the island of Marinduque. The New York Times headlines told the story: "MARINDUQUE WON. AMERICANS OCCUPY ISLE 10 MILES FROM LUZON AND 100 MILES FROM MANILA. LANDING UNOPPOSED." (January 6, 1945) It should be noted that this unopposed landing was made on the day that Admiral Oldendorf's three-day bombardment of the empty beaches of Lingayen Gulf began.

The Marinduque landing was quickly followed up by the unopposed landings at Lingayen Gulf, Subic Bay and Batangas on the main island of the Philippines, Luzon. The overall pattern is clearly a free, unopposed re-entrance into the Philippines which follows the general tactic of the imperialists in their territorial manipulations in the so-called "Second World War."

FROM THE PHILIPPINES TO IWO JIMA

THE headlines of the virtually unopposed re-occupation of the main centers of the Philippines had hardly been relegated to the back pages of papers when the front page began to roar with reports of a terrific struggle on Iwo Jima. The contrast between the two situations is so remarkable that it requires some discussion. The Philippines with their enormously rich natural resources and their population of over 16,000,000

are the proudest territorial possession of American imperialism. They are a plum that would make any imperialist mouth water. Supposedly in this "Second World War" for world empire, the Japanese rulers had come into possession of the Philippines. Peculiarly enough, they put up nothing that could seriously be called resistance when the time came for the American rulers to reoccupy the Philippines. But on Iwo Jima, according to the reports, the Japanese are offering the most ferocious and bloody resistance. Thousands of casualties are reported. What is Iwo Jima? Can it conceivably have such importance in contrast to the Philippines that for the latter the Japanese make no fight while for the former they shed the blood of thousands? What is the meaning of this strange policy?

It is necessary to view the matter in the light of the whole unfolding of this so-called "Second World War." A unique pattern of events will be found in the examination. When the Nazis occupied France (which is no Iwo Jima by any means!), such historic fortresses as Verdun and Sedan were not defended by the "Allies." The Japanese occupied Singapore without meeting a struggle, and Singapore, let it be recalled, is the greatest fortress in the Orient. When the "Allies" reoccupied France, again Verdun and Sedan were not defended, this time by the Nazis. At every crucial and important point, there has been no real struggle in the so-called "Second World War." But on Iwo Jima, on Guadalcanal, on Tarawa, the battlefields were reportedly drenched with blood. In a whole number of out of the way, insignificant places fierce fights were staged by the imperialists — but not at Verdun, not at Sedan, not at Metz, not at Singapore, not in the Philippines, to mention only a few of the really crucial places. Impressive motion pictures have been exhibited of the fighting on Tarawa and will also be shown of the fighting on Iwo Jima where the papers report that 75 color cameras are being used by the United States navy forces. But there are no color movies of any fight at Verdun, or Sedan, or Metz, or Singapore, because there was no fight! The

movies of Tarawa make a profound impression on the millions who see them; unfortunately, these millions do not link what they see with what they did not see because it never existed, namely, resistance to the Nazi occupation of France (1940) or Nazi resistance to the "Allied" re-occupation (1944). If the masses saw the totality of the pattern of the "Second World War," they would realize that unless the imperialists stage these fights in remote, out of the way places — (and don't forget the color cameras all set up like a Hollywood studio)— there would be nothing visible but one unopposed occupation and re-occupation of the main centers of the world after another. In a word, without the Iwos, Tarawas and Guadalcanals, there would be nothing visible but the clear symptoms of a sham war amongst the imperialists.

It is no accident that Iwo Jima and the color cameras were cooked up immediately following the unopposed re-entry into the Philippines. The imperialists could not let such a phoney circumstance pass without covering it up somehow. It is from this necessity that Iwo Jima flowed as have all the staged fights of this type. The lives wiped out in these fights means absolutely nothing to the imperialists who, when it suits their purpose, will cause, as in 1914-1918, the butchery of ten million and the maiming of twenty million. The casualties on Iwo Jima will be used by the imperialists to make the masses forget about the "mysteries" of the "Battles" of France, Norway, the Balkans, Singapore, the East Indies, the Philippines and other vital places in the sham war.

* * *

I N previous issues of THE BULLETIN we have presented a mass of documentary material proving that among the big imperialist powers what has been in progress since September 1939 does not fall into the category of a real imperialist war for world domination like that of 1914-1918. The attack on the Soviet Union, however, organized by world imperialism with Nazi Germany as the spearhead, falls into the same category as the imperialist intervention of 1918-1920. The

fundamental pattern which unfolded after September 1939 was the opening of territory after territory to the fascists by their alleged foes, the "democratic" ruling gangs, with the resultant launching of the real war on the Stalin-ruled Soviet Union. When it became clear at the time of the Battle of Stalingrad that the Nazi attempt to destroy the Soviet Union had definitely failed, the imperialists entered into a new stage of their maneuvers. This is the process of re-occupying the various territories temporarily handed over to fascist policing by the rulers of the "democracies." The outstanding milepost of this new stage is the unopposed re-occupation of France by the "Allies." The new developments have clearly shown themselves also in the Pacific area with the unopposed re-occupation of the Aleutians and of Philippine territories. This free handing back and forth of important territories in no way resembles the features of a real imperialist war but points to the underlying collaboration of world imperialism,

The various opportunists who pose as Marxists have been concealing the real character of the "Second World War" ever since the Chamberlain-Daladier paper declaration of war in September 1939. At no time have the pseudo-Marxists accounted for the enormous multitude of phoney military features which have characterized the operations among the imperialist powers. The tactic of the opportunists has been to ignore these crucial aspects of reality and to parade their amalgam of the "Second World War" with the war of 1914-1918. By slurring over the fundamental features the opportunists cause their mechanical use of the phrase "imperialist war" to appear a matter of "following in the footsteps of Lenin." A concrete analysis of the actual facts utterly explodes the "Leninist" pretenses of the opportunists.

The unopposed occupation of France by the Nazis in 1940 was striking enough to begin with to those who observed the facts and saw through the smokescreen spread by the capitalist propagandists. The unopposed re-occupation of France in 1944 by the "Al-

lies" was even more vivid in events indicating the sham nature of the "war." The United States re-entry into the Philippines tops the bill so far for its phoney character.

It is so with every fraud perpetrated by the bourgeoisie; the deeper its development, the more grotesque it becomes in the divergence of the pretenses from the realities. Due to the Stalinists, Trotskyites and Social Democrats who aid the imperialists by painting the situation as a real conflict between the "Allies" and the "Ax-

is" the sham nature of the "Second Inter-Imperialist World War" is now known only to a few workers. As the revolutionary proletarian forces grow stronger and come to dominate the working class as a whole, the truth will become known to all the toilers who will then be in a position to reckon with their class foes.

J. C. Hunter
February 1945

*Send for articles on the
Sham War*

IN BACK ISSUES OF THE BULLETIN

THE CASE OF HOLLAND, BELGIUM AND FRANCE

How the Nazis were swept into these countries by the "Allies"

THE SECOND "BATTLE OF FRANCE"

How the Nazis were withdrawn and the "Allies" entered

MARX ON A SHAM WAR

On Marx's "The Eastern Question" -- An analysis by Marx of the sham nature of the Crimean War

THESE ISSUES ARE FREE

Address: P.O.B. 67
Station D
New York City

LEWIS FACES A NEW CRISIS

THE new contract terms offered by John L. Lewis for the soft coal miners are a classic example of the mountain laboring and giving forth a mouse. After much raving and ranting against the Little Steel formula, Lewis presented a set of terms which carefully and designedly avoid raising this issue. Lewis does not ask for a direct increase in the basic rate of pay of the miners. The "demands" are of the "fringe" variety.

The capitalist press, in dealing with Lewis' terms, does not want to gloat too openly over the advantages which he is handing the mine bosses on a silver platter. Nevertheless, the capitalist commentators cannot refrain entirely from letting a cat or two out of the bag.

It appears that Lewis introduced an "innovation" into his terms for the new soft coal contract. In the past the mine union bureaucrat entangled the workers in two-year contracts with the bosses so that the sell-out terms negotiated behind the miners' back would have plenty of time to take effect and reap profits for the capitalists. The usual union contract runs for one year. The two-year clause in Lewis' past contracts has been recognized, at least by the more advanced workers, as a reactionary feature in itself which was aimed at tying the hands of the miners for a fairly long stretch. In his new terms for the soft coal miners, Lewis has eliminated the two-year clause. Was this, perhaps, a result of his desire to rid the workers of the paralyzing effects of a long-term contract in a situation where prices rise at a staggering rate? Not in the least! Lewis, as the report in the bourgeois press clearly shows, removed the two-year clause to satisfy the policy of the mine bosses who want to be free to lower pay rates. The story of this characteristic Lewis deal is told in the newspaper PM:

"The first item in the contract proposals represented an innovation

in UMW negotiations. Instead of the customary two-year contract, it provided that the new agreement could be terminated by either party on 20 days notice. Only the day before two of the operator spokesmen had informed newsmen that the operators would oppose the usual two-year contract because they wanted to be free to re-open wage negotiations after the end of the war in Europe or in Japan.

"Apparently, Lewis had heard from the operators direct or had read the newspapers; for in explaining the new proposal he said he understood that the operators were 'disinclined' to make a contract for a long period, so they would be free to ask for a wage reduction.' Accordingly, he added, the UMW made its proposal 'in an intense desire to be co-operative.'" (March 2, 1945. Our emphasis)

Such is the character of Lewis' "fight" for the miners. Either a long-term, paralyzing contract to freeze the miners' wages in the face of enormous price rises; or a short term contract to free the bosses' hand for a quick move to reduce wages. But this is only the first point of Lewis' new terms.

The miners are in an economic category which spends 80 to 90 per cent of its total earnings on the basic necessities of life. The cost of these basic necessities, according to conservative estimates, has gone up from 30 to 40 per cent. For an economic category spending the overwhelming bulk of its income on basic commodities to face such an increase in the cost of living means to be literally on the starvation level. To provide any kind of adequate compensation for the rise in living costs suffered by the miners they would have to win a substantial increase in their basic rate of pay. But it is precisely that kind of increase which Lewis deliberately eliminated from his "demands," leaving the whole matter revolve

around "fringe" issues, i.e., side issues of the ten-cent store variety. How much actual added cash would the "fringe" demands put in the miners' pocket, assuming they are accepted in their original condition?

"Lewis spokesmen, as the miners and operators prepared to resume negotiations today, estimated that these increases would amount to pay increases of about \$1 a day, but the operators were expected to contend that it would be much more." (New York Post, March 2, 1945)

It goes without saying that the "fringe" demands which would result concretely in increasing the net amount of the weekly pay check will be whittled down during the negotiations. In other words, at "best," the miners may get around a dollar a day more in their pay envelopes. In light of the living conditions of the miners, such a "victory" is nothing more than a gruesome joke. It is a million miles removed from what is required merely to compensate for the miners' increased cost of living, to say nothing of raising their conditions above the misery which existed even before the scale of prices shot skyward.

In the eyes of many confused workers Lewis is a "critic" of the Roosevelt regime. Even such relatively advanced workers as the adherents of the Socialist Workers Party and the Workers Party accept from their leaders the story that Lewis at least in recent times has been putting up a fight quite different from that of the Green and Murray type of bureaucrat. Lewis' maneuvers in the present soft coal negotiations completely reveal the falsity of his gestures of "criticism" of the Roosevelt regime. The "anti-inflation" policy of the Wall Street gang of rulers is nothing but a camouflage of their holding wages down to increase the profits of the bosses beyond anything the world has ever seen. Yet Lewis' elimination of a demand for an increase in the basic rate of pay is the result of direct pandering to the intensified exploitation disguised under the "anti-inflation" fraud of the ruling class:

"Lewis' decision not to ask for a basic wage increase caught the operators as well as labor leaders in general by surprise. For months the UMW's official publication, the United Mine Workers Journal, made bitter attacks on the Little Steel formula; and both within the AFL and the CIO it was assumed Lewis would lead another fight to smash the formula.

"Instead, he prefaced his reading of the specific demands with a statement that the proposals about to be presented were 'in conformity with and not in violation of the anti-inflation policy of this Government.'" (PM, March 2, 1945)

The underlying policy of every labor faker comes to the fore most clearly in times of crisis. Lewis now openly is showing the treacherous hand which he had been concealing behind a cloud of "anti-Little Steel" demagoguery. Lewis' terms "in conformity with and not in violation of the anti-inflation policy of this Government" are, of course, not merely a negative, abstentionist feature; they are a positive and very important support to the Wall Street magnates.

The "demand" for a ten cent per ton royalty to be paid to the UMW is entirely one of those football issues which bureaucrats kick about to hide the really essential goings-on behind the scenes. Let it be said immediately that if anything should actually be obtained from the bosses in the way of a royalty payment to the union "to provide for its members modern medical and surgical service, hospitalization, insurance, rehabilitation and economic protection," as Lewis grandiloquently put it, the money will be a fund for the bureaucrats. The only kind of "protection" that the Lewis gang knows about is of the brass-knuckle variety and the only "rehabilitation" they ever set afoot is that of the broken heads of the rank-and-filers who protested Lewis' gangsterism and double-dealing. It is not ruled out that the mine bosses will be willing to pay Lewis and Company a little tribute, though the ten cents per ton he "demands" sounds a bit fantastic. Actual-

ly, people close to the dickering dis- count the royalty "demand" entirely, placing it unequivocally in the cate- gory of a talking point:

"But persons familiar with the labor situation here [Washington] believe that Lewis does not serious- ly expect to get this huge fund which he said would be used for med- ical service, insurance, hospitali- zation and economic protection of the miners." (New York Post, March 2, 1945)

The whole thing is a "tactic," accord- ing to these sources:

"Lewis, it is believed would quickly drop this demand if the op- erators agreed to his proposal for fringe wage increases." (Ibid.)

From any angle, the royalty rumpus is entirely a side issue.

In connection with the new crisis in the mine fields, we call the read- er's attention to some important back- ground material vital for an under- standing of the last few years which have clearly shown symptoms of an in-

cient, profoundly important revolt of the American miners against the treacherous leaders of their union. Most significant in this respect is an understanding of the real story of Lew- is and his "Marxist" assistants in the crisis of 1943. The article entitled "The Betrayal of the Miners" in the September 1943 issue of THE BULLETIN contains an expose of Lewis' sell-out of the strike launched by the miners over the head of their leadership. Though naturally at that time no one could foretell the "demands" Lewis would put forth two years later, his role is forecast in our September 1943 article with scientific precision and in sharp contradistinction to the Can- nonite and Shachtmanite leadership who were acting as a "Left" cover for Lew- is' betrayal of the mine strike. In the present issue of THE BULLETIN the article "Class Collaboration From the 'Left'" gives a more extended treat- ment of this highly important trade union issue. Each stage of the labor fakery's machinations must be related to their career as a whole for a com- plete understanding of their function as betrayers of the toilers.

J. C. H.
March 4, 1945

*The role of opportunism
In the Trade Unions*

SEND FOR FREE COPIES OF

THE BETRAYAL OF THE MINERS
DEFENDERS OF THE TRADE UNION BUREAUCRACY
A SYMBOL OF COURAGE
MORE ON THE CANNONITES AND HOMER MARTIN

ADDRESS: P.O.B. 67
Station D
New York City

Class-Collaboration on the "Left"

THE Cannonite and Shachtmanite leaders picture their trade union line as a concrete indication of what they term their struggle for the interests of the workers. The pages of The Militant and Labor Action to an enormous extent are concerned with the trade union field. Trotskyite reporters are sent to union conventions and their reports of the sessions and convention resolutions always merit headline news in the Trotskyite press. The emphasis on trade union activity in the press is the reflection of the line which is urged upon the Trotskyite workers. What is the character of this Trotskyite trade union work? What constitutes the guiding line for this activity? The Trotskyites of both wings are a relatively tiny force in the unions. In so far as conducting union activity of their own is concerned their work is necessarily very limited because of the extreme meagerness of their forces. Inevitably, therefore, a predominant portion of the Trotskyite trade union line and its reflected activity is in relation to the big figures in the unions who do command major forces. An outstanding trade union figure who for many years has formed a pivotal point in the Trotskyite trade union line is John L. Lewis, particularly from the time of the formation of the CIO. No understanding of the Trotskyite union activity can be adequately or correctly formed unless their policy toward Lewis is thoroughly known and examined. This is only one aspect of the problem but it is a major one and deserves a thorough study in itself. The evolution of the Trotskyite policy on Lewis is organically linked to their trade union policy as a whole. The one cannot be comprehended without the other.

The Trotskyites and the Formation of the CIO

THE years 1933-34 witnessed the American workers engaging in a wave of strikes which swept across the United States, a reflection of a new

spirit of struggle which began to permeate the ranks of the workers. At first they naturally looked for leadership toward the AFL. But the AFL leaders attempted to stem the upsurge of strikes by a series of sell-outs and crooked deals with the bosses and their government stooges. As a result, a wave of dissatisfaction began to manifest itself amongst the masses against the AFL and its leadership. The spectre of the organization of the militant-minded workers in a new union movement began to haunt the more alert AFL bureaucrats. They feared the consequences of such a new union movement which would necessarily have to take shape and grow against the AFL and would not be subject to its restraining influence. These AFL bureaucrats, more astute in this respect than some of their colleagues, saw the necessity to take control of this new movement, head it off, and keep it in the channels of class-collaborationism. Thus, an "industrial union" bloc was formed by a section of the AFL leadership led by Lewis, Howard, Gorman, Hillman, and Dubinsky.

During the period of the formation of this bloc which began to take form at the 1934 San Francisco convention of the AFL, the Trotsky leaders did not hesitate to show, and quite correctly, that the Lewis-led "industrial union" bloc was a fraud designed to head off and betray the new militant movement of the American workers:

"So far then from being progressive, the Lewis-Hillman outfit is to be more feared by progressives and militants today than the other elements of the A. F. of L. leadership. The old-timers cannot possibly handle the situation any longer. Their bungling attempts are bound to play into the hands of the militants. Lewis, Hillman and Company are the agents of the capitalist class who might be able to fasten a class collaboration trade unionism on the masses generally and espe-

cially the membership of the new unions, for a period. That John L. Lewis in the face of his atrocious record in his own union and his present philosophy should today be thought of by many honest workers as a progressive and as the hope of the workers in the developing crisis is indeed ominous." (The New International, October 1935, p. 184)

The Trotskyite line on the whole Lewis-led movement was clear and unequivocal:

"Once again we say to the progressives throughout the trade union movement: Expose the fake progressivism and 'industrial unionism' of Lewis and Company." (New Militant, October 1935, p. 4)

At the October 1935 convention, Lewis openly showed that he was heading for an organizational separation from the Green-Woll gang. The New Militant, then the organ of Cannon and Shachtman, analyzed this convention and issued a watchword: "Put no trust in Lewis and Co. is the Slogan." (October 26, 1935, p. 1)

In the course of that article, the Lewis-Hillman bloc was again analyzed as a bureaucratic and class-collaborationist maneuver, designed to exploit the militant spirit of the leftward moving workers and betray them. Therefore, it was logically concluded that the Lewis bloc was even more dangerous than Green because of its false progressive mask:

"No, the conservative forces in the A.F. of L. today are the Lewis-Hillman forces, the more dangerous because they masquerade as progressive and up to-date." (Ibid., p. 3)

One of the most revealing statements about the Lewis-Hillman bloc and its motivations was made at the AFL convention in October 1935 where the "split" between the Lewis clique and Green occurred. Howard, one of the main supporters of Lewis, made a speech to his bureaucratic colleagues in the AFL leadership and pointed out what was really in the minds of the Lewis

gang. The key point in this speech was published by the New Militant. Howard spoke as follows:

"Now, let me say to you that the workers of this country are going to organize, and if they are not permitted to organize under the banner of the American Federation of Labor they are going to organize under some other leadership or they are going to organize without leadership. And if either of those conditions should eventuate, I submit to you that it would be a far more serious problem for our government, for the people of this country and for the American Federation of Labor itself than if our organization policies should be so molded that we can organize them and bring them under the leadership of this organization." (November 30, 1935, p. 5)

This brazen statement clearly indicates what the trade union agents of American imperialism have in their mind when they scurry around organizing unions. It is one of the great misfortunes of the American working class that these people have been able to seize the leading positions in the union movement with the result that when an upsurge of the workers occurs, it becomes chained to Wall Street through this leadership. Unless this leadership is unmasked and ousted from the unions, the strivings of the American workers will continue to be perverted in the interests of the capitalist magnates.

For a time Cannon and Shachtman seemed to have the intention of exposing the treacherous Lewis and his policies. They wrote about his essential strike-breaking role and used this as a point of criticism against the so-called Militants in the Socialist Party who were giving "critical" support to Lewis:

"The 'Militant' program fails even to mention one of the most significant tendencies of the present regime: its attempt to tie the trade union movement up with the capitalist government, by way of boards, laws, etc., designed in the long run to emasculate the unions, to re-

strict the right to strike, and thus to undermine the workers' power of resistance. This policy is strongly nourished by the degenerate leadership of the A.F.L. including the Lewises, Hillmans, Dubinsky, whom the 'Militants' support. Lewis and Hillman, in fact, are even closer to the government than are Green and Woll." (New Militant, October 12, 1935, p. 2. Emphasis in original.)

Professing to counterpose this line to the Stalinists, the Trotsky leaders promised to build a Left Wing in the AFL against both the Lewis and Green forces:

"Let this serve as another warning that the Lewis-Hillman-Dubinsky group in the A.F. of L. are not progressives and cannot be counted on to support progressive causes and groups. The left wing must be built against them, not as the Stalinists seek to do, by the favor of these bureaucrats." (New Militant, September 28, 1935, Editorial page)

How little the anti-Lewis noise of Cannon and Shachtman was seriously intended was shown by the fact that soon after the "break" between Lewis and Green actually materialized at the AFL convention of Oct. 1935, the Trotsky leaders suddenly made a 180 degree turn and began to whoop it up for the Lewis machine while they surreptitiously buried their previous line. The talk about building a genuine Left Wing against the Lewis bloc, which only yesterday had been declared to be even more dangerous than Green was quietly dropped and the yarn that support to "the extremely conservative tendency" was now necessary was labelled a "curious fact":

"It is a curious fact that the interests of the most revolutionary and the extremely conservative tendencies coincide to a certain extent. Industrial unionism is objectively progressive. Therefore revolutionists must support it regardless who is at the head of the movement for its realization." (Speech of J. P. Cannon, New Militant, December 14, 1935)

Once the Trotsky leaders came out for the Lewis bloc in a masked fashion, as it were, they immediately began to issue profound-looking analyses on how the objective logic of Lewis' position would drive his clique to cater to the more militant workers:

"On the other hand the leaders in the industrial union bloc will most likely find themselves compelled to lean over more upon the workers who are actually set in motion for industrial unionism and who also demand democratic unions with an aggressive policy of organization." (New Militant, February 1, 1936, p. 4)

To cover the nature of their support to Lewis with Marxist sounding arguments the Trotsky leaders even went to the extent of predicting that Lewis would be constrained to become an advocate of — TRADE UNION DEMOCRACY:

"In the course of further events it is quite likely that he (Lewis - A.B.) will be compelled to become one of the outstanding champions of trade union democracy. If so, AND THIS IS TO BE EXPECTED, it will arise out of the logic of his present position and not because of any principled adherence to the idea of trade union democracy." (New Militant, November 30, 1935, p. 4. My capitals - A.B.)

In connection with the Trotsky fable that Lewis would be compelled to fight for trade union democracy it is amusing to note what they had to say on this subject in 1938 when the CIO had already become a distinct and separate organization:

"The bureaucratic management of the new C.I.O. unions is notorious. The Lewis-Hillman-Murray clique, aware of the danger to their leadership and policies represented by the mass unionization of aggressive unskilled workers in the large scale industries sought to paralyze rank-and-file control in advance by establishing a bureaucratic guardianship over all the unions they organized. Neither the leadership nor the policies were voted by the union mem-

bership. No regular organization has been set up in most cases. Officials are appointed in the worst traditions of the United Mine Workers of America." (Socialist Appeal, February 12, 1938, p. 2)

Obviously, the talk that Lewis would be forced to become an advocate of trade union democracy was just so much dust thrown into the eyes of the Trotskyite workers designed to get them to consider their support of Lewis as progressive and in the interest of the workers.

The key argument which the Trotsky leaders advanced as a basis for their switch to Lewis was that industrial unionism was objectively progressive, as well as the organization of the unorganized workers into trade unions, and in so far as the Lewis leadership pursued these functions it was "progressive" and merited support:

"Nevertheless, the present situation is clear to militant and to revolutionary workers in the trade unions. Around the issues that stand out today — an aggressive policy of organization and industrial unionism — they must make common cause and a common struggle with the Lewis' 'progressive' bloc." (New Militant, November 30, 1935, p. 5)

The playing down of the question of the leadership — the all-essential factor — is the fraud which the Trotsky leaders practiced in swinging support to the utterly putrid and corrupt Lewis gang. A trade union can not be discussed and analyzed separate and apart from the character and policies of its leadership. Lewis and Green organize only reactionary, class-collaborationist unions. This policy is against the fundamental interests of the workers. Only when the unions are cleansed of the counter-revolutionary leadership and broken away from capitalism can they become progressive and function in the interests of the toilers. Soviets, for example, on an entirely different plane than the trade unions, are the historical form of workers' rule. Yet even in regard to this workers' structure, history has shown that Soviets can be counter-rev-

olutionary and function in the interests of the capitalists if the all-essential feature — the leadership — is in the hands of opportunists. Such was the case with the Menshevik-led Soviets in Russia, such was the case with the Soviets which fell into the hands of the German Social Democracy in 1919, such was the case with the Stalinist-organized Soviets in China. Today, in the Soviet Union the Soviets are counter-revolutionary because of their leadership.

The Marxist position is — expose and cast out the counter-revolutionary leadership which ultimately brings about the destruction of all workers' organizations through its political support to the bourgeoisie. The Trotsky leaders pursue an opposite policy. They play up the FORM, such as trade unions, and argue that whoever organizes workers into such forms is objectively performing a progressive act and should be supported. This is the swindle which they palm off as a Marxist analysis and which they utilize to prop up the labor fakers. When opportunists organize "progressive" organizations they do this precisely for the purposes of acquiring a "progressive" mask so as to bolster their leadership in the eyes of the workers whom they mean to betray. This false-face of "progressivism" must be exposed and combatted.

The Trotsky line on the question of the evolution of the CIO was developed in a fraudulent manner. First, Cannon and Shachtman opposed any break from the AFL structure, castigated the Lewis "progressive" bloc as a fraud, warned the workers that Lewis and his tendency represented an even greater danger than the Green gang, and told the workers that they would work for a "Left Wing" against Lewis as well as Green. Then they buried their previous line, told the workers that Lewis was furthering a progressive cause after all, that he should therefore be supported, and predicted that because of his "objectively progressive" position he would be compelled to become an "outstanding champion of trade union democracy."

What is the explanation for this sudden Trotskyite switch on Lewis. The

answer is to be found in the development of the Stalinist line. In the leftist "Third Period" phase, the Stalinists applied their line in the union sphere in the form of dual unions. The formation and activity of these dual unions were accompanied by a fierce verbal war against the AFL leadership. Specifically in the mine fields, the Stalinists formed a National Miners Union against the Lewis-controlled United Mine Workers. For a period of years the Stalinists poured a steady stream of vituperation against Lewis and his machine who fought to eliminate the Stalinists and their union from the coal fields. The years 1933-34 formed the transition from the Leftist "Third Period" to the Rightist "Popular Front" line of the Stalinist. In the United States, this transition proceeded much slower than in the rest of the world. Lewis' swing to the industrial union maneuver of 1935 found the Stalinists in this country with many "Third Period" features still retained in their trade union activities. Especially at the start of Lewis' maneuver, the Stalinists were still keeping up their verbal barrage against Lewis. Thus, in a statement issued a little prior to the Seventh Congress of the "Comintern," the Browder gang condemned the whole idea of the Lewis "industrial union" and "progressive" bloc as simply another method for holding the workers in check:

"The crisis within the A.F. of L. Executive Council, is, of course, not over policies for and against the workers. Reflecting the differences in the camp of the bourgeoisie itself, these labor lieutenants of capitalism are fighting over questions as how best to check and control the rank and file, how to prevent strikes, how to keep the masses chained to the policies of class collaboration. Moreover, people like John L. Lewis fear that the old craft union policies, applied to such industries as auto, rubber and steel, may well lead to the formation of mass industrial unions outside the A.F. of L. Furthermore, Lewis believes that through strongly centralized, national industrial unions, led by people like himself, he can convince the employers that

he can offer the best guarantees against strikes through such model anti-strike agreements as he signed in the name of the coal miners." (Communist International, June 1935, p. 487)

The conclusion was that the struggle for a new union movement had to be directed against both the Green and Lewis gangs:

"It is clear that the fight for militant industrial class trade unions is the fight of the masses and will be won, not only in the struggle against the Greens and the Wolls, but against the Lewises and Berrys as well." (Ibid.)

However, at the Seventh Congress of the C.I., held in July-August 1935, the remnants of the ultra-left swing were completely buried and the Rightist zigzag was sharply accelerated. At this Congress, Social Democracy was fraudulently re-evaluated as an opponent of fascism with whom blocs were therefore to be made. In the trade union sphere the American Stalinist dual union policy of the Leftist period was dropped and a line of blocs with reactionary trade union fakers was substituted. Following the Seventh Congress the American Stalinists immediately ditched their old line against Lewis and called for support to this putrid labor swindler who they now stated was performing a progressive role.

The Stalinist bureaucrats insisted, of course, that it wasn't Lewis as such whom they were supporting but the idea of industrial unionism and the organization of the unorganized workers into trade unions. In so far as Lewis performed these "progressive" functions, stated the Stalinists, they would render support to him. Referring to the line of the Stalinist delegates at the AFL convention in Oct. 1935 when the Lewis-Green "break" occurred, Stachel attempted to explain away the new zigzag to the support of Lewis:

"The attitude of the Communists and their sympathizers, who constituted a bloc of some 40 or 50 delegates, toward the Lewis forces was one of aiding them in every way as

far as they made a genuine fight for industrial unionism and other progressive measures, as, for example, the National Civic Federation resolution. Bearing in mind the past record of Lewis, they judged him on the basis of every proposal he made, re-evaluating their stand towards him not so much because they believed that he had basically changed his whole position but because the whole development in the country, in the trade union movement and the problems faced by the U.M.W.A. have placed him in a new objective role at the present moment." ("A New Page for American Labor," The Communist, November 1935, p. 1031)

This was the old opportunist line of "critical support." As a matter of fact when they indicated the political character of the "industrial union bloc," the Stalinist bureaucrats even hedged on the idea of labelling the Lewis bloc as a "progressive" bloc:

"The progressive bloc, if we should call it such, or the industrial union bloc consisted of a variety of groupings — from supporters of Roosevelt to Communists." (Ibid., p. 1030)

Thus we see the origin of the Trotskyite line and the explanation for its flip-flop into the Lewis camp. When the Stalin crew yelled blood and thunder against Lewis and exposed his "progressive" bloc as a swindle, the Trotskyite leaders followed suit and echoed the Stalinist line against Lewis. When the Browders hypocritically declared that a common struggle must be waged against both Green and Lewis, the Cannons went them one better and declared that Lewis was even more dangerous than Green. When the new Rightist gospel of the Seventh Congress was applied in the trade unions, the Stalinists doubled back on their tracks, announced support to Lewis, and defended it on the grounds that Lewis was struggling for an objectively "progressive" cause. The Trotsky leaders dutifully followed, repeating essentially the same line of argumentation to cover their hurried switch into the Lewis camp after the Stalinists had led the way. Lewis should be supported be-

cause the issue he was promoting was progressive, declared the Stalinists. Again going the Stalinists one better, the Trotsky leaders not only affirmed this argument but predicted that Lewis would even become a proponent of trade union democracy! Such was the Trotskyite trade union line in the early period of the CIO!

The Trotskyites in the Socialist Party

IN June 1936 the Cannon-Shachtman leadership applied the American version of the "French Turn" and entered the party of Norman Thomas. Prior to this move, the Trotsky leadership had been repeating the phrases of Rosa Luxembourg and Lenin about the irretrievably bankrupt character of the Social Democracy, "the stinking corpse." The 1934 Detroit convention of the Socialist Party had been characterized by Cannon-Shachtman as "a miserable affair" where the Old Guard emerged victorious. In June 1936 when the Trotsky leaders urged entry into the S.P. they "re-evaluated" the Socialist Party, played up the Detroit convention as a break from the classical Social-Democratic line, and claimed that it showed that the American Socialists did not intend to repeat the crimes of their political brothers in Europe who helped clear the way for fascism. Cannon-Shachtman then declared that the S.P. could be "revolutionized" which they forthwith promised to accomplish.

The Social Democratic line on Lewis was at least consistent. As the Trotsky writers correctly pointed out when they were condemning the Lewis crowd, the Socialists had the treacherous policy of playing up Lewis as the leader of a struggle which was in the interests of the workers. Interestingly enough, the Social Democrats also screened their support to Lewis behind a facade of qualifying and critical phrases:

"We are not prepared to follow blindly the activities of Lewis, Hillman, Dubinsky, etc. Certainly we are not going to partake in their political adventures. To the extent

that their campaign is for industrial unionism, to the extent that they intend to organize the thousands of unorganized whose only salvation lies in the organization of industrial unions, to that extent we must be with them shoulder to shoulder, and perhaps by so doing we may influence the committees' work sufficiently to avoid any mistakes which might prove fatal." (American Socialist Monthly, April 1936, p. 17)

This was the same stuff that was dished out by the Stalinists and by the Trotsky leaders when they hooked their followers onto the Lewis machine. When the Trotsky leaders announced support to Lewis, Cannon commented on the coinciding of the Lewis line with the Trotsky line as a "curious fact." That the line of the Social-Democrats, the Stalinists, and the Trotskyites on Lewis coincided was not at all a curiosity but a basic, significant political fact.

The Trotskyite hibernation in the Socialist Party signified support to Lewis during this period. Because the line of the Socialist Party was to support Lewis, the Trotsky line in the trade unions to gain recruits for the Socialist Party concretely meant attaching the workers to Lewis through the agency of the Socialist Party.

The Formation of the Socialist Workers Party and Its Stand on Lewis

WHEN the Trotsky leaders resumed an independent organizational existence in the form of the Socialist Workers Party, the line of support to Lewis continued for a brief time. In their very first document the Trotsky leaders reiterated their past stand in supporting the Lewis bloc and defended it as correct:

"The formation of the C.I.O., its fight against the Green-Woll-Frey machine, its decisive plunge into the work of organizing the masses of the unskilled in the key industries, were progressive steps and more than warranted the active support given by the revolutionists to the C.I.O. as the progressive section of the labor movement." (First Convention

Resolution, Socialist Appeal, January 8, 1938, p. 2)

Accordingly, Cannon-Shachtman approvingly quoted a Lovestoneite estimation which threw a bouquet to Lewis for his "lead" in the industrial union movement:

"John L. Lewis deserves credit for promoting industrial unionism as C. I. O. chairman, as Stolberg pointed out." (Socialist Appeal, February 5, 1938, p. 3)

The true story which Cannon-Shachtman now concealed was that Lewis organized the CIO to gain control of a developing movement tending towards independence from the AFL and the bosses whom it served. Diverting this movement in the "safe" channels of class-collaborationism, Lewis strangled the incipient independence of the industrial union development. The fundamental strike-breaking role of the Lewis machine was known to Cannon and Shachtman as they indicated on various occasions, when they cloaked their support to Lewis with "criticism":

"The C.I.O. bureaucrats are just as quick to make any kind of shady deal with the bosses or the government boards as are the A.F. of L. bureaucrats." (Socialist Appeal, October 16, 1937, p. 8)

And the bureaucratic stranglehold which the Lewis gang held over the workers in the CIO was also common knowledge and mentioned as a matter of course by the Trotsky leaders:

"The power and authority of the self-constituted committee could well be envied by the most hardened A.F. of L. bureaucrat. It appointed and discharged organizers and regional directors at will and held several of the newly-organized unions in leading strings. Some of them are still under 'provisional government' as this method was once politely called in the miners' union." (Socialist Appeal, April 30, 1938, p. 4)

John L. Lewis with his henchmen and allies, then, placed himself at the

head of a new union movement so as to behead it, which he did. He paralyzed the forward independent movement of the workers in the mass production industries and set up a ruthless bureaucratic machine to prevent and suppress any rank and file desires for struggle against the bosses. Only hardened opportunists can twist these facts around and induce the workers to render tribute to Lewis. When the Trotsky leaders stated that Lewis "deserves credit for promoting industrial unionism as C.I.O. chairman" they were merely repeating the same deceit that the Social Democrats used. The Socialist Party line was as follows:

"Moreover, we should take an active part in the work of the Committee on Industrial Organization, carefully avoiding any blanket endorsement of the CIO, because the CIO under its present leadership may continue to do good work and we hope it does; but, on the other hand it may not, and socialists must continue to be on guard." (American Socialist Monthly, June 1936, p. 9, My emphasis - A. B.)

This "on the one hand, on the other hand" business is the "critical support" by which the opportunist swindlers camouflage their propping up of reactionary leaders. Every opportunist indulges in these "critical support" antics toward his brother opportunists.

Admiration for the "good work" of Lewis stemmed from another treacherous source. Speaking of an "advance" of the American workers, the treacherous Comintern bureaucrats sang the praises of the Lewis gang for "facilitating" this so-called advance:

"On the one hand, the C.I.O. leaders, progressively minded, put themselves at the head of the awakening workers and did a great deal to facilitate their advance." (Wm. Z. Foster, The Communist, August 1938, p. 697)

Thus, Foster, Thomas, Lovestone, and Cannon-Shachtman all united on the note of paying homage to the strike-breaker Lewis. All of these leaders united in concealing Lewis' reaction-

ary role by identifying him in some way with the interests of the working class. All united in this swindle which palmed off a labor agent of the bosses as having accomplished something that advanced the interests of the American workers.

The Trotsky Swing To Opposition to Lewis

IN the years 1938-40 the Trotsky line of critical support to Lewis began subtly to change with more and more emphasis on the criticism and less on the support until for a time the idea of support was completely dropped. There were many factors in the situation which dictated a temporary change in line. The policy of open physical annihilation introduced by the Moscow trials was translated into an organized lynch campaign by the American Stalinists against the Trotskyites. Meanwhile, it became patently obvious that a bloc had been formed in the unions between the Lewis machine and the Browder gang. In payment for Browder's support, Lewis appointed Harry Bridges CIO director for the west coast giving the Browder gang a free hand for the whole area. In this sector the main area of Trotskyite influence centered in the Sailors Union of the Pacific (S.U.P.) affiliated to the AFL and led by Harry Lundeberg. The Lewis appointment of Bridges symbolized an effort to wreck the S.U.P., which was immediately attempted by Bridges, accompanied by the usual Stalinist methods of physical violence, scabbing on the S.U.P., etc.

In Minneapolis, where most of the Trotsky strength in the unions was concentrated, the Stalinists in the name of the CIO and with the connivance of Lewis attempted an organization drive and successfully swung the Machinist unions to the CIO. Since the Trotsky strength in Minneapolis was in the AFL breaking up the AFL and fostering the CIO meant the destruction of whatever influence the Trotsky leaders possessed there. Wherever the United Front between Lewis and the Stalinists manifested itself it constituted a threat to the Trotsky forces in the unions and the Trotsky leaders accordingly responded with ever increasing castiga-

tion of the Lewis-Stalinist bloc.

During the latter part of 1939 and throughout 1940 a peculiar series of circumstances intervened to alter somewhat the relationship of forces in the CIO. Sidney Hillman got the inside track with the Roosevelt political machine and won the post as "labor representative" in the government, a post which Lewis felt rightly belonged to him. Lewis immediately "broke" with Roosevelt and started a clique fight against Hillman in the CIO.

During the early stages of this bureaucratic gang warfare the Trotsky leaders explicitly agreed that both sides were waging a clique fight and that the idea that there were any principled differences between them was a Stalinist invention:

"For -- to get down to cases -- the fight between Hillman and Lewis is nothing but a clique fight. Hillman is undoubtedly trying to push Lewis out of the leadership of the CIO; Lewis is retaliating in kind. But principled issues? Where are they? The Stalinists try to invent some." (Socialist Appeal, September 28, 1940. Editorial page)

The Trotskyites Make a Discovery

IN the summer of 1941 the Lewis-Hillman clique fight continued but external events intervened to change the line-up of forces. The imperialist-planned invasion of the Soviet Union opened in June 1941. Stalin and the "democracies" told the masses that there was an alliance between the Soviet Union and the imperialist powers. The Stalinist bureaucrats raised a great clamor in favor of the "Allied" governments. In previous periods the "Comintern" line had been changed from zigzag to zigzag without regards to Stalin's foreign policy and sometimes even flew in the face of the latter (e.g., the "Third Period" uproar kept up in Germany during Stalin's "friendly" relations with the imperialists of the Weimar Republic). For the first time, in June 1941, the Stalinist bureaucrats switched the "Comintern" line for the explicit purpose of

making it directly coincide with Stalin's foreign policy. The Browder gang, who only the day before had been shouting curses at Roosevelt, now as lustily sang his praises. The phoney Lewis opposition to Roosevelt no longer served the Stalinists and they accordingly dumped him overboard and switched to Hillman.

Important developments in the summer of 1941 were also stirring in the Trotsky movement. Daniel Tobin, with the collaboration of the Roosevelt machine, moved to oust the Trotsky leaders from the Minneapolis teamsters union making a further stay in the AFL manifestly impossible for them. Meanwhile a beckoning finger was temptingly extended by Lewis to the Trotsky leaders and their union. For a long time Lewis had been trying to raid the AFL in the Construction and Teamsters field, as the Trotsky leaders had been pointing out for a period of years in their press. The Trotskyite led union looked like a juicy plum to Lewis particularly since it would gain him the long desired foothold amongst the teamsters.

The situation called for some delicate maneuvering on the part of Cannon and Co.. For many years the Cannon leadership had campaigned against the CIO incursions in Minneapolis. Furthermore, they had been sharply denouncing Lewis for conducting an unprincipled clique fight against Hillman as we have shown above. Moreover, the situation was rendered even more delicate because the Lewis-Hillman clique fight at this time was still raging through the CIO.

What course did the Cannon leadership follow? They themselves began to invent principled differences between Lewis and Hillman. The Trotskyites suddenly "discovered" that Lewis condemned the use of troops to break the strike at the North American Aviation Plant, that Lewis fought against the anti-labor functions of the National Defense Mediation Board, that Lewis resisted shackling the CIO to the Roosevelt war machine, etc., etc. And on these alleged grounds the Cannonites declared that "...PROGRESSIVE TRADE UNIONISTS MUST SUPPORT LEWIS AGAINST THE

HILLMAN-STALINIST BLOC." * (The Militant, Sept. 6, 1941, p. 3. My capitals, A.B.) All these inventions of "progressive" functions for Lewis were very convenient for the Cannon leadership, but they required a good deal of "forgetting" of what the Trotskyites themselves had written about Lewis in connection with the above-cited instances.

During the previous period when the Trotskyites were talking against Lewis they had shown that Lewis through his agents had sold out the strike at the North American Aviation Plant (See The Militant, Aug. 30, 1941, p.4), that Lewis had sent his agents, Murray and Kennedy, into the National Defense Mediation Board and had participated directly in its anti-labor functions, (See the Fourth International, May 1941, p.104) and that Lewis had explicitly endorsed the Roosevelt war program. (See Socialist Appeal, June 15, 1940, p. 4) In a word, when the Trotskyites, as payment to Lewis for support against Tobin, switched to support of Lewis, they had to keep mum about all they had shown previously concerning Lewis' treacherous role. This unprincipled maneuver by Cannon and Company is typical of their whole activity in the trade union movement. For their clique interests, the Cannon leadership unhesitatingly spreads the most poisonous deceptions amongst the workers and attaches them to any reactionary, double-crossing swindler who happens to fit into any particular Cannonite maneuver.

When Lewis payed off by providing the Trotsky leaders with some statements protesting the F.B.I. and Tobin persecutions, the horse trade was completed. The Trotskyites paraded the Lewis statements to show that they had the support of an influential section of the "labor movement." In return, Lewis won Trotskyite support and thereby gained a new ally in his struggle against Hillman. That the Trotskyite leaders understood perfect-

*For a detailed discussion of this point see "The Cannonites and John L. Lewis" — THE BULLETIN, November 1941)

ly the deadly meaning of their calling for support to Lewis can be proved beyond the shadow of a doubt. The Trotskyite flip-flop of 1941 toward the Lewis camp had an anti-working class significance which can be best described by citing their own words from the year before when the future horsedeal with Lewis was not yet in view:

"To trust Lewis, to lean on Lewis, to expect anything from Lewis, in the coming period of war and social convulsion, would be to deliver the American workers into the hands of their enemies." (Socialist Appeal, July 6, 1940, p. 4)

We agree with these words one hundred per cent. We declared the same truths time and again before the workers and never went back on them. With Cannon and Co., however, truth occupies an entirely different position. When it serves his clique purposes, Cannon will even resort to uttering bits of truth, only to discard them unhesitatingly when his clique maneuvers require the use of outright lies.

The Cannonite flip-flop to Lewis has some amusing features also. An outstanding one is the Cannonite chiding of the Social Democrats when the latter were throwing their support to Lewis:

"Its case comes down to saying: if Hillman is no friend of industrial unionism, neither are Lewis and the Stalinists. In that case, logic would demand that the Call denounce both Lewis and Hillman and call upon the CIO workers to mobilize under a third banner in defense of industrial unionism. But these Norman Thomas Socialists know only one method in trade union 'politics': pick which one of the big shots you'll back." (Socialist Appeal, December 14, 1940, p. 2)

"Pick which one of the big shots you'll back" — a superb description of the trade union line of the Cannon leadership!

The Trotskyites and the Betrayal of
the Mine Strike in 1943

I N 1943 a severe crisis convulsed the coal fields which threatened to erupt into a strike of major proportions. Such a strike would have shaken up the authority of the strike-breaking War Labor Board and would have shattered the open no-strike agreement concluded between the labor fakers and the bosses' government which was and still is paralyzing the union workers and leaving them an easy prey to reaction. The conclusion of the mine crisis found the strike movement strangled by Lewis who prevented a real struggle by secret negotiations and truces with the bosses and their government agents. As a result of this betrayal the exploitation of the miners was intensified. The WLB decision for a stretch-out in hours was agreed to by Lewis in return for a trifling increase of a few cents an hour which didn't even remotely resemble the modest demands made at the beginning of the situation on March 10, 1943.

How did Lewis maneuver to achieve this betrayal? On March 10 Lewis officially opened negotiations with the coal-owners. The bosses rejected the demands without much ado in line with the strategy of passing the buck to the WLB which works in connivance with the capitalists. By the end of March it was becoming clear that the WLB and the operators whom it really represented would not accede to any demands really beneficial to the miners. To stave off a strike which would logically follow from such a situation, Lewis agreed to a "truce" behind the back of the miners and "extended negotiations" for thirty days. The incipient strike was thus beheaded by Lewis. When this strike-breaking agreement terminated, Roosevelt "took over the mines" and Lewis responded with another strike-breaking "truce," this time for fifteen days. The farce of "negotiation" continued but still no indication was given that any demands would be granted. At the expiration of these fifteen days, the question of strike again came to the fore and again Lewis responded with another strike-breaking "truce" for another

fifteen days. This run-around for the rank-and-file miners continued to June 1 when the May 15 "truce" ended. Now, for the first time the miners actually stayed out of work a few days although no strike call was issued by Lewis. The latter, by this time, was confronted with a growing rank-and-file rebellion against his policies. On June 5, with the aid of his lieutenants he met the new situation with yet another "truce" for another fifteen days. On June 20, when this "truce" expired the miners again faced the alternative of a fight-to-the-finish strike which they desired from the first. Meanwhile the revolt against strike-breaker Lewis began to assume large scale proportions, virtually all the miners walking out. Clearly, the game of "truces" was now washed up and Lewis had to terminate the situation quickly. He did so two days later, on June 22, with a return-to-work order. The original demands were thrown out, the conditions of work remained the same, and a four month period (to October 1943) for the definitive decision by the WLB was set by Lewis. We have already mentioned this decision above — a stretch-out in hours in return for a miserable hourly increase. The final upshot of this situation was that the authority of the bosses' WLB was upheld and strengthened as well as the open no-strike agreement.

Only the strike-breaking policies of Lewis made this stinging defeat of the miners possible. His repeated verbal blasts against the WLB during the course of the mine crisis were only face-saving tricks to give the miners the impression that he was putting up a struggle in their interests. When Lewis finally stifled the threatened struggle by dumping the matter into the lap of the WLB whose verdict he accepted in October 1943, he plainly showed that his "opposition" to the WLB was just a sham to fool the miners into accepting his leadership.

In this betrayal of the miners Lewis found many outside assistants. Lewis, remember, was the big-shot picked by Cannon in 1941. The Cannon leadership gave Lewis support and concealed his strike-breaking. In their game of

playing up Lewis, the Trotsky leaders could hardly find enough superlatives in praise of him. During the mine crisis they pictured his leadership as follows:

"Thanks to his aggressive and independent policies, Lewis has done much to rehabilitate his reputation!" (The Militant, May 15, 1943)

The double-crossing behavior of Lewis, with his cooked-up strike-breaking agreements, concluded with the capitalist representatives behind the back of the miners, met an enthusiastic response from the Cannon crew:

"By his masterly conduct of the miners' battle Lewis has won greater support from the miners than he has ever had during the past twenty years." (The Militant, May 22, 1943)

The Cannonites were not in the leadership of any miners' union, but just as surely as if they were, they helped to sell out the mine strike by their whitewash of Lewis' treachery.

The Shachtmanite Line on Lewis

IN August 1940 Shachtman separated organizationally from Cannon. Prior to this Shachtman had shared the leadership of the official Trotsky movement with Cannon and in this capacity supported and participated in all the maneuvers with the rotten Lewis machine. When Shachtman set out on his own as the leader of the Workers Party he continued the same trade union policies which he had followed in the Socialist Workers Party. During the course of the threatened mine struggle which Lewis strangled in 1943, Shachtman applied the same policy that Cannon was pursuing. He misled the workers under his influence with the story that Lewis' union was waging a correct struggle — not only in the interests of the miners, but for the entire American working class as well:

"Lewis is the leader of a union that is waging a battle for all labor — and waging it properly." (Labor Action, May 17, 1943, p. 4)

The truthful statement would have been: Lewis is the leader of a union who is selling his 500,000 miners down the river.

After the conclusion of the mine crisis the Shachtmanite support to Lewis continued. So far have the Shachtmanite leaders gone in distorting and concealing the role of John L. Lewis that they pretend that he did not behave as a Murray or Green would have in the mine strike situation of 1943 :

"The Roosevelt government attempted to break the UMWA because this union by its actions was upsetting the wage-freeze apple cart and in fact repudiating the no-strike pledge. Its leader, Lewis, unlike Murray, Green and Thomas, did not rush from mine to mine exhorting the men to return to work." (Labor Action, Oct. 2, 1944, original emphasis)

A more brazen distortion of the truth could not be imagined. The first time the miners walked out was on June 5, 1943 after months of "truces" and stalling by Lewis. This walkout was directed against Lewis and was so treated by him. Even the capitalist press reported this fact and showed that the Lewis henchmen were going from mine to mine in an endeavor to nip the incipient strike in the bud. Under the headline "Lewis Facing Crisis as Rebellious Men Return to Mines," the New York Post reported:

"With few exceptions, coal miners in this area went back to work today — but they returned reluctantly and only after UMW officials crushed a budding rank-and-file revolt.

"It was the most serious crisis faced by the United Mine Workers Union since the wage controversy started. John L. Lewis, himself, obviously concerned with the trend, was in constant communication by telephone with local officials, while members of the policy committee rushed from meeting to meeting, seeking to stem the rebellion." (June 7, 1943)

Thus, Lewis, contrary to the Shachtmanite fable did exhort the workers in mine after mine to return to work. Shachtman's myth constitutes just so much whitewash for the labor faker, Lewis.

During the mine crisis of 1943 we exposed Lewis' strike-breaking role, and tore the mask off his "Left" supporters. Readers have only to look back in the pages of THE BULLETIN to verify this in the written record, to compare the truthful picture we presented of Lewis scoll out with the lies and whitewash spread by the opportunists. (See "The Betrayal of the Miners," THE BULLETIN, September 1943)

Had the policy presented by our tendency on the mine strike been accepted by key sections of the workers, the story of that profoundly significant event would have been told in quite different terms, not a story of betrayal, but one of the ousting of the traitors and the victory of the miners. Unfortunately, even the workers who are relatively well advanced politically remained under the domination of opportunist frauds like Cannon and Shachtman and were made simply a tail to Lewis and his crimes. The possibility of proletarian victories in the trade union field, as in the political, hinges on the rejection of the opportunists by the leading sections of the working class and their re-unification on a Marxist line.

* * *

In the Fall of 1944 the Lewis ridden United Mine Workers Union held a convention. The Shachtmanite organ, Labor Action, goes to great lengths to picture in glowing, enthusiastic language the goings-on at these bureaucratically manipulated shindigs. The kind of garbage singled out for special praise is well illustrated in what Labor Action picked as the "high-light" of this 1944 convention.

"The highlight of the Convention was the exchange of telegrams between the Interior Department and the UMWA. We only have space for some of the best paragraphs from

these replies of the convention." (October 2, 1944, p. 2. My emphasis)

What were some of "the best paragraphs" which Labor Action saw fit to quote? In the first telegram by the Lewis bureaucrats, one excerpt reads as follows:

"You know, Mr. Secretary of the Interior, the coal miners are doing a job producing coal to win the war; they are buying bonds, too. We hope you will study the record on these facts. With nearly 300,000 less men employed in the anthracite and the bituminous industries, we will produce this year nearly 45,000,000 tons more than was produced in the war year of 1918." (Ibid.)

Thus, the Shachtman leaders chose to display the boasts of the Lewis crooks about the increased speed-up of the miners, their intensified exploitation, and played up the misguided miners' pro-capitalist illusions, nurtured by none other than the Lewis bureaucrats themselves.

From the other telegram the Shachtmanite leaders exhibit a piece of fraudulent demagoguery which all bureaucrats seek to instill among the naive and uninitiated — i.e., that they are not bureaucrats at all but loyal servitors of the rank-and-file:

"This convention is the supreme authority of the union. We are the employers of John L. Lewis and he is responsive to our orders." (Ibid.)

These excerpts, according to the Shachtmanites, represented only the best paragraphs. We can picture what was contained in the parts that were not quoted. And these "best paragraphs," according to the Shachtmanites, highlighted Lewis' convention!

One stumbling block which automatically confronts the Trotsky leaders in their line of hooking their followers to the Lewis gang is Lewis' open sup-

port to capitalism, a fact which must be explained away to the revolutionary workers following Shachtman. Ever since he set out on his "own" Shachtman has followed the original Social Democratic, Stalinist and Cannonite fraud that Lewis was a "progressive" on purely trade union questions but a hopeless reactionary on political questions. For example, Labor Action presents Lewis as a symbol of courage on the trade union question:

"In Lewis' case, you have a labor leader with great imagination and courage on purely trade union questions, who, despite that, is a hopeless reactionary politically."
(July 31, 1944, p. 4. Emphasis in original.)

The truth is that there is, of course, no Chinese Wall separating the political Lewis, who serves capitalism and the labor faker Lewis who serves the bosses in the trade union sphere. But the Shachtman leaders see a source of inspiration ("great imagination and courage") in Lewis' strike-breaking role in the unions, his open boasts about the increased speed-up (and therefore the intensified exploitation) of the miners, and his proud references to their bourgeois ideology.

What is all this talk about Lewis being "a labor leader with great imagination and courage on purely trade union questions"? This is sheer bunk and Shachtman knows it. Here is the real Lewis, as described by the Trotskyites themselves — a plain labor crook and thief:

"His career of 'industrial statesmanship' began many years ago as a petty official systematically looting the treasury of the Panama, Illinois local union. Through that he learned the first lessons in the shady art of buying henchmen. In the highest office of the union he made it into a system. He reinforced this with the methods of deliberate vote-stealing, frame-ups, and slugging of opponents." (The Militant, February 10, 1934, p. 1)

In explaining away the Lewis who

is "a hopeless reactionary politically" the Shachtmanites have introduced an innovation. It turns out, according to Labor Action, that Lewis is reactionary politically because of naivete, because he sincerely believes in the promises of the Republican Party!

"Lewis evidently believes what the Republican platform says about its opposition to the freezing of wages and its protestations on labor front trends of the Roosevelt government. This is certainly a very naive and we might say non-political manner for the leader of a great organization like the Miners Union to render or withhold political support to either of the two capitalist parties." (September 11, 1944, p. 2)

Shachtman knows perfectly well that Lewis made a big fortune out of his swindling of the trade union workers; that Lewis hobnobs with millionaire pals who implicitly trust him; that Lewis is the uniquely skillful organizer of the outstanding bureaucratic gangster machine in the trade union movement; that Lewis for decades has been one of the top personal advisers to the imperialist politicians on ways and means of swindling and exploiting the workers; that Lewis is looked upon by the imperialist masters as one of their chief tools in keeping the workers under the Wall Street heel. This master-mind of treachery is whitewashed by Shachtman as politically naive!

We recall how the Social Democrats praised the Lewis gang for its "good work" in the CIO, how the Stalinists praised Lewis' leadership which, they said, facilitated an "advance" of the American workers. Shachtman is even more enthusiastic than the rotten and criminal Social Democrats and Stalinists in his praise of Lewis' role during the formative period of the CIO.

"JOHN L. LEWIS DID FINE WORK FOR THE CIO." (Labor Action, Nov. 27, 1944, p. 2. My capitals - A. B.)

The strangling bureaucracy at the top, the open strike-breaking, the no less openly acknowledged class collab-

orationism of the CIO leadership— all this was what Lewis bequeathed to the workers in the CIO. "Fine work" indeed! Nothing could better expose the Shachtman role of screening the trade union agents of the bosses than this particular estimation of Lewis' "work."

The Outcome of the Opportunists'
Trade Unionism

THE trade unions, historically organs of defense of the workers, have been converted into a set of chains which render them helpless before the assaults of the class enemy. The mechanism of this transformation is the infiltration of a powerfully organized, corrupt, treacherous leadership whose loyalties are completely attached to Wall Street. The class collaborationist unions today are the chief strike-breaking device in America. It can be stated without any reservation that if it were not for the paralyzing influence of the class collaborationist leadership of the unions, the United States would have been swept in the last couple of years with an all-embracing wave of militant strikes. The question of leadership is paramount. Many perfectly honest workers have a tendency to regard the unions with a strongly romantic view. "They are organizations of workers!" This fact is the all-in-all in this limited view of the unions. History proves that it is precisely organizations of workers which have perpetrated the greatest crimes against the toilers. It is only necessary to cite the Stalinist parties, the Social Democratic parties and other opportunist organizations whose ranks are predominantly from the wage working class. In all cases, the leaders engineered the crimes; the working class rank-and-file were the victims.

In light of this fundamental historical fact, the enormity of the Cannon-Shachtman type of opportunism in the trade union question stands out all the more sharply. Cannon-Shachtman's trade union tactic is nothing more than fishing for a hand-out from some of the big shots. This tactic is concretized in light of the momentary exigencies of the situation. In 1938, for a while, it looked as if a piece

of pie might be forthcoming from Homer Martin. The latter is practically a symbol for the most crass and flagrant careerism, happened to be engaged in a gang fight with the Stalinists. This was an opening for Cannon-Shachtman to do a little bootlicking. Hence they promptly began to yell for support to Martin. This was their "intervention" in that situation. Unfortunately for Cannon-Shachtman, Martin bungled the affair and was eventually wiped out of the union movement entirely. Cannon-Shachtman were left with their eager paws outstretched — and empty. "Dutifully," they engaged in "Bolshevik self-criticism" and declared that Martin was after all a good-for-nothing dog who was incapable of really waging a principled fight. On other occasions the self-styled "Bolshevik-Leninists" were luckier in their maneuvers. Thus in the New York Food Workers union at the end of 1940 they formed a bloc with the Stalinist bureaucrats. In return for this support which put the Stalinists back into power in that union, the bigger bureaucrats threw Cannon a bone in the form of a few minor posts. For their cringing before Lewis, Cannon and Company received some CIO endorsements in the clique fight with Tobin. And so on down the line. Trade union work is a business with these opportunists. One makes an "investment" and one expects "returns." The shoddy commodity known as Trotskyite trade union work is sold to the rank-and-file all wrapped up in bright red tissue in the form of long winded theses and resolutions on The Tasks of the Trade Unions, Our Platform in the Auto Workers Union, What Next for the American Trade Unions, etc., etc. When workers who do not know the poisonous reality back of these pretentious harangues read them, they imagine Cannon-Shachtman are literally running themselves ragged trying to instill new life into the trade unions and break them from their present bondage. All the trade union fakers employ the same tricks. As a matter of fact, Cannon-Shachtman learned their act in the Stalinist Party and that today, more than sixteen years after they went into business for themselves, they still engage in the same antics, only proves how well they learned their lessons in

Such a brand of trade unionism can only have deadly results for the workers. The entire direction of the trade unions must be torn from the claws of these swindlers to whom the unions are nothing but a source of careers, prestige and power. In our fight for this aim, which is and can only be a revolutionary aim, our line has been clear and consistent. We have exposed the perversion of trade unionism into a policy of horse deals and, to the extent of our influence, have brought to the attention of the workers the crimes being committed against them through the medium of the unions. Our fight is to transform the unions to their original state, organs of protection of the workers, but with a Marxist understanding in the place of the utopian notions of the old founders. As long as the unions remain in the hands of the present leaders, they can be only organs of sell-out. This is the crux of the entire problem. The pseudo-Marxists of the Cannon-Shachtman stripe play a special role in frustrating the struggle to cleanse the unions of their corrupt leadership. Cannon-Shachtman have direct influence over workers who already realize that the present union leadership is hopelessly rotten and must be ousted. This is the reason why Cannon-Shachtman are compelled from time to time to issue remarks against people like Lewis, Green, Martin and their ilk. The anti-union fakor noise by Cannon-Shachtman is sheer damagogy, for their basic line is to use their followers as a pawn in the game of angling for posts from the real big powers in the unions. That in the course of this job-hunting scramble Cannon-Shachtman have to condone and white-wash an epoch-making sell-out such as that of the mine strike of 1943 is only an "incident" to these careerists, but a matter of the greatest and most vital concern to every honest worker. These "incidents" have put the toilers in their present terrible situation. Without these "incidents" perpetrated by the opportunist leaders, the capitalist class would be almost powerless to continue its oppression, for under a Marxist leadership the enormous and powerful proletariat could crush the bourgeoisie with ease. The capitalists look so strong only because the

We have been speaking as if the trade union sphere were an entity in itself not connected with the other phases of life in class society. In reality, the trade union line of any organization is organically linked to its political line; indeed, it is only an expression of politics. Examine an organization's political line and you will know in advance the nature of its trade union policy. Understand its trade union line and you will know its brand of politics. The Trotskyites' trade union line is the mirror image of their fundamental political position. In the political sphere the Cannon-Shachtman leadership has a long record of foisting on the workers an opportunist line of support to the Stalinist Party, to the Social Democratic Party and to the trade union careerists dressed up in political clothes labelled "Labor Party." It goes without saying that this support is rationalized with "criticism," with "oppositional" gestures and the like, all designed to make the opportunist maneuvers palatable to the relatively advanced rank-and-file.

The outcome of the trade union policy of the opportunists is necessarily manifested in the political aspects of the class struggle. Just as there is no such thing as "pure and simple trade unionism," so the effects of any line in the trade unions are not purely and simply economic. The fundamental effects are political. Lewis, to take an outstanding example, is only in appearance an economic agent of Wall Street imperialism. Basically, he and his kind are political agents functioning in the so-called economic sphere. Lewis' sell-outs in the "pure and simple trade union struggles" result in tying the workers to capitalism as a social system. His crooked machinations in the trade unions are an aspect of political counter-revolution. It is to the latter that Cannon-Shachtman chain the workers with their trade union tactics and it is in this fundamental light that the Trotskyite leaders' trade union policies must be understood.

Arthur Burko
February 9, 1945

SOME LIGHT
ON A
CROOKED DEAL

Know them by the blocs they make is the translation into political terms of an old and familiar proverb. A highly revealing episode in the career of Trotsky's so-called "Opposition" in the Soviet Union was his bloc with Zinoviev and Kamenev in the years 1926-27. This incident is especially interesting in light of the fact that Zinoviev and Kamenev were originally clique partners of Stalin. Zinoviev and Kamenev (with Stalin at first in the background) were, moreover, the authors of the faction fight opened in the Autumn of 1923 to oust Trotsky from power and so initiate a bureaucratic centralization process to their own advantage. This pair of eminent bureaucrats was profoundly involved in the degeneration of the Bolshevik leadership.

How did it happen that at a certain stage they entered into a bloc with Trotsky against whom for three years they had been waging a bitter clique fight? The Trotsky leaders have given an explanation of this startling about-face in rather simple terms. Shachtman in an old pamphlet on the history of the Trotsky faction puts it this way:

"The first two years of struggle of the Opposition finally bore fruit in the revolt of the revolutionary Leningrad proletariat in 1925, which compelled its leaders—men like Zinoviev who had fathered the campaign against 'Trotskyism'—to combine in a bloc with the 1923 Opposition." (Ten Years, The History of the Left Opposition, p. 54)

Shachtman, of course, is only repeating the official explanation issued by Trotsky himself. A later example of this explanation was given by Trotsky before the Dewey Commission:

"They were under the pressure of

workers, of the best workers we had —of Petrograd and Moscow—the most developed and most educated workers. Stalin's support was in the provinces, the bureaucracy in the provinces. At first they did not themselves understand — that is, Zinoviev and Kamenev, as others also — why the split came. But it was the pressure of the workers of both capitals. The pressure of the workers pushed Zinoviev and Kamenev into contradictions with Stalin. (The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 81)

As we see, according to the official story of the Trotsky leaders, the pressure of the workers who followed Zinoviev and Kamenev caused these clique partners of Stalin to turn about 180 degrees and unite with Trotsky and his "Opposition."

If this is all that one knows about the matter, it sounds quite plausible. In contrast to this official version, however, Trotsky on other occasions was constrained to paint quite a different picture of this incident.

According to this other version, the workingclass followers of Zinoviev and Kamenev had exerted no pressure whatever, and what is more, they were strenuously opposed to any bloc with Trotsky. For three years, Zinoviev and Kamenev had been poisoning their followers against Trotsky, so that when the bloc with him was broached from the top, even Zinoviev's petty henchmen were absolutely flabbergasted, at a loss to comprehend, and harshly against it. Trotsky in a letter of November 1927 testifies that Zinoviev himself told him how hard it was to convince his followers to agree to the bloc with Trotsky. In order to facilitate this bloc, Zinoviev had "admitted" that he had been wrong in attacking Trotsky. Here is what happen-

ed:

"In this manner, Zinoviev admitted his mistake of 1923 (in waging a struggle against 'Trotskyism' and even characterized it as much more dangerous than that of 1917 (when he opposed the October insurrection!)).

"This admission on the part of Zinoviev aroused considerable astonishment among many second-rank leaders of the Leningrad Opposition who were not initiated into the conspiracy and who honestly believed in the legend of 'Trotskyism.'

"Zinoviev told me repeatedly: 'In Leningrad we hammered it into the minds of the comrades more deeply than anywhere else and it is, therefore, most difficult to reeducate them.'" (L. Trotsky, The Stalin School of Falsification, p. 91)

So far were Zinoviev's followers from exerting pressure on him that it was a tough job to "reeducate" them to the idea of joining up with Trotsky!

In fact, Zinoviev's proposal for a bloc with Trotsky actually put the former in danger of losing his supporters. Trotsky himself is the witness testifying to this effect:

"On the other hand, the advanced Petrograd workers, followers of Zinoviev, who had engaged honestly and seriously in the struggle against 'Trotskyism' could by no means reconcile themselves to the sudden turn of 180 degrees. Zinoviev was confronted with the danger of losing the best elements of his own faction." (The New International, February 1938, p. 57)

What is the meaning of these sharply contradictory stories and what is the real reason for the bloc formed by Zinoviev-Kamenev with Trotsky? The story of the "pressure of the workers" is sheer hokum. History records no such pressure on Zinoviev and Kamenev and what is more, even Trotsky himself gives the lie to this yarn. On other occasions, Trotsky let slip still another version which not only explodes

the myth about the "pressure of the workers," but points to the real reasons for Zinoviev-Kamenev's move for a bloc with Trotsky. Stalin had accumulated enormous power and his partners, Zinoviev-Kamenev, saw that they were about to be elbowed out. They therefore cast about for some maneuver to recoup their lost bureaucratic fortunes. A bloc with Trotsky, in 1926 still a big figure before the Soviet masses, seemed a shrewd trick to Zinoviev and Kamenev. The latter pair imagined that by pooling their stocks with Trotsky's they would be able to counterbalance Stalin's mounting power. Trotsky many years after the event related this real source of the bloc of 1926-27:

"They came over to the Opposition, hoping to gain power in a short lapse of time. Toward this end they joined with the 1923 Opposition." (The New International, Nov. 1934, p. 109)

In other words, the whole thing was a factional maneuver at the top. Small wonder that the workers at bottom, completely in the dark at what was going on in the leading circles, were actually shocked by the Zinoviev-Kamenev bloc with Trotsky.

There is one more point, a particularly choice one, connected with this episode which is worth relating. For sheerly factional reasons, as a trick to decrease Trotsky's power and prestige, Zinoviev and Kamenev in 1923 had launched an attack on Trotsky's theory of the Permanent Revolution, originally formulated many years earlier in the pre-1917 period. Zinoviev and Kamenev took advantage of the fact that Lenin prior to 1917 had mistakenly attacked Trotsky's theory. We emphasize the word mistakenly to differentiate Lenin's pre-1917 attack which was the result of an honest error, from Zinoviev and Kamenev's 1923 attack which was a deliberate, criminal clique maneuver to demolish Trotsky as a figure in the Soviet Union. Lenin's old anti-Trotsky remarks were exhumed and constantly paraded before the workers by Zinoviev, Kamenev and Stalin after 1923, and the fact that in 1917 Lenin

had adopted Trotsky's theory in practice was concealed. The result was that when Zinoviev-Kamenev in 1926 proposed the bloc with Trotsky, their followers raised a protest: What about Trotsky's theory of Permanent Revolution? For quite a while Zinoviev and Kamenev have been shouting that this is a Menshevik theory and now they want to form a bloc with Trotsky!

Zinoviev and Kamenev had to worm their way out of this embarrassing situation. The scheme they hit upon was really simple, like so many great crimes. They "merely" got Trotsky to repudiate his theory of the Permanent Revolution! By declaring publicly that in the past controversies over this theory Lenin—who had actually been wrong—was right, and Trotsky—who had actually been right—was wrong, Trotsky officially washed his hands of this great Marxist principle. His declaration to this effect was even written into the Platform of the Opposition, the "theoretical" vehicle of the Zinoviev-Kamenev-Trotsky bloc:

"Trotsky has stated to the International that in all those questions of principle upon which he disputed with Lenin, Lenin was right — and particularly upon the question of the permanent revolution and the

peasantry." (See The Real Situation in Russia, p. 180)

That this was nothing but a maneuver to cover Zinoviev's treacherous tracks also can be proved directly by Trotsky's own words:

"With my acknowledgement of Lenin's correctness, Zinoviev sought, if only partially, to throw a veil over the previous criminal 'ideological' work of his own faction against me." (L. Trotsky, The New International, February 1939, p. 57)

In such a shameful way was a fundamental Marxist position traded over the counter in the formation of the Zinoviev-Kamenev-Trotsky bloc.

We have reached the real essence of Trotsky's bloc with Zinoviev and Kamenev, a clique maneuver absolutely devoid of principle. We have come a long way in these few pages from the official Trotskyite fable about the "pressure of the workers" with which this article begins. But we close with the political proverb with which we started: Know them by the blocs they make.

J.C.H.
March 1945

Compiled
The Trotsky School of
Falsification

TROTSKY "TEACHES" PARTY DISCIPLINE
TROTSKY'S "ADVICE" TO THE RUSSIAN WORKERS
THE POLITICAL NATURE OF THE TROTSKY-ZINOVIEV BLOC
THE MOTIVES OF ZINOVIEV AND KAMENEV
THE POLITICAL MORALS OF THE TROTSKYITE LEADERS
* * * * *

PAGES FROM TROTSKY'S POLITICAL HISTORY

DID TROTSKY COLLABORATE WITH STALIN
(A Reply to J. R. Johnson of the Workers Party)
THE CANNONITES "ANSWER" THE SHACHTMANITES

SEND FOR FREE COPIES

ADDRESS: P.O. 67, Station D