

# **T H E BULLETIN**

**OF THE WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY**

**WHO PUT TITO IN POWER** —ARTHUR BURKE

**The Small Nations Smoke Screen**  
—THOMAS F. HARDEN

**THE WALLACE ACT**  
—GEORGE MARLEN

**THE ISSUE OF PALESTINE** —A. JAMES

---

**THE WORK OF CANNON AND SHACHTMAN  
IN THE TRADE UNIONS — PART VI  
A HORSE DEAL WITH JOHN L. LEWIS**

---

**Documents From The Archives Of Trotskyism**

**THE DECLARATION OF OCTOBER 16, 1926**

**THE RED STAR PRESS**

**P. O. BOX 67**

**STATION D**

**NEW YORK**

THE BULLETIN

of the

WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

---

Vol. IX - No. 5. (Whole Number 48)

Nov. - Dec. 1946.

---

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

	<u>PAGE</u>
Who Put Tito in Power?	1
-- Arthur Burke	
Why the War Talk	6
--- A.B.	
The Small Nations Smoke Screen	12
--- Thomas F. Harden	
The Wallace Act	18
--- George Marlen	
The Issue of Palestine	22
--- A. James	
*****	
THE WORK OF CANNON AND SHACHTMAN IN THE TRADE UNIONS: Part VI.: A Horse-Deal With John L. Lewis	25
--- A.B.	
Goldman on Shachtman And Shachtman on Goldman	32
--- A.B.	
*****	
DOCUMENTS FROM THE ARCHIVES OF TROTSKYISM: The Declaration Of October 16, 1946.	35

---

Address Communications to:

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

## THE BULLETIN AND ITS PURPOSE

THE BULLETIN of the WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY is devoted to crystallizing the programmatic foundation for a new revolutionary proletarian party in America and a new international. On the basis of the lessons of the October Revolution, of a struggle against the betrayals resulting from the bureaucratic degeneration of the Comintern, against the workings of Social-Democracy, as well as against the policies of imperialism in the present epoch, THE BULLETIN presents a system of ideas for the fight against capitalism.

The immediate aim of the WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY is to arm the revolutionary workers with an understanding of the pseudo-revolutionary organizations now controlling the proletarian vanguard and to organize these workers into a new party.

The role of Stalinism as the chief betrayer within the ranks of the proletariat and of the Trotsky tendency as a loyal "opposition" and main prop of Stalinism among the revolutionary anti-Stalinist workers has been established in THE BULLETIN with documentary evidence. THE BULLETIN contains the only scientific exposure of the so-called "ultra-left" tendencies which spread the confusion that the Stalinist bureaucratic apparatus controlling the State issuing out of a proletarian revolution, is a new class.

To rally the proletarian vanguard around the program based on the best traditions of Marx, Engels and Lenin for the struggle to liberate the toiling masses from every form of oppression - this is the purpose for which THE BULLETIN has fought from its formation and which differentiates it from all other publications.

---

### A N N O U N C E M E N T   O F

### O P E N   F O R U M S

---

THE WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY is conducting a series of open forums on the vital problems confronting the workers today. At each Forum there is full, free discussion and exchange of views from the floor.

Topics include the roots of the bureaucratic degeneration of the October Revolution, the development of Stalinism and the role of Trotsky, and also problems and positions on current issues.

Time: Wednesday Evenings at 8:00 P.M.

Place: 108 East 14th St.  
New York City  
Room 301.

---

HAVE YOU SEEN OUR NEW PUBLICATION

"POLITICAL CORRESPONDENCE"

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* WHO HELPED TITO TO POWER? \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

In the relationship between Stalin's puppet, Tito, and the American and British imperialists there has been a distinct pattern since the ending of the military situation in Europe in May 1945. This pattern consists of a series of crises each succeeded by a brief breathing spell and then followed by a now and even more intense crisis. The more recent events in this pattern were as follows.

On July 12, 1946 a clash occurred between Yugoslav and American patrols in the disputed Venezia Giulia area. On July 16, 1946 an American jeep was reported ambushed by Tito's forces. This was followed by further "incidents" accompanied by sharp diplomatic exchanges between the British and American imperialists and Tito. On August 9, 1946 it was reported that an unarmed American transport plane over Yugoslav territory had been forced to land by Yugoslav planes using tracer bullets. Then on August 19, 1946 came the climactic report that a second unarmed American plane had been shot down by Yugoslav planes and that all occupants of the American plane were killed. Screaming headlines in the American capitalist press brought these events to the attention of the masses. A regular campaign was organized around these incidents strengthening the developing war atmosphere in the United States.

On August 21, 1946 the American statesmen capped the diplomatic war by issuing an ultimatum to Tito. The New York Times drew the following picture of the situation:

"Less than a year after the formal end of the greatest war in history, the world has been shocked to find itself in the midst of another crisis of dangerous potentialities. Once again, as in 1914 and 1939, the dreaded word 'ultimatum' leaped out at one from the banner headlines of the press, striking fear in men's hearts everywhere, and especially in Europe, which is still writhing under the consequences of the last war. But this time, the ultimatum was issued by the United States, and by a curious irony of fate it was directed against some of the very same forces which helped to stage both the first and second World Wars-- Serbian provocations and Russian ambitions of expansion." (Aug. 23, 1946. Editorial)

Stalin's stooge, Tito, countered the American offensive with a diplomatic barrage of his own, detailing a whole number of unauthorized flights of American planes over Yugoslav territory and of his protests which had been ignored. In addition, Stalin's henchman pointed out that from August 19, on which day the second American plane had been shot down, these American flights were continuing as if begging for "incidents.":

"Requesting the United States to take urgent measures to prevent further infringements, the note charged that since Aug. 19, when five Americans were shot down and killed by Yugoslav fighters, eleven United States bombers, fourteen fighter planes and seven transports had flown over Yugoslav territory." (New York Times, Sept. 4, 1946)

The American bourgeoisie countered by disputing the specific figures

but did admit that violations had indisputably occurred:

"American authorities have admitted some violations because of weather conditions." (New York Times, Aug. 25, 1946)

The crisis was temporarily allayed when Tito agreed to pay some indemnities, to prohibit any further shooting down of American planes while the American imperialists promised to take precautions to keep clear of Yugoslav territory in the Austria-Italy air route. The flimsy basis of the temporary easing of the crisis can be seen from the following headline which was duplicated in the bourgeois press:

"ARMED U.S. TRANSPORTS FLY THE AUSTRIA-TO-ITALY ROUTE." (New York Times, Aug. 27, 1946. My emphasis-A.B.)

While nothing further has been heard on this point at the present writing the diplomatic war continues with "incidents" in Trieste and in diplomatic clashes at the Paris "Peace" Conference.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

One can expect that the tense situation between Yugoslavia and the imperialists will continue to develop. Let us, then, examine how the whole situation was prepared. Only this knowledge can form the scientific groundwork for an exposure and struggle against the imperialist camp on one hand and the Stalin camp on the other.

In 1943 when it became evident to the imperialists that the Nazi Army had failed in its effort to defeat the Soviet Union, the British and American imperialists effected a significant reorientation in strategy for the reorganization of Europe. This occurred while Stalin's Army was still engaged with the Nazi forces deep inside the Soviet Union. It was revealed in the press from sources in the Office of Strategic Services that a plan for an "Allied" landing in the Balkans in 1943 was discarded by the British-American rulers. This was substantiated by the Mikhailovitch trial at which a British officer testified that an "Allied" landing had been planned for the coast of Dalmatia in 1943 but then was dropped. From the original idea of getting into the Balkans ahead of Stalin, the imperialists made a 180 degree turn and adopted an opposite policy. In consequence, at the Teheran conference, Roosevelt and Churchill arranged for a switch in allegiance from Mikhailovitch to support of Stalin's hegemony through Tito in Yugoslavia:

"The Teheran conference in November, 1943, gave Russia a western frontier as deep into Europe as it owned at its imperial zenith. It acknowledged Russian aspirations in regard to Finland and the Balkan states, conceded Bessarabia and recognized Russian spheres of influence in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria." (Colliers June 22, 1946 p.13)

Coinciding with this was the formation by Tito of a Provisional Government. C.L. Sulzberger, a New York Times correspondent, cabled from Cairo on Dec. 24, 1943 that the agreement at Teheran involved a British-American switch to Tito and that this was behind the sudden formation of a government by Tito. Louis Adamic, writing in PM on Dec. 12, 1943 stated that the formation of Tito's government was approved beforehand by Churchill and Stalin. These revelations were soon

vindicated by concrete developments. A conscious policy was developed by the British and American rulers to build up Tito:

"By late 1943 and early 1944 it was Tito who began to get the help."  
(PM, June 18, 1946.)

The specific figures on American lend-lease confirms this as the imperialist policy in that period:

"Most of the \$32,000,000 in American lend-lease aid sent to Yugoslavia went to Tito's forces." (New York Times, Aug. 25, 1946.)

Tito was given an official standing by the imperialist rulers even though Stalin's troops were still far from the borders of Yugoslavia. Under the personal supervision of Churchill, conferences were held with Tito which gave him hegemony over Yugoslavia and thus helped draw that country into Stalin's orbit:

"Plans for much closer coordination of military operations by Allied forces in Italy and the National Army of Liberation in Yugoslavia were worked out at the recent conferences of Prime Minister Churchill, Gen. Sir Henry Maitland Wilson and himself, Marshal Tito said today."  
(New York Times, Aug. 25, 1944)

Where the imperialists chose to keep Stalin out, they did as in Greece, although Stalin had a huge, well-organized supporting force inside the country and Russian troops stationed at the Greek frontier. In light of the facts there is only one inescapable conclusion- that the imperialist schemers wanted Tito (Stalin) in control of Yugoslavia and wanted Stalin in control of the rest of Eastern Europe, except Greece.

The official Stalin story is that Stalin legitimately won his way into all these territories by virtue of his military victories against the Nazi forces. A variation of this idea is the yarn that the imperialist-Stalin agreements recognizing Yugoslavia and other territories as Stalin's sphere was only a recognition of the inevitable. There was nothing else the imperialists could do, goes this tale, and so they made the best of an unhappy situation. This variation of the Stalinist propaganda is refuted in the case of Greece where Stalin's troops were on the scene fully a month before the imperialist forces.

It is clear that Stalin's forces entered only where the door was opened to them by the imperialist schemers, such as the Balkans, minus Greece, Manchuria, North Korea, Sakhalin, and the Kuriles Islands. The imperialists had a deliberate policy of agreeing that Stalin occupy these territories. During the war period when Stalin was being played up as a great hero by the democratic imperialists the capitalist spokesmen pretended to favor Stalin's territorial expansion. During a Stalin-Churchill conference in Moscow the capitalist press pointed out the imperialist policy:

"The fact is that the British have reached a point where they are willing to see Rumania, Bulgaria and even Hungary and Yugoslavia brought within the Russian security system along with Czechoslovakia and Poland. They take at its face value Russian Foreign Commissar Vyachesloff M. Molotoff's assurance to Rumania last June that the Russians had no desire to communize the country, and they sympathize with Russia's desire to cushion her own frontier." (New York Times, Oct. 15, 1944.)

By the Fall of 1944 the imperialists knew well that the Nazi force was on the verge of elimination, Germany would be demilitarized and occupied. Yet they pretended to be sympathetic to Stalin's desire to cushion his frontier. Against whom was it necessary to "cushion" Russia's frontier? With the defeat of the Nazi Army the only military forces which could offer a threat to Stalin were the British and American imperialists. The hypocrisy of the excuse which the imperialists used to justify their policy in this period is quite obvious.

There are other related features involved. The cunning imperialist leaders were not so naive as to "take at its face value" Molotov's assurances and pledges regarding the Stalin line in the occupied territories. They knew full well what would happen. Once Stalin got a foothold in these territories he would work to integrate them in his bureaucratic system. This could not have been otherwise.

In agreeing to Stalin's occupations with the intent of bringing those territories within his system, the imperialists laid the foundation for a reversal in their propaganda line. After the Nazi defeat in Russia the American-British imperialists thus put into effect their strategy for building up a basis for a new attack on the Soviet Union. The Anglo-American imperialists could not proceed as the Nazi leaders did by the simple medium of tearing up a pact with Stalin and ordering their armies to march. The British-American imperialists need a suitable ideological atmosphere and this could be achieved only by a transformation in the ideology of the masses in the bourgeois democratic countries toward the Soviet Union. Stalin's reputation as a fighter against aggression which resulted from the defeat of the Nazis had to be shattered and the idea of Stalin himself being a new Hitler threatening the peace of the world had to be inculcated. Had Stalin remained within the old borders of the Soviet Union this transformation in ideology would have been impossible due to the total lack of a logical basis for such a propaganda campaign.

When the Nazi regime began to expand territorially, only then did the feeling mount among the masses for a war against Nazi Germany. It was the expansion of territory which gave the alarm that the Naz rulers were a threat to peace. Similarly, the issue of "Communism" in Russia for years has been established in the minds of the masses as being a purely internal Russian matter. The imperialists would not have been able to start any crusade for the purpose of "straightening out" internal Russian affairs. But it was a different story when Stalin entered into the Balkans, North Korea, etc. and put up an "iron curtain", suppressing the masses in the accustomed Stalin manner. The democratic imperialists knew of Stalin's rapacious and greedy appetite (partition of Poland with Hitler, war with Finland, occupation of the Baltic states, 1939-1940, occupation of Bessarabia) and utilized this in their strategy. Stalin's occupations of vast territories in Europe and in Asia gives substance to the propaganda about his greedy appetite for expansion and his trampling on the rights of "small nations". The pledges which Stalin made covering his occupation of these territories and his violation of those pledges lends authenticity to the idea that in this respect, too, Stalin is another Hitler. It was the imperialist-Stalin deals during 1943-1945 therefore which brought Stalin a tremendous expansion of territory and prepared the basis of the present ideological campaign to build up a war atmosphere, making both Stalin and the imperialists equally guilty for bringing about the present danger of a mass

slaughter to the world proletariat.

All sordid machinations of the stripe outlined above are made palatable by political supporters with all sorts of ideological trimmings. In Yugoslavia an essential element of the Tito-led Partisan move to gain power was propaganda for unity with the Stalin-ruled Soviet Union cloaked with the demagogic cover that such a move would bring about a Free Balkan Federation. Of course, the leaders of the Trotsky tendency know very well that any talk of a "Free Federation" under Stalinist leadership is a reactionary snare and that any dealings with the Stalinist bureaucracy involves annihilation of the revolutionary masses. Yet the Trotsky leaders palmed off this reactionary Tito propaganda as "profoundly progressive" and thus gave direct support to Stalinism:

"The idea of a Free Federation of the Balkan peoples and unity with the Soviet Union which permeates the Partisan ranks is profoundly progressive." (The Militant, Jan. 1, 1944. Original Emphasis.)

Thus the Trotsky leaders added their mite to put across this vicious Stalinist fraud and it was this fraud which helped boost Tito into power.

Arthur. Burke  
Oct. 1, 1946

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

EDITORIAL NOTE:

After a prolonged discussion on the international situation, the majority of the WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY adopted the main tenets of the position expressed in the "Thesis on the International Situation" published in the June-July 1946 issue of THE BULLETIN, and "The Truth Behind the European Peace Crisis" published in the Sept.-Oct. issue. The columns of THE BULLETIN are open to further discussion articles on the international situation.

— INTRODUCING A NEW PUBLICATION —

POLITICAL CORRESPONDENCE

of the WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

First Issue -- October 1946 -- Now Available --

POLITICAL CORRESPONDENCE contains discussion articles on important issues, polemics on our position both pro and con, and letters of political interest from groups abroad and in the United States.

Subscribe To: ..... THE BULLETIN  
..... POLITICAL CORRESPONDENCE

SPECIAL OFFER \*\* One Dollar (\$1.00) per year FOR BOTH

Address communications to: Red Star Press  
P.O. Box 67 Station D  
New York, N.Y.



WHY THE WAR TALK ?

Imperialist plans for war are always concealed from the masses with sugary assurances of pacific intentions. Military preparations are palmed off by the capitalist spokesmen as pure "defensive" measures to serve presumably as protection from aggression.

In a series of secret deals from 1943 to 1945, from Teheran to Yalta, the imperialists agreed to have Stalin occupy enormous territories in Eastern Europe and Asia. Stalin entered into these deals for his own bureaucratic purposes: aggrandisement and expansion of his power. The imperialists, on their part, entered into these agreements with the express aim of utilizing the reactionary bureaucratic aspects of Stalin's regime for their own ends and thus laid down the basis for the present propaganda line of the "iron curtain" and other features which are being used to incite the masses in the bourgeois democratic countries against the Soviet Union. This basis was prepared by the maneuvers of both Stalin and the imperialist rulers.

The deliberate preparation for war is being concealed from the masses by a steady repetition that a war led by the American and British rulers on the one hand and Stalin on the other is "unthinkable" and thus excluded as an inevitable outcome of the present world development. Every conceivable argument is wheeled out by the bourgeois writers to put the masses to sleep. The purpose is to leave the imperialist leaders a free hand in hatching what promises to be the most terrible blood bath in history.

Despite this general propaganda line there is occasionally an admission of the truth. In this connection, a leading correspondent of The New York Times, James Reston, has come out with a most significant statement. He acknowledged bluntly that a war psychology is being developed in the United States. Lest this cause any alarm the writer attempts to negate the real meaning of his facts by a pretense that the status of American military preparations belie the significance of the developing war atmosphere:

"The most striking fact in the capital today is that war-talk is increasing while America's ability to wage war is decreasing. And the corollary of this fact is that a war psychology is developing before the peace treaties have been signed and before President Truman and Premier Stalin have ever had a single exhaustive talk about the fundamental problems that divide the United States and the Soviet Union." ( Sept. 2, 1946)

The fact about the building of a war psychology among the American masses is most obvious. But what about the supposed anomaly of American ability to wage war decreasing at the same time that war talk is increasing? It is necessary to marshal a few facts against this assertion of demilitarization and the fraud immediately becomes apparent. The policy of American imperialism is to strengthen and increase its ability to wage war as indicated by some facts.

The major portion of the American budget is devoted to military

expenditures. In an article entitled "Military Policy of U.S." Hanson Baldwin, the military analyst of The New York Times, showed the American policy aimed at "air forces second to none, a Navy larger by far than any other in the world" and the establishment of far-flung military bases in the Atlantic and Pacific. (Aug. 28, 1946)

And what, it may be asked, is the purpose behind this gigantic military program? A broad hint is contained in a report concerning a proposal for an immense United States base in the Aleutian Islands:

"Because of Russia's increasingly tough attitude during the past few months, American bases in the Aleutians have become more important. In the next few years the naval base at Adak may rival that of Pearl Harbor, now probably the largest base in the world." (N.Y. Times, Sept. 5, 1946. My emphasis-A.B.)

The United States Army has formed a "Task Force Frigid" with top priority rating to test the effect of Arctic cold on American soldiers and on every type of ground force equipment. It doesn't require too much vision to see what the American rulers have in mind. An article in the capitalist press which reported on this "Task Force Frigid" stated as a matter of course:

"Of the large armies of the world the Soviet Army is by far the most experienced in cold-weather operations, according to Army sources here. They point out that central Alaska is in the same general latitude as the Russo-Finnish front, where the Soviet Army gained several years of experience in Arctic warfare." (N.Y. Times, Sept. 26, 1946)

On Sept. 30, 1946 Secretary of the U.S. Navy, Forrestal, declared publicly that the U.S. Naval forces "were in the Mediterranean and eastern Atlantic to support American foreign policy and that they would remain there." (N.Y. Times, Oct. 1, 1946) There is hardly any secret as to why American foreign policy necessitates keeping the U.S. Navy in Europe:

"Mr. Forrestal's statement was viewed as timely and significant because of the new wrangles over the Dardanelles, Trieste and the Greek situation. In each of these disputes the United States has taken a view opposing that of the Soviet Union." (Ibid. My emphasis- A.B.)

The official American policy has been established before the masses as "Get Tough With Russia."

Five members of the Military Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives made a six-week inspection trip in the Far East and "said they are convinced of the urgency of building up a strong ring of defenses, reaching within striking distance of Russia." (Chicago Herald American, Sept. 19, 1946. My emphasis- A.B.)

The senior member of the Committee, Rep. Short, quoted an enigmatic statement from an American admiral in Tokyo that the Japanese will be wearing American uniforms in the next war. Short explained the meaning as follows:

"We might as well be frank about it- we want war with Russia", Short added." (Chicago Tribune, Sept. 17, 1946)

There are other facts worth noting to disprove alleged imperialist disarmament. These facts can be culled from the capitalist press itself.

For example, we learn that "U.S. TAKING START ON WAR STOCKPILE." (N.Y. Times Aug. 11, 1946) It has also been reported that "ARMY WOULD SAVE ORDNANCE PLANTS." (N.Y. Times, Aug. 30, 1946) The avowed purpose for this latter move is to "keep a 'safe' proportion of the American munitions industry on an operating or stand-by basis." (Ibid.) In addition to all this are the reports about round the clock production of atomic weapons and continued experimentation with newer and more infernal methods of destruction.

To make the true picture complete one has but to combine this factual information with the admission that a war atmosphere is developing. The conclusion is that the American capitalist rulers are consciously preparing for war in the present period.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

Prior to the Nazi attack on the Soviet Union Stalin kept the masses blindfolded on the true relations existing between the capitalist world and the Soviet Union. Today, however, when no one can possibly miss the ideological preparations on the part of Stalin and the British and American rulers for hurling the masses of the Soviet Union and of the capitalist world into a war, Stalin has come out with an official statement (Sept. 24, 1946) that no danger of war exists and that he and the "Great Powers" can cooperate.

The motive for the Stalin statement is quite understandable. The increasing war-talk necessarily disturbs the Russian workers and peasants who are fearful of another terrible slaughter. In 1939 when the Russian masses were afraid that they would be drawn into war, the Stalin gang lied that Stalin's "brilliant" diplomacy had divided the imperialists and saved the Russian masses. Stalin could never admit that his opportunist diplomacy only isolated the Russian toilers and left them an easy prey to imperialist attack. Stalin today can not confess that his crooked deals with Roosevelt and Churchill from 1943 to 1945 gave the imperialists a solid foundation to whip up a war campaign against the Soviet Union. The Stalin press distorts the meaning of the present development by speaking of a few imperialists "gone mad" or of some "dreamers" as the instigators of the war campaign against the Soviet Union. Today as in the past, the unity of world imperialism is concealed from the Russian masses by Stalin. And now, to allay the fears of the Russian masses Stalin unequivocally denies the present danger of a new war. His statement has another purpose which is connected to the present diplomatic war conducted by both the imperialist and Stalin camps. The imperialist line is to portray Stalin as the new "Hitler" who is threatening the peace of the world. Stalin's statement is designed to counter-act this propaganda and states in effect that if anything is a threat to "peace" it is the presence of the American troops in China.

It is interesting to observe that Stalin's statement discounting the present war danger would have been absolutely inconceivable immediately after V-J day. At that time, in the entire world, in so far as we know, only a few revolutionists in our group held that the Anglo-American imperialists were putting into effect a strategy to transform the ideology against the Stalin-ridden Soviet Union as a preliminary for war. But now the war talk is so extensive that Stalin finds it necessary to come out with some reassurances.

The angle presented in the imperialist press on Stalin's statement is quite indicative. The reports are that the American and British

leaders "breathed a sigh of relief." The masses in the bourgeois democratic countries are given the impression that the whole war atmosphere stems from Stalin and that it is only Stalin who can do something to correct it. On the other hand, Stalin tells the Russian masses that if anything does threaten peace it is the presence of American troops in China. Due to the policy which both sides pursued from Teheran to Yalta, it was both the imperialists and Stalin who prepared the present world development.

Stalin's reassurance to the Russian masses was echoed immediately by the imperialist spokesmen- Truman, Bevin, Byrnes, Premier Smuts, General Eisenhower, and others of the same stripe. While echoing Stalin's reassurance, the imperialist leaders pointed out that Stalin's statement denied capitalist encirclement of the borders of the Soviet Union and minimized the threat of the U.S. atomic bomb:

"Like President Truman, Secretary Byrnes readily agrees with Premier Stalin that there is no immediate danger of war. He goes even further and proclaims his conviction that no nation nor any responsible individual wants war, and he rightly voices the expectation that Mr. Stalin's statement should now put an end to the Moscow charges that any nation or group of nations is seeking to encircle Russia in a plot for war." (N.Y. Times, Oct. 5, 1946, Editorial )

But behind this cloud of pacific sounding oratory a definite war atmosphere is being steadily developed. Just as Stalin made sure to indicate that, if anything, it was the presence of American troops in China which endangered peace, so do the imperialists sing the same tune against Stalin. After asserting that no nation really wants war, Byrnes made sure to put across the idea that "some nations, while decrying war, are nevertheless pursuing policies which lead to war, or seek political or economic advantages which they cannot obtain without war." (Ibid.) The same editorial then bluntly indicated who was meant in this accusation:

"The reference to Russia is obvious." (Ibid. My emphasis- A.B.)

The basic imperialist strategy is to inculcate the notion that Stalin is the new Hitler and it is this idea which is being implanted by all sections of the capitalist press in one way or another.

The Anglo-American imperialists and Stalin are unified in this respect; both camps talk the very real war danger out of existence. Only through a relentless exposure of the lies of both the imperialist and Stalin forces can the revolutionary masses be made aware of the terrible danger threatening the proletariat today.

#### Workers Party Support to Imperialist and Stalinist Demagogy

From 1943 to V-J day the common refrain in the capitalist and Stalinist press was that of "Big Three Unity" in which Stalin was portrayed as a full and equal power with Britain and America and collaborating with them. By the year 1946 it became increasingly plain that this "unity" was just a fiction and that the reality was a sharp cleavage between the imperialist powers and the Stalin-ruled Soviet Union. Nevertheless, as late as Feb. 1946 all that the leaders of the W.P. (Shachtmanite) could see was a continuation of "collaboration" between Stalin and the imperialist powers, with ups and downs to be sure, but destined to last for an entire historical period!:

"Obviously we are now living in the aftermath of World War II, in a

period of peace, uneasy, unstable, but nevertheless destined to last for a whole historical period in which Big Three collaboration will go on with ups and downs." (The New International, Feb. 1946 p. 38)

However, the crisis continued to sharpen between the Anglo-American imperialists and Stalin despite the theoretical prognosis of the Shachtmanites to the contrary. But Shachtman was adamant. On March 11, 1946 his paper, Labor Action, reacting to the rising talk of the prospects of war between the American military giant and the Soviet Union declared that the imperialists and Stalin could not maneuver the masses into a war in this period. The assurances of Shachtman about the forthcoming period are no accident. It is integral to his analysis of the current world situation. On March 28, 1946 Labor Action reiterated its views on the present world development as follows:

"There will probably not be a war in the immediate future. The powers are not ready for it yet. War preparations take time. The peoples of all countries are emotionally tired, physically exhausted, politically sceptical. And it will take time to prepare new stockpiles of war material, to 'reconvert' to atomic warfare."

Having given such a tremendous build-up to the destruction and devastation in the capitalist world in the "Second World War" the Shachtmanites apparently find it somewhat contradictory to explain how the imperialists are preparing for a terrible war immediately on the conclusion of the previous war situation. Were Shachtman to admit the truth, that a war situation is brewing, he would have to admit that the American and British imperialists emerged ready for war with the Soviet Union, with their forces intact and greater than before their exhausting "war" with the "Axis." The intact imperialist forces belie an exhausting war and should necessitate a complete repudiation of the whole mass of deceptions which Shachtman's press duplicated from the capitalist propagandists on the "Second World War."

One would think from Shachtman's analysis that it was the Stalin-led Soviet Union which emerged strengthened from the previous war situation and the Anglo-American imperialists who came out helpless. Thus Labor Action pictures Stalin as being on the offensive and bullying the imperialists around:

"The basic Russian strategy seems to be to take advantage of the common knowledge that America and Britain are not prepared for immediate war and therefore to indulge in imperialist raids." (Ibid.)

The war between Naz Germany and the Stalin-ridden Soviet Union was one of the most destructive wars in history. European Russia was converted into a shambles and the Russian masses suffered a tremendous loss of life. Apropos of the vast extent of destruction in European Russia, one correspondent pointed out that:

"To a great extent the comparative slowness in which industry and agriculture are being rehabilitated is the result of German thoroughness in destruction. In these areas not only were factories destroyed, but the means of restoring them were demolished and looted." (N.Y. Times June 9, 1946)

In the Don Basin, one of Stalin's most important centers of coal mining and iron and steel production, it is estimated that "it will be years before production in the Don Basin regains the levels it had reached

in 1940, before the Germans came." (N.Y. Times, Sept. 25, 1946 )

Vladimir Valuev, Stalin-appointed head of the State Planning Commission, "declared agricultural rehabilitation could be accomplished by 1948- else- where the date mentioned was 1950- if tractors and other agricultural machines were provided." (N.Y. Times, Sept. 26, 1946, My emphasis-A.B.)

This gives a glimpse into the devastation which encompasses Stalin-ruled Russia. From a strictly military point of view any honest comparison of forces would have to take in the following factors:

"It (Soviet Union-A.B.) has the fantastically huge jobs of recovery at hand. It has no navy. It has no strategic air force. It has no fissionable weapons. It might well take a quarter century of industry, ingenuity and assistance of the German scientists rounded up by the Red Army to overcome this difficulty." (N.Y. Times, June 16, 1946)

As against this force stand the two imperialist giants, the British and American empires with all their satellite forces in South America, Asia, Africa and Europe. Yet Shachtman presents a picture of the imperialists sitting around powerless while Stalin, supposedly better prepared, is stepping all over them with "imperialist raids." A more direct support to the plans and propaganda of the imperialists can not be imagined.

Meanwhile a lot of things have been taking place while the Shachtmanites have been reassuring the workers that war was not threatening in the immediate future. In the present development events move at an accelerated speed with one crisis following rapidly on the heels of another. Since the Shachtmanite prognosis there have been the incidents in Yugoslavia and the mounting diplomatic war between the imperialists and Stalin in the Paris "Peace" Conference. Jackson Ligher, president of Radio Station WLIB returned from the Paris 21 nation conference and reported:

"Out of this Peace Conference has come positive confirmation of a new alignment of nations for war." "This alignment, he said, is the 'western or capitalistic nations' against 'Communist Russia and her puppets.'" (N.Y. Post, Aug. 19, 1946)

As we indicated, even some of the capitalist correspondents are frankly admitting that a war ideology is being created among the American masses. But Shachtman has not seen fit to revise his fundamental prognosis. Noting the sharpening atmosphere between the Soviet Union and the capitalist powers, Labor Action attempts to answer the question that is weighing on the minds of the workers:

"Does all this add up to war, in the immediate future? To believe so would be a serious error in judgement." (Sept. 9, 1946)

Instead of sounding a warning, the Shachtman press is still peddling reassurances.

There is another, far more important, way in which Labor Action in issue after issue helps deaden the minds of its readers to the immediate development. Though the domestic conditions play an important part in the life of the workers, an overwhelming concentration on trade union and

other local matters to the exclusion of sounding the alarm concerning the war preparations tends to conceal those preparations from the eyes of the workers. Labor Action's economist character serves to divert attention of the advanced workers almost wholly to trade union and similar local issues and thus operates to depoliticize their understanding of the world situation. The Economist nature of Labor Action is a cover for the parroting of imperialist demagoguery.

A.B.  
Sept. 1946

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*  
\* THE SMALL NATIONS SMOKE SCREEN \*  
\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

The role being played by the smaller nations in the present international situation is an extremely important feature of the struggle going on between the imperialist powers and the Stalin bureaucracy.

The role the smaller sections of the world bourgeoisie play in the machinations of imperialism have been clearly outlined in the past. In a situation where the imperialist powers are concerned with the very preservation of the capitalist system itself, history has shown that the interests of a smaller section of the bourgeoisie, in the physical sense, are readily sacrificed to the interests of the class as a whole. When the situation demanded it, the German bankers and industrialists wiped out the Jewish bourgeoisie. They also had no compunctions about handing over the eastern Polish landlords and capitalists to Stalin when the strategy of imperialism demanded that. Similarly, for the sake of the overall imperialist strategy, Roosevelt and Churchill had no qualms of conscience at sacrificing the native exploiters of smaller nations when they agreed at Teheran and Yalta that Stalin install himself in the Balkans, in Manchuria, Korea, and their territories of "small nations". Roosevelt and Churchill, and the interests they represented knew well in advance what Stalin would proceed to do militarily, economically and politically to the native capitalists of these territories. They had an imposing array of data on which to base their expectations in examples furnished by Stalin's occupation of Latvia, Esthonia, Lithuania and the Eastern half of Poland in 1939-40.

Today, the smaller nations are mouthing bitter sounds at the suppression of liberty by Stalin in the countries which he occupies. Interestingly enough, they raised no voice of protest against the territorial agreements of Teheran and Yalta, and never raised a voice of warning to Roosevelt and Churchill that Stalin would impose his own ruthless rule and suppression in these occupied territories. Even now they raise no voice against these agreements having been made, only at Stalin's not carrying them out in the promised manner. At present the small nations are being pushed out onto the international stage by imperialism, to berate the Stalinist bureaucracy and seemingly to champion the cause of "freedom" for the small nations and the working masses. The purpose is to inflame the average backward worker and uninformed petty-bourgeois, whom imperialism is grooming for war against the Soviet Union.

It will be noted that both Stalin and the imperialists use their puppets. Naturally since the pawns on Stalin's side are fewer in number than those controlled by the imperialists, the latter, from the point of view of playing up to the democratic sentiments of the workers, command an advantageous position. In consequence, they can pretend to abide by the majority rule in various diplomatic bodies that have been set up which form the stage for the preparations to develop a war psychology.

In this context let us look at the sessions of the "Peace" Conference at Paris. It is very significant that after the opening of the conference the first speaker of any importance on the very first day was Herbert V. Evatt, Australian Minister for External Affairs, a leader of the Australian Labor Party. On July 29, 1946 Evatt "told the conference in straightforward language that his country and certain other nations considered that they had as much right as the members of the Big Four Council of Foreign Ministers to participate in the final decisions on peace with Italy, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria and Finland." (New York Times, July 30, 1946. My emphasis- T.F.H.)

In the same issue of The New York Times, we find an illuminating editorial entitled "MR. BYRNES TASK", from which we quote:

"There is no reason, however, why the American delegation should be an 'advocate' of these decisions (of the Big Four-T.F.H.) or seek to impose them on the conference if it should turn out that the overwhelming majority of the conference members is against them...That makes it the primary duty of the American delegation not to attempt to impose the will of the Big Four on the conference, but to seek to impose the will of the conference on the Big Four." (My emphasis- T.F.H.)

Any politically astute person who read the news articles in conjunction with the editorial could have forecast the line the imperialists pursued at Paris. On the very first day of the conference the method was established. There was an attack on the Big Four decisions in the name of the "small nations" and by a "Labor" leader. This was the preparatory basis for a verbal offensive against Russia, in which the American and British delegations ultimately joined, saying that although they respected the previous decisions of the Big Four, they could not "tyrannically" disregard the wishes of the majority of the nations at the conference. Of course it was known to all beforehand that the majority of the small nations were under the thumb of the big imperialist powers and would line up against the "Russian bloc."

It did not take longer than the third day of the conference (July 31) for Evatt to name the target of his blasts. On August 1, The New York Times under the significant headline: "EVATT ASSAILS SOVIET GAIN IN DRAFTS" stated:

"Dr. Herbert V. Evatt, Australian Minister for External Affairs, strongly criticized the drafts submitted by the Big Four on the ground that the drafts assured a prior position for Russia in the economic life of Italy, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Finland.  
"Thus the doughty Australian once again came to the fore as the champion of justice as conceived by the little countries of the world." (My Emphasis- T.F.H.)

We see that from the very start the leading role of the "labor" leader of the "small nations" in the diplomatic offensive against the Stalin gang was made quite clear.



The central aim in the diplomatic bickering between Stalin and the imperialists since V-J day is for each to blacken the other side before the masses. The obvious step to be taken after the ending of the war situation was the signing of peace. The imperialists have to present Stalin as being opposed to peace in order to further his expansionist aims. Stalin, in self defense, aims to show that the imperialists are ganging up on Russia and frustrating a democratic peace. In this light the "Big Four" held a series of unsuccessful meetings to draft peace. Finally some treaty texts were agreed on for Finland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Italy with explicit cleavage registered on vital points such as Trieste, an "open door" on the Danube, etc. The problem then logically became one of submitting the texts to the "Allied" nations, which number twenty-one. Stalin, knowing that he would easily be out-voted on all questions, insisted on certain guarantees. One was that the "Big Four" would vote for the agreed-on texts in a bloc at the conference. Another was that only a two-third vote of the twenty-one nations could be construed as a "recommendation" to the "Big Four" who have the final power to vote the finished texts after the conference. The two-third vote agreement was basically undemocratic but the imperialists presented their agreement with Stalin on this point as evidencing how great a concession they would make to get Stalin to work for peace. But the imperialists had no intention of giving Stalin any real advantage. The small pawns of the imperialists immediately raised a noise about the Big Powers imposing their will on the conference and asked for a majority vote to be sufficient for a recommendation to the "Big Four." Cunningly, the imperialists then moved forward with a compromise proposal. On August 6th, the rules committee of the conference accepted the British plan providing that conference decisions will be looked upon as "recommendations" if there is a two-third majority, and measures adopted by a simple majority will be sent also as "proposals" to the Big Four Conference of Foreign Ministers. Byrnes, of course, voted for this British plan.

Several things are significant about this. In the first place it is important to note that the proposal was made by the British delegation. "Socialists," a section of the international Social Democracy. In the second place it is to be noted that three of the "Big Four", England, France, the U.S. all voted for the British proposal. The proposal carried in the rules committee for recommendation to the conference by a solid bloc of 15 votes against the six votes of the Stalin bloc. In the first test of strength the line up showed that the Anglo-American forces had not only a majority but a two-third majority.

On August 7th Molotov demanded that the general conference drop the British compromise proposal and adhere to the two-third vote agreed on by the "Big Four." Since the "Big Four" were committed to vote as a bloc on the submitted texts, Molotov hoped to break up the two-third majority. This day saw a clash between Molotov and the imperialist errand boy, Evatt.

On August 9th, by a vote of 15 to 6 the Stalinist proposal to reject majority votes and to retain the two-third vote only was defeated and the British proposal was adopted. Thus, in the first round between the Stalin and the imperialist gangs the capitalist bloc, pushing forward Evatt and the British Laborites, had succeeded in implanting in the mind of the masses the idea that Stalin was assuming Hitler's role of swallowing up small nations, was opposing majority rule and democratic procedure, and was doing all this in order to safeguard his territorial grabs.

The ground having been laid, the imperialists could proceed further. There was a very important session on August 15. On that day Byrnes asked whether the conference wished to see the economy of the Danube valley put behind an "open door or an iron curtain." It was but a little over two weeks after the opening of the conference and the bourgeois press could paraphrase Byrnes as follows:

"For the only thing we demand is economic freedom in a free world and equality without discrimination. It is Russia which seeks to impose a discriminatory monopoly arrangement along the lines previously employed by the Nazis, which mean exploitation and slavery." (N.Y. Times Aug. 16, 1946. My emphasis-T.F.H.)

Naturally, the Stalinist representatives to the conference were not idle. All along, as shown for instance in the interchange of speeches between Molotov and Byrnes on the question of the anti-Soviet bloc, the bureaucrats of the Kremlin knew the object of the imperialist representatives. They knew that Paris was to be used as a sounding board. They also knew that a position of openly flouting the capitalist majority would fall right in with the diplomatic offensive of the imperialists. Apparently the vote of 15 to 6 convinced them that they could not attempt to play the French imperialists against the British and American rulers for on August 16th, the Stalin bloc opposed the granting of votes to France in the Rumanian Commission, the Balkan and Finnish economic commissions, and contested the voting rights of France (and the United States) on the Finnish question. By eliminating various powers on the specific questions the Stalin stooges hoped to cut down the majority against them and still more to cut down the effectiveness of the bourgeois propaganda,

To counter this the capitalists again pushed forward a "Labor" representative of the "small nations," William J. Jordan of New Zealand, who launched into an attack on Russia, saying "We are sick of these continual delays, this quack, quack, quack." This persiflage was played up by all the capitalist papers as indicative of the impatience of the "small nations" at the delaying tactics of the "Russian aggressors."

On August 18th ~~Statt~~ backed a United States proposal to put a clause into the Italian treaty, guaranteeing fundamental rights to territories transferred from Italy, and also proposed that such clauses be inserted in the treaties with Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary and Finland. By fundamental rights the representatives of the bourgeoisie, of course, mean above all, the right of private property.

By this time so far had the process of utilizing Stalin's brutal bossing in the Balkans proceeded, a bossing made possible through the preliminary maneuvering of Roosevelt and Churchill from Teheran through Yalta, that on August 19th The New York Times could come out with an editorial headed "OPPORTUNITY AT PARIS", in which ~~boldly~~ stated:

"Indeed, despite all the wrangling and dilatory talk, the Conference has already served a salutary purpose by showing to the world just what the issues are and where the sympathies of most nations lie. It has shown that, whatever Russia may have thought when it subscribed to the Atlantic Charter, the war was really a three-cornered conflict in which Russia fought her own war for her own purposes, and that these purposes are scarcely different from those of the defeated enemies. Having swallowed eastern Europe with the aid of Hitler,

it now proposes to swallow central Europe and the Balkans with the aid of the Western Allies, and by the methods which prompted even the diplomatic Mr. Byrnes to compare them with the methods of the Nazis."

A necessary part of this whole machination is the seeming "fight" of the "small nations" against all of the Big Four. As we have seen on all important questions this always results in an Anglo-American-small nations bloc against the Stalin bloc. However, it is sometimes necessary to give the appearance that Britain and the U.S. are trying to hold on to their commitments to Russia but guide themselves by the sentiments of small nations. An example of this sort of thing was seen on August 23. Just a week before that date, on the question as to whether Austria was to be heard on the South Tyrol question with reference to the Italian treaty, there was the usual solid vote of 15 to 6. But on August 23 The New York Times came out with the headline "SMALL POWERS WIN IN FIRST PACT VOTE". The article continues that the small powers on the Italian political and territorial committee voted down the Big Four plus the Soviet bloc by 11 to 9. But the real significance is to be found in the inadvertent sub headline on page 4: "SMALL POWERS WIN OVER RUSSIANS IN FIRST BALLOT ON TREATY TEXTS." (My emphasis-T.F.H.) As a matter of actual fact the "fight" was over immaterial wording (as to whether Italy had "undertaken" rather than "declared" a "war of aggression.") But the incident itself is of key importance. It shows:

1. That on the important issues there are two solid blocs, the imperialists and Stalin.
2. That a little subsidiary game of the "small nations" against the "Big Four" is played for camouflage only.
3. That the intelligent representatives of the bourgeoisie know what is going on and correctly interpreted the vote of August 23rd.

On August 26 the Australian delegation placed before the Economic Commission for the Balkans and Finland a proposal that the reparation problems should be placed in the hands of a permanent inter-allied commission with power to examine the operation already carried out by Russia in Rumania, Hungary and Finland. At once the Stalinists saw the meaning of this. Although Molotov was not personally a member of that particular commission, he appeared before it and attacked the motives of the Australian delegates, saying that the proposals, which also included provisions against bilateral agreements, and for payment of reparations on the basis of international exchange, not in kind, were such as "only an aggressor" (against the S.U.-T.F.H.) could support."

Molotov followed this up on August 27 in the Italian economic commission in a speech in which he asserted that he thought that Australia, in pressing numerous treaty amendments, was acting as a front for "other nations."

On the same day in the Italian political and territorial commission a violent exchange took place between Beasley of Australia and Vishinsky, a Stalinist. Beasley charged that Russia was "spreading fear throughout Europe and the world," attempting to thrust her views down the throats of other delegations", and stated "there has been a lot of lying."

Vishinsky retorted that the Australian delegation "though representing the country furthest removed from Europe have submitted 35 percent of all the amendments before the conference." On the same day Molotov was

compelled to remark bluntly "Australia's proposals are directed against the Soviet Union." On August 28, The New York Times, most intelligent and consistent exponent of the imperialist strategy summed up the first stage of the conference in an editorial: "THE ISSUE AT PARIS " and declared:

"The issue at Paris remains what it was when this meeting began: Is this to be a general peace conference, in which the voice of the smaller nations that helped to win the war is heard, or are the small nations to be forced to accept without change the decisions of the Big Four, on the insistence of the Russians?" (My emphasis-T.F.H.)

If we analyze all the proceedings to date we can see that the plan of the imperialists to use the Paris Conference as an instrument of war incitement is daily succeeding. It is succeeding because they skillfully put forward Social democratic "representatives" of "small nations." as fighters against the Stalinists. But above all, it succeeds because Stalin intends to hang on to his occupied territories by hook or by crook. He can maneuver as he did in Manchuria, replacing Russian generals with Chinese Stalinist stooges. But he cannot withdraw entirely without turning back the occupied territory to imperialism. Stalin's machinations to remain in control of the occupied countries fits in with the imperialist plan, the cornerstone of which was laid by Roosevelt and Churchill at the secret conferences with Stalin from 1943 to 1945.

Of course two things must be kept in mind. The first is that Paris is only part of the international picture and only a small part of the imperialist plan. The speech of Byrnes at Stuttgart which raised the issue of the German borders and the Potsdam agreement was of the utmost importance. The second is that the accidental also plays a role and fits into plans already made. The shooting of the American fliers over Yugoslavia was at once seized upon by the bourgeoisie and sharpened the war atmosphere more than any occurrence at the Paris Conference.

We have shown that the spearhead of the imperialists at Paris is Social Democracy. The Stalinists, of course, have prepared the ground for imperialism by their acceptance of the crooked offerings in the previous secret agreements. The official Trotskyites (Socialist Workers Party) continue their "good soldier" support to Stalin and thereby aid in the spread of the counter revolution from the Stalinist side. On the other hand, the Shachtmanites, (Workers Party) in this country objectively side with the imperialists by their "analysis" of Stalin's machinations as "imperialist aggression." Both the Cannon and Shachtman camps can only mislead the working class. The key to the removal of the war threat and the freeing of the working class from Stalinism and imperialism today lies in the policy of exposing the imperialist-Stalin manipulations which led to the present danger to the proletariat. Only on the basis of a scientific understanding can the workers break from the opportunist grip and organize a revolutionary party to destroy Stalinism and imperialism.

T.F. Hardon  
Sept. 9, 1946

FOR FURTHER MATERIAL ON THE CURRENT WORLD SITUATION WRITE FOR:

DISCUSSION ON THE WORLD SITUATION .-.05  
THE TRUTH BEHIND THE EUROPEAN "PEACE" CRISIS .-.05

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* \*  
\* THE WALLACE ACT \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

On September 12, 1946, Henry Wallace, then Secretary of Commerce, in a speech at Madison Square Garden apparently drew a line of demarcation between himself and Secretary of State, Byrnes, on the issue of the foreign policy of American imperialism. Wallace implied that Byrnes was following a "get tough with Russia" policy which was leading to war, whereas he was advocating a "go-easy" attitude to maintain peace.

Immediately a flood of comment and interpretation came from numerous political quarters. One basic point upon which all shades of opinion agreed was that a major split had suddenly developed in the top bourgeois circle on the question of war or peace with Stalin. When Wallace resigned from the Cabinet, at the "request" of Truman, it was interpreted as a definite cleavage.

How much reality is there in this story that the established foreign policy of American imperialism found a genuine opponent in its own camp? How much reality is there in the expressed view that within the ranks of capitalism, and in the top structure of the capitalist state at that, there is a force which is for a "peaceful" division of the world between imperialism and Stalin?

First of all, what is the political character of this Henry Wallace who is alleged to be opposing the war drive? Wallace is a seasoned diplomatic war horse, having actually served American imperialism for many years. Thirteen of these years were spent in Washington in one or another high government position. During this whole time Wallace has been a "liberal" cover for the bourgeoisie, first as Secretary of Agriculture, then as Vice-President, and finally as Secretary of Commerce. His specific role and his value to the Democratic Party consisted of corraling the labor vote by his pseudo-progressive front. He was the CIO-PAC candidate for Vice-President at the last Democratic convention. In the early part of 1945 he came out with a capitalist utopia called "Sixty Million Jobs", a "progressive" cover for the bankruptcy of capitalism. Having these qualifications, having all along played the imperialist game, Wallace has proved very useful to American capitalism. This is particularly shown by the fact that the Senate ratified his appointment as Secretary of Commerce, a position in which he was in daily rapport with the biggest capitalists whose approval he obviously needed for the job in the first place.

The basis for the present war atmosphere is the series of secret agreements the imperialists made with Stalin from 1943 to 1945, allowing him to occupy huge territories. These secret agreements resulted in Stalin's "iron curtain" and violations of pledges in the occupied territories upon which the imperialists undoubtedly counted when they acquiesced in Stalin's huge territorial expansion. Wallace, while in a key position in the capitalist political machine, wholeheartedly supported these secret agreements. Wallace's acceptance of these secret agreements reflected a direct participation in the basic imperialist strategy. To this day Wallace stands on

the secret agreements which prepared the present situation. The fiction of a real division in the top structure of the American capitalist state in the form of the Wallace "Opposition" becomes quite obvious. The policy of the Truman administration towards Russia is the policy of American imperialism. Accompanying Byrnes to Paris was not only the Democrat Senator Connally but also the republican spokesman on foreign affairs, Vandenberg. Never was the slightest objection raised to this united policy in high bourgeois circles.

Now what was Wallace's policy prior to the "fateful" Madison Square Garden speech? A light is thrown on this by the book "Sixty Million Jobs". On page 7, after expressions of pious hope for peace with Russia there occurs this significant remark:

"I am assuming, of course, that the Russians will come halfway."

This book was published in the early part of 1945, at a time when Stalin was being hailed as a co-victor over Nazism, when there was not even a hint of war talk except in the columns of the Hearst and McCormick press. Already Wallace was foreshadowing "the shape of things to come." At that time the official bourgeois policy was one of "appeasement", and already Wallace was raising in advance the question of war or peace in the relationship between the capitalist world and the Soviet Union.

Some time after he penned this significant statement the American imperialist government changed its line and began to create a "get tough" atmosphere in its relations with Stalin. War talk began to pervade the columns of the capitalist press, the radio, and other opinion-moulding devices of the bourgeoisie.

At a certain stage the need arose to mark out clearly the direction of the policy and to increase and consolidate popular support for the "get tough" policy toward Russia. And precisely here is where the Wallace act came in. Let us look a little more closely into the mechanics of the thing.

On July 23, 1946, more than a month and a half before the Madison Square Garden speech, Wallace wrote a long letter to Truman in which all the points of his subsequent speech were indicated. At that time nothing happened. There was no publication of the letter. Wallace retained his cabinet position. Nothing was openly said. On September 10, two days before the speech, Wallace gave a copy to Truman and it was approved. On September 12, just a few hours before the "cleared" speech was made, Truman explicitly stated that Wallace's text was in direct line with American foreign policy. Wallace then carried out his assignment, polarizing a minority "peace" sentiment while the masses were given the impression that the overwhelming majority among them were on the side of Byrnes. Signs of this strategy have been evident. For example, WORLD REPORT of October 1, 1946 writes:

"The world thus is put on notice by President Truman that there is a fundamental conflict over America's international policy between the Administration and those who think as Henry Wallace does. The overwhelming majority in the U.S., Truman believes,

is with the Administration."(p.6 )

The old game the imperialists are playing is to manipulate loyal oppositions in order to push their real aims forward. There is as little conflict on foreign policy between Byrnes and Wallace as there was between Churchill and Bevin before the advent of the British Labor Party Government and as there is now between Bevin and the "opposition" of Churchill.

The condition which Wallace lays down for a peaceful cohabitation of Stalin with the imperialists is that Stalin meet the latter "halfway." Stalin will naturally endeavor to retain his possessions, continue his "iron curtain" policy, and thus will not meet Wallace's "condition." Consequently the future entry of the Wallace "Opposition" into the war camp at a strategic moment is a foregone conclusion.

The opportunists within the working class, who fall either into the Stalin camp or the imperialist camp, or both, picture the Wallace maneuver as a wide rift in the high circles of American imperialism. The Daily Worker, for example, immediately proceeded to plant the illusion among the Stalinist workers that the Wallace policy was really that of peace. The Trotskyite organ, The Militant, presented the notion that Wallace has broken with Wall Street and actually believes that American imperialism should turn toward a policy of peace with Stalin. Wallace, as his record has clearly shown, the true and loyal tool of Big Business, is portrayed by the Trotsky leaders in the role of a representative of the petty bourgeoisie:

"Like a number of businessmen, chiefly small business, Wallace believes that it is easier to make a deal with Stalin through 'soft' methods." (Sept. 28, 1946 )

Even if Wallace were a representative of the petty bourgeoisie, history has long since proved that a politician of small business always and invariably carries out the policy of imperialism.

In evaluating Wallace's act the Shachtman Trotskyites actually went further and saw a "peace" wing of American imperialism. In LABOR ACTION of September 23, 1946 they speak of "two lines in foreign policy developing in the Administration." On September 30, 1946, under the front page headline: "IMPERIALIST POLICY CLASH ERUPTS IN CABINET CRISIS" they say:

"The bitter internal struggle within the Democratic Administration, climaxed by Henry Wallace's resignation, has exposed to public view the conflict of interest and differences of opinion within American capitalism on how to meet the present international crisis." (My emphasis- G.M.)

There is only one line (although there are prearranged roles within that line) in the Wall Street Administration, and the Wallace act was a necessary and planned part of it. The line is to marshal the American masses for a war against the Soviet masses who are held in bureaucratic shackles by Stalin. It is more or less clear to most political tendencies that the imperialists are developing

a war hysteria against Stalin, and there is not a single political party pointing the correct road to the prevention of the bloody catastrophe.

The C.P. bureaucrats are recruiting supporters for the Soviet bureaucracy which is making ready for war. The Social Democrats are pulling in the direction of the imperialists. The Cannon Trotskyites with their left hand, are tying the most advanced workers to the Stalin machine through periodic support to the Stalin candidates in elections, as well as through the line of unconditional defense of the Soviet Union and a thousand other, visible and invisible threads. With their right hand the Trotsky leaders are attaching the workers to imperialism through the policy of building a bourgeois labor party or supporting one in elections as in Britain.

When Stalin was accepting the territories by agreement with Churchill and Roosevelt he could not have failed to understand that the imperialists would later present him as an expansionist and that his continued occupation of those territories would furnish the imperialists with a powerful pretext for war. Stalin's opportunism has again placed the Russian and other workers into a war trap.

The first step for the working class to stop the march toward war is a complete, sharp political and organizational break with Stalinism and all other opportunism. The drive toward war by the class enemy, the imperialists, was made possible by the opportunist machinations of the Stalin gang, the concealed enemy within the working class. The release of the Russian and all other workers from the paralyzing clutches of the Stalinist counter-revolution and the adoption of the policy of establishing an international democratic workers republic is the only road toward preventing the bloody catastrophe now in preparation by the imperialists and the Stalinist bureaucracy.

George Marlen  
October 1946.

---

NEWS STANDS WHERE YOU CAN BUY

THE BULLETIN

14th Street & 4th Avenue — (Corner of The Central Savings Bank)

14th Street & 6th Avenue — (Southeast Corner)

42nd Street — Three Newstands Between 5th & 6th Avenue  
(Library Side)

GET YOUR COPY OF THE BULLETIN & POLITICAL CORRESPONDENCE  
REGULARLY AT THESE STANDS



\*\*\*\*\*  
\*  
\* THE ISSUE OF PALESTINE \*  
\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

National minorities have consistently been used by the ruling class as political footballs for creating artificial antagonism among sections of the oppressed masses for the purpose of dividing them and channelizing their bitterness into safe avenues for the ruling class.

Czarist Russia is an excellent example. Through their paid hooligans (the Black Hundreds) the Czarist regimes deliberately fostered anti-semitism and arranged pogroms, to divert the attention of the workers and peasants from the true cause of their miserable lot, capitalist and landlord exploitation. In the United States there is a regime of lynch terror against the negro, enforced segregation and a perpetuated split between the white and negro workers to prevent a unified struggle against capitalism. The British imperialists promote similar divisions among the exploited in India (Hindus, Moslems, etc.) and throughout the entire imperialist world one can find similar applications of this reactionary principle, divide and rule.

In Germany and then in all of Nazi-occupied Europe, Hitler used the very same tactic, of a major anti-semitic campaign which distracted the attention of the terrorized German workers and hampered resistance to the Nazi rule. Hand in glove with this went the Nazi superman "Aryan" theory as an ideological smokescreen. Directly responsible for the rise of the Hitler rule, for the anti-semitism, the concentration camps, the mass murder and torture, was international imperialism and the opportunist forces in the world proletariat which by their policies prevented world revolution.

The world bourgeoisie turned over the major portion of Europe to Hitler, from 1936 (the Saar) through Czechoslovakia (Munich 1938), Poland (1939), through Western Europe (1940), to the Balkans (1941). Today, among the homeless refugees roaming the face of Europe and being crammed by their "liberators" into displaced persons concentration camps, there are thousands of Jews who survived the Nazi massacres and seeking escape into Palestine. Their terrible plight is a result of the policy, not only of Hitler, but of Chamberlain, Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin.

Intrinsically, the Jewish question, the Negro question and all other minority questions, are not, as the bourgeoisie would have them appear, "national questions", but are class problems, a direct product of the class struggle. The only solution to them is a class solution. An attempt to solve a National minority question within the context of capitalism is not only doomed to failure, but plays right into the hands of the ruling class.

The British policy in Palestine has been to play the Arabs and Jews against each other, thereby diverting the unrest of the masses under the imperialist colonial regime. The Jewish and Arab bourgeoisies have been vying with each other for the role of lackey to British imperialism. There are approximately 11 million Jews throughout the world, only a small portion of whom are in Palestine, whereas there are some 50 million Arabs, largely concentrated in the highly strategic Middle East. To the end of strengthening the hand of the Arabian exploiters, the

British imperialists allowed the Mufti of Jerusalem, an undisguised fascist who worked hand in glove with the Nazis, to "escape" and continue his activities in Egypt, while the American rulers have been making large loans to the Arabian leaders. The Arab bourgeoisie, playing the role of complete servility to imperialist interests, is more than willing to guarantee the security of imperialism in that important area of the world.

The Jewish bourgeoisie in Palestine desires nothing more than the opportunity for "peaceful" capitalist expansion and exploitation in that country, and to work together with imperialism to suppress the masses. Due to the imperialist policy of propping up the Arab rulers, the Jewish workers suddenly find themselves being dealt with by the British forces in a manner strongly reminiscent of the methods employed by the Nazis.

The Jewish masses, filled with reactionary nationalist ideology, look for leadership to the Jewish bourgeoisie who in turn ask only for crumbs from the table of British imperialism. On their part, the Arabian masses, in their national ardor for an Arab Palestine, are in the camp of the Arabian exploiters who are likewise in league with British imperialism. Befuddled by racial demagoguery, both the Arab and Jewish masses are ironically pawns in the support of the brutal colonial regime in that country. The Jewish workers are utterly unaware of the fact that the imperialists who are now persecuting them are the very same ones who are responsible for their plight in having been butchered and driven from their homes to wind up in the displaced parson's camps of Europe. While appealing to British or American imperialism for alleviation of their sufferings by immigration into Palestine or the United States, or elsewhere, the Jewish national leaders are completely covering the fact that the imperialists as a whole share responsibility for the sufferings of the Jewish workers. Any political force which implants the notion that the Jewish question can be solved within the framework of imperialism, misleads the Jewish and other workers and keeps them bound to their oppressors.

#### OPPORTUNIST SUPPORT TO IMPERIALISM

The colonial semi-fascist tactics of British imperialism in many parts of the globe are being carried out against the workers by that agent of the bourgeoisie, euphemistically called the British Labor Party. History has shown <sup>that</sup> during a period of unrest and leftward movement of the masses, the capitalist class, behind its "left" Labor cover, can continue a policy of extreme reaction, both in the imperialist country itself and in the colonies. Support to the Labor Party in England means support to British imperialism. The policy pursued by the two previous "Labor" governments established this irrevocable fact. Those workers who were induced by various political tendencies to vote for the Labor Party in the British General Elections of 1945, unwittingly gave direct support to the subsequent continuation of the bloody colonial policy by that agent of imperialism. Those who advocated putting the Attlees and Bevins in power are in a very real sense responsible for the concentration camps and the terroristic rule by the British imperialists in Palestine today.

Almost every shade of opportunism within the ranks of the working class supported the imperialist British Labor agents in the elections. The Stalinists in Britain, and elsewhere, came out in complete support of the labor fakers, representing their election as a smashing victory for the working class. This typical Stalinist sell-out helped put over the Labor Government's fraud of "Nationalization", whereby it guarantees profits to the bourgeoisie in otherwise profitless industries (Coal), and propped up the brutal colonial policy.

Following in the footsteps of the Stalinists in support of the Labor Party came the Trotskyites. The Trotskyites, although following the very same basic political line of advocating election of the labor fakers, did so with a more "left" cover in the form of "criticism." (Of course, there is plenty to criticize!) The criticism was merely a cloak for the concrete action of support and when the Trotskyite party electioneered for the Labor Party at election meetings in England, one can be sure that the "criticism" was not the election propaganda whereby they tried to influence workers to vote the Labor Party Ticket. The Militant, organ of the Cannonite section of the American Trotskyites, deluded its readers with the poisonous lie that for the workers, the election of the labor fakers constituted "An Inspiring Victory." (Aug. 4, 1945) The Shachtmanite branch of the American Trotskyites echoed the deception of their Cannonite brothers when it stated that the victory of Attlee, Bevin and Co. "is a victory that should command the support and admiration of the workers of the world." (Labor Action, Aug. 6, 1945)

The workers of Palestine who are being beaten and killed in concentration camps are a concrete refutation of the vicious deceptions by the Trotskyite leaders and other opportunists who boosted the British Labor Party into power. The terrorized workers in Palestine are in no position to appreciate this "inspiring victory." The brutal imperialist policy is the same as under the Tories, the guns and bayonets are the same, the concentration camps are the same; in political essence, Attlee and Churchill are the same to the workers in the concentration camps in Palestine and elsewhere. What happened to these workers exposes as a monstrosity the Trotskyite story that "The middle classes from town and country have joined the workers to deliver the first telling blow against capitalism" (The Militant, Aug. 4, 1945) in evaluating the Bevin-Attlee victory. The Trotskyite line of support to British imperialism emerged in all its nakedness during the General Elections when the British Trotsky leaders dedicated themselves to the following task as expressed in their paper, Socialist Appeal:

"Our comrades will work hard in the localities together with the Labour workers to return a majority Labour Government." (June, 1945 p. 4)

The solution of the Jewish question is inseparable from the task of liberating the world proletariat from imperialism. This can be accomplished only by exposing all direct and indirect supporters to imperialism and thereby building a revolutionary movement to liberate the proletariat from capitalist slavery.

A. James  
October 1946

THE WORK OF CANNON AND SHACHTMAN  
IN THE TRADE UNIONS

PART VI - A HORSE-DEAL WITH JOHN L. LEWIS

As head of the CIO John L. Lewis was in a very strategic position in the American labor movement. The Lewis policy of sell-outs, which kept the miners under the heel of the mine-owners, was now extended to the wide field offered by the CIO and affected the daily lives of millions of trade union workers who followed the CIO leadership. In the Trotsky press the Lewis machine was correctly characterized as "the agency of American imperialism in the labor movement." (Socialist Appeal, Nov. 14, 1939)

For the organized workers in that period (1939-41) the problem of defeating the maneuvers of Wall Street's government to tighten control of the labor unions assumed a key importance in view of the developing military preparations. The capitalist line was to organize a war machine and to integrate the top labor leaders into the government mechanism. The purpose was to use the labor bureaucrats as a weapon in the unions to prevent any possible movement against the developing military mobilization of economy and the concomitant rise in the cost of living. All the labor fakers scrambled to curry favor with the Roosevelt administration and to prove their ability to hold back the workers from struggle. For Lewis a long-awaited dream seemed to be on the verge of fulfillment; a job as a "labor representative" in the bosses government. The Trotsky leaders were cognizant of the fact that a regular campaign was organized by the CIO leadership for a seat in the war policy boards of the government:

"Today, the chief demand of Lewis and the CIO is 'labor representation' in the war policy boards of the government!" (Socialist Appeal, Sept. 20, 1939. p. 4 )

But Lewis was doomed to a bitter personal disappointment. Sidney Hillman got into the good graces of the Roosevelt administration and won the coveted appointment to the National Defense Advisory Commission. Lewis, his hopes rudely shaken, showed his displeasure by breaking with Roosevelt in the election year, 1940, and went all out in a clique war in the CIO against his successful rival, Sidney Hillman.

Enter the Stalinist Gang

Meanwhile the Stalinist bureaucrats had been developing a twist all their own in their trade union policy. After turning over the Spanish workers to Franco, the Stalinist bureaucracy in March 1939 with the Madrid putsch laid the basis for a switch to the left in the C.I. line in order to cover up their momentous betrayal. The Stalin-Hitler Pact in August 1939 added momentum to the new development and accelerated the anti-Roosevelt talk which the American Stalinists were beginning to put into circulation. This coincided with the Roosevelt-Lewis schism. Of course, the shrewd Browders and Fosters knew perfectly well that Lewis was only interested in the bone which Roosevelt had tossed to Hillman, and that his anti-administration talk was sheer demagoguery. Nevertheless the Stalinist deceivers featured Lewis' new verbal gestures against Roosevelt and taught their followers that this represented a real fight against

the Roosevelt capitalist government. The Stalinist followers in the unions were organized as recruiting agents for Lewis and the Daily Worker hailed Lewis as a "progressive labor leader" in contrast to Hillman. The Stalinist game was to condemn the class-collaborationism of Hillman but to keep mum about the fact that Lewis hewed to the fundamentally identical policies. The fact that Lewis was warring against his successful rival, Hillman, was used by the Stalinists as "evidence" that Lewis was antagonistic to the Hillman sell-out policies. The Trotsky leaders knew that the Stalin leaders were lying about Lewis:

"At the same time, however, in order to keep their following, the Stalinists require the fiction that Lewis is more progressive than what Hillman represents. Since that fiction cannot be bolstered by evidence of a progressive policy actually practiced by Lewis, the Stalinists are trying to clothe that fiction by the evidence of an organizational split between Hillman and Lewis." (Socialist Appeal, Sept. 28, 1940. Editorial)

There was no question but that on the program of sell-outs and class-collaborationism there was not one iota of difference between Lewis and Hillman. The S.W.P. leaders pointed this out:

"In a word: show us one union situation in which Lewis has been advocating a class-struggle program as against the class-collaboration program of Hillman. You can't show it because it doesn't exist." (Ibid. Original Emphasis.)

The clique fight between Lewis and Hillman infected the entire CIO. The misled rank and file were artificially divided between the two unprincipled factions and were used as pawns in the crooked maneuvering on both sides.

In the 1940 Presidential elections Lewis swung over to Willkie and acted as the "Labor" standard bearer for the Republican Party. Lewis' support to Willkie was calculated as revenge against Roosevelt. Lewis' open support of capitalism politically was quite consistent with his avowed policy of class collaborationism in the unions; indeed, there can be no separation of direct political support to capitalism from the opportunist policy pursued in the unions. However, the Lewis swing to Willkie put the Stalinist leaders in an uncomfortable position. The Browders and Fosters had to some fast talking to justify their support to Lewis in light of the latter's open political support to capitalist reaction. The Stalinist wizards came up with a unique explanation to befuddle the workers: Lewis was a sort of Jekyll-Hyde character. In the union field, according to Browder and Co., Lewis was a "progressive"; in the political field he fell in line with capitalist politics. This pernicious deception was buttressed with the usual "theoretical" hokum: since Lewis was a union leader, his main concern was the preservation of his union field of operations and thus he had to fight to preserve the unions against the pressure of the bosses. The truth is that the political line of Lewis paves the way for capitalist reaction as that of every other opportunist current. Lewis' policy supports capitalism and this policy will continue even when the bourgeoisie works to destroy all labor organizations. Many of the Social Democratic, Stalinist and other trade union leaders who by their policy opened the door to fascism ended up in the fascist slaughterhouse since fascism operates to destroy all labor organizations. The Cannon paper showed a clear understanding of the political meaning of Lewis' line:

"Lewis is merely travelling in the footsteps of the Blums, Kautskys, Caballeros, who led the European working class to its doom. Like them, Lewis paves the way for a native or foreign Hitler." (The Militant, May 10, 1941)

In the clique fight in the CIO the Marxist role would have been to expose resolutely both cliques and counterpose the policy of class struggle as against the pro-capitalist activity of both Hillman and Lewis. This was all the more incumbent since the Social Democrats were tagging along with Hillman and the Stalinist were backing Lewis. The exposure of the true character of both unprincipled cliques was the prerequisite to any political struggle in the unions against the dominant currents of Stalinism and Social Democracy which were paralysing the advanced workers and through them tying the trade union workers to Wall Street. The Trotsky workers were given the impression that in this situation their leadership was performing that very Marxist role. The Stalinist policy of supporting Lewis was castigated ferociously in the pages of the Trotsky press. The Militant boldly told its readers:

"The Whitewashing of John L. Lewis is the Keystone of Present Stalinist Line." (Headline. May 17, 1941)

As to the Social Democrats who were supporting Hillman, the Trotsky leaders noted with contempt:

"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, Dec. 14, 1940)

The Trotsky workers sincerely thought that in contrast to Stalinism and Social Democracy Cannon's policy was guided by principled considerations and inspired by the interests of the working class. A line independent of all reactionary leaders was supposedly the policy adopted by the Trotsky leaders in this important trade union development. But it was not long before the real political line of Cannon and Co. emerged in this trade union situation. It took some important events in Minneapolis, the Mecca of Trotskyite trade unionism, to push the concealed Trotsky line to the fore.

In May 1941 Daniel Tobin, AFL potentate of the Teamsters, moved against the Trotskyites in Minneapolis and blasted their leadership of Local 544 publicly in his paper. Tobin arranged for a meeting in June 1941 to throw the Trotsky leaders out of the AFL entirely and to take over the leadership of Teamster Local, 544. Tobin's all-out offensive made a further stay of the Trotsky Minneapolis leaders in the AFL manifestly impossible. Watching this rift the Lewis crowd in the CIO pricked up its ears and soon edged into the situation by beckoning a finger to the Minneapolis Trotsky leaders who were now left without a home. For a long time Lewis had been trying to raid the AFL in the Teamsters and Construction field as the Trotsky trade union "experts" had been pointing out for years in their press. These raiding attempts leading to frequent unprincipled jurisdictional wars were organized by A.D. Lewis, John L's brother and lieutenant. The Trotsky press had pointed out that the Stalinists were covering up A.D. Lewis' role because of their unprincipled combination with John L. Lewis:

"The Daily Worker document correctly denounces the AFL top leadership

for its strikebreaking role in the Ford, International Harvester and Allis-Chalmers strikes, where AFL charters issued to company stooges gave anti-labor elements the pretext to condemn 'jurisdictional strikes.' The Daily Worker is, however silent about the fact that the same kind of scabby role has been played by the CIO's 'Construction Workers Organizing Committee' headed by A.D. Lewis, John L's brother and lieutenant." (The Militant, May 17, 1941 p. 3. My emphasis-A.B.)

But when Tobin moved to throw the Trotsky-led Teamsters out and this same A.D. Lewis offered a home to the 544 leaders in the CIO, Cannon and Co. gleefully published A.D. Lewis' invitation and just as the Daily Worker before kept silent about his scabby role:

"A.D. Lewis, Chairman of the United Construction Workers Organizing Committee, CIO, had invited the truck drivers to affiliate at their Monday meeting, stating:

"We visualize this move on the part of the truck-drivers of Minneapolis as the first step toward the complete organization of all truck-drivers in the United States in the CIO." (The Militant, June 14, 1941 p. 1)

The Trotsky-led union looked like a juicy plum to Lewis since it would give him the long desired foothold among the Teamsters. The situation called for some maneuvering on the part of Cannon and Co. For years the Trotsky press had condemned the CIO incursions in Minneapolis and the attempted Lewis raids among the Teamsters and in the Construction field. Furthermore, they had put themselves on record as unequivocal opponents of John L. Lewis for his unprincipled clique fight against Hillman as we have already indicated above. The Hillman-Lewis clique fight was still raging in the CIO and naturally nothing had changed in the sell-out policies of both factions. However, Cannon did not hesitate for a single instant. The Trotsky workers were immediately given the new policy to line up with Lewis and serve as his defenders in the faction fight against Hillman. Just as the Stalinists did before, Cannon and Co. invented "principled" differences between Hillman and Lewis and portrayed the latter as an opponent of government strikebreaking! This reevaluation was the preliminary for open support:

"The tendency of the John L. Lewis group in the CIO has been to resist government interference and government strike-breaking, and to oppose the Subservient Roosevelt-stooging of Hillman." (The Militant, Aug. 9, 1941)

Following in the footsteps of the Stalinists who had used the same sophistry before, the class-collaborationism of Hillman was pointed out while the basically similar class-collaborationism of Lewis was carefully kept hidden and palmed off as a class struggle policy. The sell-out line of Lewis and his gang was presented by Cannon's paper as being in the interests of the working class whom Lewis was actually betraying. Evaluating the role of the respective factions at a union convention, The Militant, wrote:

"The Lewis group was far more progressive and reflected correctly the needs and desires of the masses of workers. Hillman and his tendency represented the cynical and unabashed labor lieutenants of the war machine who were willing to tie labor to the tailcoats of the Wall Street politicians who dominate the war production agencies." (Aug. 30, 1941. p. 4. My emphasis- A.D.)

The real motive for the Trotskyite switch to Lewis was given away in one phrase where Cannon and Co. noted that "Lewis encourages the affiliation of the militant drivers movement to the C.I.O., while Hillman's associates pass resolutions against it <sup>the</sup> in the bodies they control..." (The Militant, Sept. 6, 1941 p. 3) This was reason for the entire swing to Lewis and why the Trotsky leadership urged that "progressive trade-unionists support Lewis against the Hillman-Stalinist bloc." (Ibid. My emphasis-A.B.)

The reader will notice that the Stalinists were now portrayed as being aligned with Hillman and not Lewis as was the case before. Indeed, from the line of supporting Lewis, the Stalinists had switched to Hillman. On June 22, 1941 the Nazi Army attacked the Soviet Union and caused an immediate switch in the Stalinist line. The open support by the Hillman faction to the Roosevelt administration fitted right into the new Stalinist policy while the verbal anti-Roosevelt gestures of Lewis were no longer in accord with the changed Stalinist line. The Stalinist gang promptly dropped Lewis like a hot potato and hooked their followers to Hillman whom they had been cursing the day before. On the night of the 21st of June the American Stalinist workers had gone to bed on the line of supporting Lewis as against Hillman. When they arose the next morning they learned that it was really Hillman who was the "progressive" and Lewis the reactionary. Just as the unsuspecting Stalinist workers are used as so many pawns in the crooked Stalinist machinations so are the honest but uninformed Trotsky workers used depending on what is factionally expedient for Cannon. The Stalinist bureaucrats, before they switched to Hillman, had invented "principled" issues to justify their support to Lewis; now Cannon resurrected this same Stalinist "theoretical" hokum and presented it to their followers as a Marxian analysis.

Was there even a grain of truth to the new Trotskyite story about the Lewis policy being one of "resistance" to government strike-breaking? Was it true to fact that the Lewis led faction "reflected correctly the needs and desires of the masses of workers"? Here is what the Trotskyites themselves revealed in the period when they were feigning an air of opposition to the Stalinist fakery on Lewis:

"While the labor movement will never learn how, at various secret conferences between the President and the two labor leaders, Lewis and Green planned to put the workers of the two labor bodies at the disposal of the war department..." (Socialist Appeal, April 4, 1939 my emphasis-A.B.)

There was not an iota of difference in fundamental union policies between Lewis and Hillman. When Cannon had no special factional interest at stake, he stated openly that:

"Like Hillman, Lewis dislikes strikes and militant trade union methods, and prefers 'good relations' with the bosses. Like Hillman, Lewis wants above all 'good relations' with the capitalist government." (Socialist Appeal, Nov. 2, 1940 p. 1)

There were no principled issues dividing Lewis from Hillman; their rotten squabble was nothing but a clique fight. Cannon not only knew that there were no principled issues dividing Lewis from Hillman and that their rotten squabble was nothing but a clique fight but he even recorded this paramount feature in his own paper:



"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, Sept. 28, 1940. Editorial page)

However, when Lewis happened to fit into the Trotskyite maneuvers in Minneapolis, Cannon "forgot" these few fragments of truth about Lewis and Hillman being birds of a feather, deceived the workers and threw his weight behind Lewis, lying that Lewis differed in principle from Hillman.

Lewis reciprocated by providing the Trotsky leaders with some statements protesting the Tobin union persecutions and the Tobin-approved F.B.I. persecutions which were cooked up against the Trotsky leaders at that time. In return, Lewis gained the Trotskyite support and thereby acquired a new ally in his factional struggle against Hillman. Cannon and Co. were fully conscious of the treachery involved in calling upon the workers to support Lewis. The Trotskyite switch to Lewis had a reactionary anti-working class significance which truly expresses the meaning of Cannon's brand of mass work. A year before their switch, when the horse-deal with Lewis was not yet in view the Trotsky leaders themselves explained precisely what supporting Lewis meant!:

"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 working class into the hands of their enemies."  
(Socialist Appeal, July 6, 1940. p.4)

We agree one hundred percent with these words. On our part, we have declared the above time and again and have never gone back on them. But to Cannon and Co. the truth is made to serve factional maneuvers. When it suits his purposes Cannon will tell the truth such as the above citation on the meaning of supporting Lewis. But when his clique purposes require it, Cannon will unhesitatingly discard the truth and use outright lies to put over his opportunist policies.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

The clique fight between Hillman and Lewis came to an end with Lewis' withdrawal from the CIO. In throwing his support to Willkie Lewis had promised that he would resign from the leadership of the CIO in the event of Roosevelt's reelection. Lewis miscalculated badly and was forced to go through with his widely heralded promise. He turned over the presidency to his personal henchman, Phillip Murray, who had worked as Lewis' stooge in the building of the gangster machine in the United Mine Workers Union. But when Murray was awarded the presidency of the CIO he developed ambitions of his own and knifed his former boss. Lewis had no course open but to get out of the CIO altogether and attempt to patch up matters with his old cronies in the AFL leadership. With Lewis out from power and Murray, Hillman, and the Stalinists in a united front in the CIO leadership, the Trotsky leaders were left high and dry and vented their disappointment by cursing the ousted Lewis who now could be of no use to them.

"For one, John L. Lewis has lost his commanding position in the CIO and the American trade union movement. For another, he sees no

reasonable prospect of regaining it so long as the CIO exists in its present form and with its present leadership. For a third, he now seeks a working collaboration with the Tobins, Wolls, Hutcheson's, et al., of the present AFL Executive Council, as an aid to restoring himself to his former influence, even if this has to be achieved at the expense of the industrial unions- excepting his own miner's union, of course." (The Militant, Jan 24, 1942. Editorial)

Now that Lewis was no longer in a position to favor the Minneapolis union in the CIO, Cannon lost, <sup>for the moment</sup> all reasons for inventing stories about why it was in the interests of the working class to support Lewis. Accordingly, Cannon and Co. recovered from their attack of amnesia in so far as Lewis was concerned and recalled that his policy was class- collaborationist after all:

"He pleads the self-same argument that the employers and all the reactionaries are advancing to force the CIO into the AFL under any terms. The bosses view the unification of the labor movement as a means of binding the unions to the war machine, destroying their independence and curbing their freedom of action. The employers and their press will undoubtedly hail the proposal of Lewis- he whom they damned such a short while ago." (Ibid.)

The reader will have observed the chronology of the Trotskyite flip flops on Lewis in a couple of years. In 1940 Lewis was delivering the American working class into the hands of their class enemies. (Socialist Appeal, July 6, 1940.) In 1941 the Lewis gang "reflected correctly the needs and desires of the masses of workers." (The Militant, Aug. 30, 1941) In 1942, back to the truth that Lewis was simply an agent of the bosses. In 1943, as the next section will show, it was back to the lie again that Lewis was acting in the interests of the workers. (The Militant, May 15, 1943) As a matter of record, that is the precise pattern of the Trotsky manipulations in the trade unions from the inception of the Trotsky group to this day.

TO BE CONTINUED.

-----

NOTICE TO THE READER-

This series contains a documentary history of the work of Cannon and Shachtman in the trade unions from the formation of the Trotsky group in 1928. The earlier installments deal with the period of Dual Unionism (1929-1932) when the Trotskyites were supporting the Stalinist fakery of "Red Unions", the fraudulent manipulations with the Progressive Miners of America, the sell-out of the 1934 Teamsters strikes in Minneapolis, the unprincipled zigzag to Lewis during the formation of the CIO, the bloc with Homer Martin in the U.A.W., and the bloc with Stalinism in the Food Workers Union. These issues are still available:

- PART I- THE PERIOD OF DUAL UNIONISM (1928-1932)
- PART II- THE MINNEAPOLIS TEAMSTERS STRIKES OF 1934.
- PART III- THE PERIOD OF THE FORMATION OF THE C.I.O.
- PART IV - THE TROTSKYITES IN THE U.A.W.
- PART V - THE SELL-OUT OF THE FOOD WORKERS.

WRITE IN FOR THESE INSTALLMENTS - -FIVE CENTS PER COPY-  
Address: P.O. Box 67, Station D., New York City

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*  
\* GOLDMAN ON SHACHTMAN \*  
\* AND SHACHTMAN ON GOLDMAN \*  
\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Recently, Albert Goldman carried through a split from the Cannonite Socialist Workers Party and went over to the Shachtmanite Workers Party. In the course of Goldman's bickering with Cannon he revealed some significant information about some past maneuvering of the Cannon-Shachtman leadership. Goldman's revelation concerns the Cannon-Shachtman application of the "French Turn" to the American Trotsky section when it entered the American Socialist Party in June 1936. The relevant facts on the affair cast an interesting light on the political nature of Cannon, Shachtman and Goldman himself.

About two years before the Trotskyite entry into the Socialist Party on May 26, 1934, The Militant published an article by Albert Goldman called "The Left Face of the Socialist Party." That article repudiated the idea that the American branch of Social Democracy could be revolutionized and it attacked those who thought that the line of proletarian dictatorship could be reconciled with membership in the S.P. However, about two months later, Trotsky advocated the entry of the French Trotskyites into the party of Leon Blum. A tremendous crisis was caused by this "French Turn" in the entire Trotskyite movement. In the U.S. the overwhelming mass of the rank-and-file Trotsky workers explicitly rejected any such orientation toward the American Socialist Party. Goldman, on the other hand, was shrewd enough to understand that the "French Turn" was the beginning of an international orientation and that sooner or later it would be applied by the American Trotsky movement. Without waiting for any further formalities, Goldman quickly reversed the stand which he had taken in his article on May 26, 1934 and in the Fall of 1934 dived headlong into the embrace of Norman Thomas.

Cannon-Shachtman had a strong internal opposition to deal with and thus had to move more cautiously. They even created the impression that they were unconditionally opposed to the extension of the French Turn to America. In line with that attitude, on Nov. 3, 1934 the National Committee of the American Trotsky organization officially denounced Goldman as a capitulator and reiterated the stand that the Socialist Party was hopelessly bankrupt and could not be "revolutionized." Goldman's move was labelled "the act of a strikebreaker." (The Militant, Nov. 17, 1934. y emphasis-A.B:)

The official statement of the Cannon-Shachtman leadership contained one interesting fact about Goldman's maneuvering. It seems that Goldman had gone behind the back of his own organization before thrashing out his new line with the rank-and-file:

"In taking the position stated Goldman also violated elementary discipline of the League by submitting his views to non-League members, including members of the Socialist Party, before thrashing them out in his own organization." (The Militant, Nov. 3, 1934)

From that time on, until 1936, Goldman's name became a curse on the lips of the Trotskyite workers and a symbol of political double-dealing.

Meanwhile, Cannon and Shachtman were cautiously moving toward the same line as Goldman, though with different methods. In Dec. 1934 they fused with the left-Social Democrat, Muste, and kept assuring their followers that they had no intention whatsoever of entering the Socialist Party. Only several weeks before Cannon-Shachtman actually duplicated Goldman's move, they attacked any ideas of unity with the S.P.:

"It is necessary not merely to understand that social-democratic reformism is bankrupt; but, positively, to break sharply from Social Democracy; and this sharp break can be decisively accomplished only by embracing and adhering firmly to the principles of revolutionary Marxism." (New Militant, April 18, 1936 p.1 My emphasis-A.)

But in June 1936 Cannon-Shachtman did a quick-change act and plunged into the S.P. with the solemn repetition of the excuse that the S.P. could be "revolutionized" after all!

Up to now the Trotskyite workers have been led to believe that Cannon-Shachtman seriously reevaluated their previous position and that this motivated their sudden reversal. Goldman, however, has now told what actually happened. In the recent S.W.P. faction fight the Cannon bunch was badgering Goldman for carrying on negotiations with Shachtman while he was still a leading member of the S.W.P. Goldman turned on his tormentors and spilled the beans about their own double-dealing when they pushed their followers into the S.P. in 1936. The information was given by Goldman at an S.W.P. Plenum in Oct. 1945, reprinted in an Internal Bulletin and republished by Shachtman:

"Here I want to repeat the charge I made before, that during the period just prior to the entry of Trotskyists into the Socialist Party, Cannon, Shachtman and Burnham secretly held conversations with leaders of the S.P., at a time when the majority of the Political Committee was against entry." (The New International, Feb. 1946. My emphasis-A.B.)

Goldman here reveals a bureaucratic act on the part of the Cannon-Shachtman leadership which involved double-crossing the membership and acting behind the back of the rank-and-file. This also shows up Goldman who later became a bosom companion of Cannon and Shachtman while they all roosted in the S.P. Goldman kept this secret from the Trotskyite rank-and-file all these years and revealed it only in self-protection from attacks by Cannon in the recent S.W.P. faction fight. And since Goldman wanted to keep a path clear to join with Shachtman, he defended this double-dealing in retelling the incident by stating that he was only proving that substance is more important than form. (Ibid.) The revolutionary workers will draw different conclusions from this illuminating example of Stalinist skullduggery. Cannon and Shachtman deceived the rank-and-file of their own organization and secretly committed their followers to a policy which the majority of the organization opposed.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

Shachtman, for his own factional reasons, printed Goldman's revelation without a word of comment. It is quite characteristic of Shachtman to keep mum about the bureaucratic maneuvers which he

carried out in common with Cannon. But Shachtman makes certain to give Goldman a clean bill of health for the sell-out which he accused him of committing in 1934. At that time, Goldman was branded as a "strikebreaker." But now when Goldman broke from Cannon and joined Shachtman, the latter made haste to tell the workers of the new important acquisition. Accordingly, the readers of the Shachtmanite paper were given a biographical portrait of the new distinguished recruit. Here is what it had to say on the period when Goldman was castigated as a strikebreaker:

"When the left wing movement began to gain strength and significance in the Socialist Party between 1934 and 1936, comrade Goldman joined the Socialist Party and became the outstanding spokesman of its Marxist wing." (Labor Action, June 17, 1946)

Thus Labor Action whitewashes Albert Goldman on a very vital phase of his political biography and leaves the former accusation of strikebreaking unrepudiated and unacknowledged. It is merely a continuation of the double-dealing which Shachtman shared in common with Cannon while in the leadership of the Trotsky organization. These factional flim-flams are symptomatic of the political machinations of both the official and "unofficial" Trotsky organizations.

A.B.  
July, 1946.

H A V E Y O U R E A D T H E S E P A M P H L E T S ?

Pages from Trotsky's Political History  
Cannon's "Struggle For a Proletarian Party"  
The Trotsky School of Falsification  
    Part I (17 Articles.)  
    Part II (16 Articles.)  
After Sixteen Years of Silence  
    (On Trotsky's article- "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?")  
Marx On A Sham War.

SEND FOR YOUR COPY.....\$.05 each

TO BE PUBLISHED SOON:

C H I N A ( 1931-1946 )

- 1- The Japanese Invasions
- 2- The Line of the Chinese Bourgeoisie
- 3- Policy of World Imperialism
- 4- The Role of Stalinism

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO: P.O. Box 67  
Station D  
New York City

FROM THE ARCHIVES

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \*  
 \* THE DECLARATION OF OCTOBER 16, 1926.  
 \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

Editorial Note:

Unable to refute our exposure of Trotsky as a loyal "oppos. ist" and political collaborator of Stalin, the Trotsky leaders have maintained, officially, a stony silence on the evidence we have unearthed. However, echoes of their unofficial attempts to "dismiss" our disclosures have been reaching us for some time. It appears that their ready retort to workers who raise questions in regard to the evidence presented by us, is that we took citations out of the context in which they appeared in the original documents. We shall try to nail that tricky method of "refutation" by further authenticating our charges against Trotsky through the publication of full documents of the Trotsky "Left Opposition"- for the most part, documents which the Cannon and Shachtman leadership will never dare to print.

The documentary story of the ignoble role of the Left Opposition is a closed and sealed book in so far as the Trotsky leadership is concerned. Just as Stalin dares not publish Lenin's Testament, Lenin's letters and notes on the Georgian question, so the Trotsky leaders dare not print certain Trotsky writings of the "Opposition" period. The fear in both cases is of a kindred nature: to keep the truth from the workers.

The first Trotsky document we reprint deals with the aftermath of the only attempt of the Opposition Bloc to sally into the open before the Russian Communist Party early in October 1926 in an effort to launch a political discussion. Several days after this move the leaders of the Opposition, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and others issued a document known as the October 16 Declaration. We have hitherto printed passages from this revealing document in The Bulletin articles on Trotsky's participation in the Stalinist degeneration. These passages deal with the Trotsky confession that he and his associates had violated the Stalin discipline and orders not to present their "views" to the Party membership, along with Trotsky's condemnation of criticism of the Comintern and disassociation with any one who carried on any agitation against the Stalinist Comintern. The reader will find in the document an attack by Trotsky, Zinoviev, and Kamenev against the international sections which offered the Opposition bloc support against Stalin. As will be clear to any honest reader, Trotsky threw himself completely at the factional mercy of Stalin's Central Committee and Central Control Commission at the head of which stood Stalin's strong man, Ordzhonikidze. Last but not least, in addition to all the "confessions" there is a pledge to aid the Stalin faction in suppressing the Trotsky faction.

Let the reader judge whether we distort the context of the Declaration when we conclude that the document manifests the capitulatory, cringing policy Trotsky pursued, a policy which gradually led the unfortunate opposition workers and the Trotsky opportunist leaders themselves to a terrible fate.

DECLARATION OF THE OPPOSITION

Following declaration, signed by Comrades Zinoviev, Trotzky, Djatakov, Sokolnikov and Jevdokimov has been published in the

At the XIV. Party Congress of the C.P. of the Soviet Union and onwards, we disagreed with the majority of the Party Conference and of the Central Committee in a number of questions of principle. Our views are laid down in official documents as well as in speeches delivered by us at the Party Conference, in the Plenum of the Central Committee and in the Polbureau. We also stand at present on the basis of these views. We decidedly reject however the theory and the practice of 'freedom of fractions and groupings', and recognize that such a theory and practice are contrary to Leninism and the decisions of the Party. We consider it our duty to carry out the decisions of the Party regarding the impermissibility of fractional activity. At the same time we consider it <sup>to be</sup> our duty to admit openly before the Party that we and our supporters, in putting forward our views on a number of occasions after the XIV. Party Conference, have committed acts which violated Party discipline and that we have followed a fractional course which goes beyond the limits of ideological struggle within the Party laid down by the Party. In recognizing these acts as wrong, we declare that we emphatically renounce the fractional methods of propagating our views, as these methods endanger the unity of the Party, and we call upon all comrades who share our views to do the same. We call for the immediate dissolution of all fractional groupings which have been formed round the views of the Opposition. At the same time we admit that by our appearance in Moscow and in Leningrad in October we violated the decision of the Central Committee on the impermissibility of a discussion, in that we opened such a discussion against the decisions of the Central Committee. It was equally wrong to mention the Stockholm Conference at the XIV. Party Conference, for this remark could be regarded as a hint and a threat of a split, although this was in no way intended by Comrade Krupskaya. We unanimously repudiate such a prospect, which is harmful and has nothing in common with our standpoint. We emphatically condemn such a criticism of the Comintern or the policy of our Party which goes over to incitement, which weakens the position of the Comintern as the fighting organization of the international proletariat, of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as the outpost of the Comintern, or of the Soviet Union as the first state of the proletarian dictatorship. Not only the agitation of Korsch and his consorts who have broken with Communism, but anybody who goes beyond these limits will meet with energetic resistance on our part. We emphatically deny the right of those who carry on an agitation of any sort against the Comintern, the C.P. of the Soviet Union or the Soviet Union, to lay claim to any solidarity with us.

While recognizing the right of every member of the Comintern to advocate his views within the limits of the statutes and decisions of the Congresses of the Comintern and of the E.C.C.I., we consider it as absolutely impermissible to support either directly or indirectly the fractionalism of any group in the various sections of the Comintern against the line of the Comintern, be it the Souvarine group in France, the Maslov-Ruth Fischer-Urbahns-Weber group in Germany, the Bordiga group in Italy or any other group, no matter what their attitude may be towards our views. We consider as particularly impermissible any support of the activity of persons such