

# THE BULLETIN

## THE ONCOMING WAR

THOMAS F. HARDEN

## The Tito Rebellion

## THE ROOTS OF STALIN'S RUSSIAN PATRIOTISM

GEORGE MARLEN

## *Stalin a Dictator in 1918*

G. M.

## THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION TROTSKY'S ALLEGED FIGHT IN 1923

THE RED STAR PRESS  
P. O. BOX 67, COOPER STATION, NEW YORK

THE BULLETIN  
of the  
WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

Vol. XI - No. 2 ( Whole Number 53)

Nov. Dec. 1948

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

|   | <u>PAGE</u> |
|---|-------------|
| The Tito Rebellion<br>-- Thomas F. Harden   | 1           |
| The Trotskyites and The Tito-Stalin Break<br>-- George Harlen                                     | 3           |
| The Oncoming War and The Tasks of the Proletarian Vanguard<br>-- T.F.H.                           | 10          |
| On The British Trotskyites -<br>A Letter to the W.L.R.P. from Arthur Priest                       | 21          |
| The Roots of Stalinist Russian Patriotism<br>-- G.M.  | 24          |
| Stalin A Dictator in 1918<br>-- G.M.  | 28          |
| *****   |             |
| THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION:<br>Trotsky's Alleged Fight Against Stalin in 1923<br>-- G.M. | 31          |

---

The Red Star Press  
P.O.Box 67     Cooper Station  
New York, N.Y.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* THE TITO REBELLION \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

On June 28, 1948, the entire world was amazed by a document emanating from the Prague meeting of the Cominform denouncing Tito and the whole leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia as "creating a hateful policy in relation to the Soviet Union and to the All Union Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)." This document and the reply of the Yugoslavian CP revealed the fact that the conflict had been going on underground for some months and that the June 28 blast was just the official declaration of a war that had been raging under cover of silence.

This rebellion of Tito is one of the most significant events in the history of the Comintern. There had been seeming revolts before, in practically every country in which there was a Stalinist party, but all the previous ones had been artificially induced internal convulsions for the purpose of centralizing the power of the masters of the Kremlin. This time it was the supporters of the Kremlin who were crushed. Holding in his hands the power not only of the party, but of the State as well, Tito was able to crush any potential threat to his rule. Formerly the process within the Comintern had been that the liquidation of every "revolt"

had resulted in bureaucratic centralism being further strengthened. Now a new feature made its appearance denoting a process of bureaucratic decentralism. The significance of this can only be seen in a recital and analysis of the facts.

On March 20, 1948, the Russian Stalinist Central Committee addressed a letter to the Parties of the Cominform with the significant exception of the Yugoslav Party which anticipated the attack of June 28. Subsequently the charges were repeated by similar letters from all the Parties except the Italian and French. It is obvious that prior to these letters the Russian Stalinists must have already failed in their endeavors to control the Tito Party by covert means. This is borne out by the subsequent charge that Tito had not only "discredited Soviet specialists" and had them shadowed but that the same fate had happened to "Comrade Judin" representative of the Cominform in Belgrade. Still more Tito had taken a leaf from the Moscow purges and had purged from the Party and the State Zuyovitch and Hebrang, stooges of Stalin, and was about to purge them from life itself.

Faced with revolt for the first time by an opposition having state power in its hands, and for that very reason unable to stifle it, nay more, finding its own forces being stifled and liquidated, the Russian Stalinist bureaucracy was forced to come out into the open, which it did on June 28. After the necessary preparations, the Cominform was convened and a terrific blast launched at the Titoists. Stripping this document of its "cover" phrases the charges amount to accusations of nationalism, bureaucratism, and capitulation to capitalism. Tito and Kardelji, formerly lauded to the skies as "great leaders of the proletariat," "bearers of the Marxist-Leninist traditions" now become revisors of Marxism seeking to lead Yugoslavia back to a kulak state.

In its reply of June 29 the Tito Central Committee took particular pains to disassociate itself from capitalism, to declare its solidarity with the Soviet Union and "all the democratic countries," even to acknowledge the ideological hegemony of the Russian Stalinists but to demand that it be accorded a right to independence within the framework of the bureaucratic structure.

This the Russian Stalinist leaders could not permit. The Cominform,

now urged of the Tito dissentients came out with a lead editorial reprinted in the July 11 "Sunday Worker" which stated categorically that the Russian Stalinist leadership, organizationally and not only ideologically must be recognized by all the "Communist Parties" throughout the world.

The Titoists reply to this was to cut loose the most important moorings by summoning a Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia which served as a bureaucratic "Declaration of Independence." The building in which this congress was held was surrounded by anti-aircraft batteries.

At this Congress where Byzantine adulation of Tito was reminiscent of the similar sickening Russian sycophancy to Stalin and the mummification of Lenin, nationalism of the Yugoslav variety took a further step on July 23 by demanding that the pro-Russian government of Bulgaria grant autonomy to the Macedonians of Pirin, a small section of the land that remains within Bulgaria.

The last fact of importance to date is that at the Danubian conference being held in Belgrade the Russian and the Yugoslav bureaucrats "marched separately and struck together" against the imperialist powers on the issues of the control of the Danube and of Trieste.

We have now arrived at the point where it is necessary to break down the separate facts, arrange them into an orderly pattern and see what kind of a picture they present. Many years ago we of the IRRP began to investigate the system which issued out of the October revolution. Gradually we not only came to the conclusion but proved that from the very first day of that revolution the Party bureaucracy had usurped to itself the political and economic fruits of the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. We proved that this bureaucracy was animated solely by the desire to keep power. It had a dual task, to prevent military overthrow by imperialism and, still more important, to prevent an upsurge anywhere that would lead to its overthrow by the world proletariat. The latter it accomplishes by harnessing the rising masses to its counter revolutionary Comintern by the system of ultra right and ultra left zigzags.

With the launching of the imperialist attack on the Soviet Union every effort was bent by the Stalinists to prevent their military overthrow. In these efforts tremendous concessions were made to nationalism which became the theme everywhere within the Comintern. With the failure of the Nazi imperialist spearhead at Stalingrad world imperialism changed its policy and set the stage for the present war situation by its policy of "appeasement" designed to make Stalin look like a new Hitler. As an integral part of this policy Yugoslavia was turned over to Stalin's then tool, Tito, while Mikhailovitch, the agent of the Yugoslavian bourgeoisie, was sold down the river by the Anglo-American imperialists.

A most peculiar phenomenon resulted. The imperialists sacrificed the property of the Yugoslav urban and rural bourgeoisie and assisted in the creation of a bureaucratic-nationalist workers state. But Tito, desirous of usurping the fruits of the bourgeois expropriation for his bureaucracy rather than the Russian, knowing full well that the next step in the ordinary development of Russian bureaucratic centralism would be not only the loss of his power but of his life, took advantage of the situation to establish a national-bureaucratic regime of his own, using the same methods of bureaucratic suppression, terror, and liquidation that he had learned from Stalin, but this time against the Russian bureaucratic forces themselves. But Yugoslavia can not remain suspended in mid air. By the very nature of its property system it can not align with the imperialists. Tito is therefore forced to attempt to accelerate the decentralizing forces within

the bureaucratic structure, to weaken the Stalin forces in the satellite countries, to set up a whole ideological and organisational structure of "socialism in several countries", at the same time clinging to the Russian bureaucracy in a military-political sense.

The crack in the Stalinist structure in the case of Yugoslavia is the first but by no means will it be the last. This is shown by the desperate attitude of the Russian bureaucracy. The first task of the proletarian vanguard is to study and digest the lessons of the whole phenomenon. But very probably little time is left for study alone. The Tito rebellion presents two very important practical dangers. The first is the illusion that there is anything of subjective value to the world proletariat in the national-bureaucratic rebellion. It must be burned into the consciousness of the proletarian vanguard that Tito represents the same system of oppression and exploitation as Stalin. Socialism can only be achieved on a global scale and only on the basis of world workers' democracy. The second danger is any slightest capitulation to the idea that the Russian bureaucrats represent in this situation "internationalism" as against national bureaucratism. The fight between Moscow and Belgrade is a naked brutal struggle for power between two usurping bureaucracies equally opposed to Socialism, equally counter-revolutionary. Particularly must the Trotskyite workers break from their leadership, cease overt and covert support to bureaucratism in the Moscow or Belgrade camp and create with us now the cadres of a real Workers World Party that will march on to the destruction of capitalism and of every counter-revolutionary national bureaucratic workers state. If this is done the Tito-Stalin split, tremendously weakening the whole bureaucratic structure objectively, will be of immeasurable assistance to the world proletariat.

Thomas F. Harden

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* THE TROTSKYITES AND THE TITO-STALIN BREAK \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

### THE CANNON TROTSKYITES

Every major historical event puts into sharp relief the character of every political tendency operating in modern society. One such event is the Tito-Stalin split, and it helps to illustrate once again the political essence of the Trotsky movement.

In their first reaction to the wide crack in the Stalinist bureaucratic structure, the Cannon Trotskyites reflected: "Tito's greatest crime apparently lies in aping Stalin a little too closely." (The Militant, July 5, 1948)

This is reasonably close to fact. Encouraged by his spectacular military achievements and factional successes in his own Yugoslavia, Tito, an ambitious political adventurer, resolved to strike out on his own and model his dictatorship on the Kremlin pattern. The Cannon leaders fully recognize the personal character of the Tito regime:

"Like his mater in the Kremlin, Tito has prepared himself against any unpleasant 'surprises' by a preventive purge of his government and party, removing in advance all those whose personal loyalty to him was doubtful." (Ibid.)

It is obvious that the organizational separation of Tito from Stalin and the resultant enhancement of Tito's dictatorial power over Yugoslavia did not change one iota the political Stalinist nature of his regime nor did it open the avenue to liberation for the Yugoslav masses. If anything the development at this moment is in the direction of intensification of Great Serbian nationalism and

the tightening of the grip of the Tito gang over the masses.

At first the Cannon Trotskyites, it appeared, were inclined to adopt this view. But soon the smokescreen of correct-sounding phrases was lifted and the Trotskyist policy of deception was put forward:

"The people of Yugoslavia are now in a position where they can strike out on the road of socialism." (The Militant, July 12, 1948)

What did the Cannon leaders seek to accomplish with this fraud? Their aim, obviously, was to obscure the fact that today, as before the Tito-Stalin break, the Yugoslav masses are saddled with a section of the counter-revolutionary Stalinist bureaucracy which now, just as before, holds them from striking out on the road to Socialism. Nor is it difficult to see the purpose behind this piece of political deceit. It was introduced to pave the way for a line of "critical" support to Tito and thus give the impression to the Trotsky workers that they were fighting Stalinism. A lucid expression of this line was soon to follow. The Trotsky leadership addressed a letter to the Tito Stalinists in which deception and hypocrisy were made to serve the desired ends:

"Keep up your fight! Deepen the significance of your struggle with Moscow and its international machine! Do not yield to imperialist pressures! Establish a regime of genuine workers' democracy in your party and in your country! Thereby you will contribute immensely to the rebirth of the international workers movement." (International Secretariat of The Fourth International, The Militant, July 26, 1948)

This letter contains only one sincerely-meant word, the word "Comrades", for, indeed, the Trotsky leaders and the Stalinist bureaucrats are political comrades.

That the Trotsky leadership is part of the Stalinist fraternity we have long established through original documentary sources. The roots of this political affinity are buried in the origin of Stalin's power and set down in the authentic historical records. Many months before the birth of the Trotsky Opposition Lenin had laid down the line of removing Stalin from power. Trotsky was fully appraised of this, as he himself testifies in My Life: "Lenin was now preparing not only to remove Stalin from his post of general secretary, but to disqualify him before the party as well." (p. 480). According to Trotsky, the execution block of Stalin's career was to be the Twelfth Congress of the Russian Communist Party scheduled in the Spring of 1923. Trotsky, on the other hand, pursued an opposite line which he revealed in his talk with Kamenev. Trotsky said: "I am against removing Stalin..." (p. 486). And indeed at the Twelfth Congress Trotsky and Stalin stood united on all questions. The speeches of both mark complete solidarity in the face of Lenin's line which demanded the removal of Stalin. Only a month before, Trotsky testifies, Lenin had broken all comradely relations with Stalin. This was known to Trotsky on the same day the break occurred. (p. 485) Yet at the Twelfth Congress Trotsky and Stalin were comrades, not only organizationally but above all, politically. This is borne out by the minutes of the Congress, by the official Soviet press and by Trotsky's own writings. The records stand, and no amount of silence or of lying can erase them.

Aware of the fact that the knowledge of Trotsky's true role in the Stalinist development is still an unknown chapter to the proletariat, the Trotsky leaders write today with self-assurance:

"It is incumbent, especially for the followers of the Stalinist parties, now to review and reconsider the whole struggle between Trotskyism and Stalinism in the light of the Yugoslav events." (The Militant, July 19, 1948)

The Cannon leaders know that to discover the truth about Trotsky and Stalin one must pore through a thousand documents, an exertion they do not expect from the followers of Stalin, nor from their own. We hold that it is imperative for all vanguard workers to study the genesis of Stalin's power and Trotsky's role and compare the Trotsky opposition with the Tito rebellion.

What really caused the rise of the Trotsky Opposition? At the Twelfth Congress in April 1923 complete unanimity prevailed between Stalin and Trotsky. After the Congress Stalin and his partners, Zinoviev and Kamenev, launched a secret campaign to undermine Trotsky who stood above them in prestige, popularity and ability. Outwardly all was peaceful as before. A portion of the leadership, some personal friends of Trotsky, alarmed by the anti-Trotsky intrigue formed a group named the Moscow Opposition. Trotsky officially stood aloof from the Opposition and even issued a resolution together with Stalin (Dec. 6, 1923) purporting to herald a new course for the Party and the State. The Moscow Opposition, on the other hand, submitted a resolution of its own.

A few days later Stalin openly attacked Trotsky for his refusal to take an unequivocal stand on the Moscow Opposition and drew the conclusion that Trotsky was rendering the Opposition a diplomatic support. In a test of strength in the Party, half of the membership, nearly 350,000 sided with the Opposition, therefore, by the general understanding with Trotsky.

Did Trotsky utilize this immense support to open a drive against Stalin? Did he reveal to the workers the Leningrad which called for the removal of Stalin? Did he make a statement regarding the insidious Stalin and his partners concocted against him personally? No, Trotsky maintained unbroken silence regarding all these vital points. And in a public declaration he told the workers that his silence was correct and in the interests of the Party. (Pravda, Dec. 18, 1923). He thus left his supporters disarmed politically and therefore at Stalin's mercy. Such was the ignominious birth and infancy of the Trotsky movement.

Tito is a minor figure compared with Trotsky. For many years he was just another Browder, ruling the Yugoslav section of the Comintern by the sanction of Stalin. In the process of war Tito rose as a military leader and as the Nazis and the Yugoslav bourgeoisie were removed from power, Tito acquired control of the country. Having become the ruler of a State, Tito grew independent-minded. Unlike Trotsky, he organized his Party forces for a rebellion against Stalin's domination. Here then that, he smashed Stalin's faction in Yugoslavia.

Whereas Trotsky, who was the idol of the Red Army masses, resigned his post as the head of all the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. and thus handed over to Stalin the strongest instrument of authority (Pravda, Jan. 20, 1925), Tito based himself on this instrument to secure independence off Stalin. And when Tito at the Yugoslav Party Congress flung his challenge to his former master, he surrounded the building with anti-aircraft guns as a warning to Stalin.

Whereas Trotsky issued his abject Declaration of October 16, 1926 in which he confessed "errors" and obligated himself to abide by the decisions of Stalin's Central Committee, Tito does not go down on his knees and recants but throws defiance in the face of Stalin's Central Committee. Trotsky's policy was "peace-making and reconciliation." (Letter to Luralov), Tito's policy is armed struggle if Stalin attempts to cross the boundary of Yugoslavia. Where Trotsky maintained silence, Tito speaks. He repels Stalin's assault with the declaration that the "charges put forth by the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) grounded on slanders, fabrications..." (The New York Times, June 30, 1948) Trotsky, when he was still a member of the powerful Politburo, member of the Comintern Executive and Commissar of War never used such an open, defiant language

in the face of the "theoretical" frame up cooked up by Stalin's Central Committee. He shielded Stalin against exposure and, after having aided Stalin to conceal Lenin's Testament, he lied publicly that Lenin left no Testament (Trotsky's Statement on Eastman, 1925).

Today the Trotsky leaders peddle the story that Trotsky fought Stalin like a lion and only due to the adverse objective conditions he went down in heroic defeat. However, when Trotsky just arrived in his Turkish exile, in 1929, he wrote that he had done his utmost to avoid a struggle and that he deliberately chose defeat (Six Articles for the Bourgeois Press). About Tito no one can say, least of all Tito himself, that he avoids a struggle and seeks defeat. Tito does not issue capitulatory documents like the October 16, 1926 Declaration of the Opposition, or the cringing statement of December 3, 1927, begging for readmission into Stalin's organization.

Tito rebelled and snapped the ties with the Cominform. He does not label his party a section of the Cominform. The Trotsky leaders, on the other hand, for many years called their movement a fraction of the Comintern, long after the Comintern had disrupted the revolutionary situation in Germany in 1923, destroyed the Chinese Revolution of 1925-27, betrayed the British workers in 1926, and for a while even after the Comintern brought Hitler to power in 1933.

While Tito's split with Stalin is clearcut, and irreparable, yet underneath the break Tito and Stalin are united politically because they are inextricably enmeshed in the same political system. The Belgrade gang is tied to the Moscow gang with a thousand unbreakable criminal threads. Both against the proletariat and against the military threat of the bourgeoisie, Tito and Stalin must stand shoulder to shoulder. This basic fact has been concretely demonstrated in the Tito-Stalin unity on the Danubian issue. The bourgeois observers marked this fact:

"Their behavior at the Danube Conference is pretty convincing evidence that Russia and Yugoslavia stand firmly together in their relations with the Western World." (The New York Times, August 9, 1948).

The fundamental truth about the internal convulsions of the Stalinist system is that no matter how wide the personal and organizational break among its parts, no matter how savage is the NKVD's persecution of the Trotskyites, Zinovievites, Bukharinites in Russia and how base and slanderous are recriminations and abuse passing between the Tito and the Stalin bandits, no matter how strong is Cannon's language in referring to Stalinism as the syphilis of the labor movement, politically they are all of the same essence. It is perfectly in line with this fact that Cannon's Socialist Workers Party leaders address Tito and his counter-revolutionary gang as "comrades," and it is no accident that in the letter to the American Stalin bureaucrats, who had a hand behind the GPU assassination of Trotsky, the Cannon crew calls them "comrades." Indeed, they are comrades all.

#### THE SHACHTMAN TROTSKYITES

In a slashing criticism of Cannon's comradely message to Tito, the leaders of the Shachtman Workers Party evaluate the policy of the Cannon organization with these words:

"The political line of Cannonism is that of a 'left' critical appendage of Stalinism, a 'democratic' wing of Stalinism, so to speak." (Labor Action, August 16, 1948).



This is a fairly accurate appraisal of the Cannon politics. However, the Shachtman leaders leave several things unexplained and one vital matter not only concealed but definitely distorted. It is well known that the masses of the Comintern as well as the workers who follow Cannon, believe that Cannon's political line is sharply antagonistic to Stalinism. By dint of what magic does Cannon succeed in appending his organization politically to the Stalinist system without being suspected by his followers?

It requires no special keenness of insight to observe that Cannon employs an old trick used by opportunists for generations. A fierce verbal blast is leveled against capitalism and under the cover of this blast the trusting followers are lined up in support of some position or somebody that defends and perpetuates capitalism. The verbal appearance leaves a lasting impression on the mind, while the concrete momentary acts of the real policy leaves only a fleeting recollection if at all.

In the Tito case the Cannon maneuver is simplified by the fact that on the surface Tito appears to have broken not only with the Kremlin Dictator and his satellite stooges in all countries, but also with the Stalinist politics. Since the spirit of antagonism in the mind of Cannon's followers is directed against Stalin more than against Stalin's henchmen, Cannon induces his followers to give Tito critical support in his fight with Stalin. Once this is accomplished they, without realizing it, are attached to Stalinism because Tito's politics is Stalinism. And Tito is only one of the Stalinist connecting links to which Cannon fastens his followers.

More often Cannon ties his followers to bureaucrats and politicians who, unlike Tito, maintain direct or indirect organizational connections with Stalin. The political path of Trotskyism is strewn with such cases as support to out-and-out Stalin electoral candidates like Ben Davis.

The pretexts for support vary. A vote for Ben Davis, for example, is interpreted to mean an expression of upholding the cause of the Negro race; a vote for some white Stalinist tends to break the workers from the traditional capitalist parties.

The Cannon leaders keep a sharp eye for any and every occasion to tie their followers to the Stalinist system. If the Tito case is good for this purpose, the Foster-Dennis case is no less convenient. The Trotsky workers are made to overlook the fact that the Foster bandits are in direct service of Stalinism not only politically but also organizationally and that it is they who are largely responsible for the political strength of Wall Street imperialism. The Cannon leaders write to the Foster "comrades" proposing a united front against capitalist reaction which is promoted by the policies of these very Foster "comrades." If the united front is established- and in the past it was frequently established- it will be conducted, as always, on the policy of Stalin.

The Shachtman leaders avoid explaining the fundamental Trotsky method of attaching the vanguard workers to the Stalinist system, the method of "transmission belts" whereby a number of wheels in a machine turn in the opposite direction from the main wheel, with all serving as parts of the same mechanical device for the same purpose. The reason for this Shachtmanite omission is simple. They themselves employ this method. Just as the Foster bureaucrats denounce American capitalism while in reality diverting the workers from abolishing it by attaching them to Wallace and by other means, and just as the Cannon bureaucrats rave against Stalin while in reality tying the workers to his politics, the Shachtmanites vociferate against Moscow and Washington but in political deeds chain their followers to both. However, the weight of Shachtmanite support to these two centers of world reaction is unevenly distributed, tending more and more

in the direction of American imperialism.

How does Shachtman perform this political action despite the opposite subjective desires and sentiment of his followers? He employs the old trick of "transmission belts." On the one hand he proves, though on a limited scale, that the Cannon organization carries on Stalinist politics, is a "left" appendage to Stalinism, on the other hand he advises his followers and other workers to give support to Farrell Dobbs, Cannon's candidate in the forthcoming American elections and the author of the letter to the Foster "comrades". Be it remembered that the Shachtman leaders establish the Stalinist nature of Cannon's politics and use such facts as Cannon's "transmission belt" support to Tito. We establish Shachtman's support to Stalinism on the basis of his "transmission belt" support to Dobbs.

We have said that Shachtman links his followers not only with Moscow but even more so with Washington. In the latter task he makes use of the "transmission belt" Norman Thomas, candidate of the American Socialist Party and a staunch supporter of the American capitalist class. Shachtman suggests to the workers to vote for Thomas if they prefer him to Dobbs. Shachtman seems to be indifferent as to the workers' choice, what he is concerned with, he says, is a "Socialist protest" vote - a "new" old fake to hook the workers. But the recent systematic anti-Cannon outbursts in Labor Action and the relatively brief statement regarding the pro-capitalist policies of Norman Thomas indicate that Shachtman's preference is the transmission belt connection with Washington not with Moscow. And to add a little more weight to Washington, Shachtman offers the workers a third choice, Teichert, the candidate of another limb of the Social Democracy, the Socialist Labor Party.

We have stated that Shachtman concealed and distorted very vital facts. He hides from the workers the fact that the Cannon group, in the leadership of which he had shared for over fifteen years, has not undergone a "rapid degeneration toward a 'left' critical appendage of the Stalinists" (Labor Action, August 16, 1948), but has always been a Stalinist group. About the political nature of the Cannon group before its expulsion from the Communist Party, Shachtman wrote in 1932: "The Cannon group stood upon the platform of international Stalinism, sometimes a little to the Right of it and sometimes a little to the Left of it." (The Situation in the American Opposition: Prospect and Retrospect - Max Shachtman, Albert Glotzer and Martin Abern).

Upon its expulsion from the Stalinist organization the Cannon group assumed the role of a faction of the Comintern and described the Stalin Party ruled by Browder and Foster as "our Party." After the Trotsky leaders declared for a completely independent Fourth International and concretized this thesis by abandoning their organizational independence through the entry into the Second International, they continued being an appendage of Stalinism. Through the American Socialist Party, the Browder-led North American Committee of Aid to Spanish Democracy, they gave support to Dimitrov's thesis of "Democracy versus Fascism" thus aiding Stalin to betray the Spanish revolution, and they came out for a Stalin-Social Democratic government in France. In this pro-Stalinist politics Shachtman fully participated.

When by compulsion the Trotsky movement once more assumed a separate organizational existence, it reverted to the previous tactic of "transmission belt" support to Stalinism and also to the bourgeoisie. This is one of the basic facts concealed by the Shachtman leaders.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

The Tito rebellion provides a good many lessons to the workers. It clearly demonstrates that political unity is not synonymous with organizational

affiliation, or, in different words, organizational or personal split does not mean a political separation. As Trotsky quite frankly admitted at the Dewey hearings in Mexico during the Moscow Trials: "You ask if I am ready to collaborate with Stalin and his closest collaborators? I have never repudiated such collaboration, and now, before the serious difficulties within and without the country, I am less disposed than ever to repudiate it.

"Politics knows no personal resentment nor the spirit of revenge."  
(The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 171)

The split between Stalin and Trotsky, between Stalin and Bukharin, between Stalin and Tito are splits within one and the same political system. The Stalinist system owes its endurance to the Trotsky movement whose function has been to corral the most advanced anti-Stalin minded workers and keep them chained within the Stalinist orbit.

A reorientation of the vanguard workers toward revolutionary politics cannot be checked indefinitely. The transmission belt method of Cannon, Shachtman and others will wear thin. The political emancipation of the vanguard will simultaneously signify the end of the Stalinist system and the beginning of the great Socialist revolution.

G.M.  
AUGUST 1948

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* THE ONGOING WAR AND THE TASKS \*  
\* OF THE PROLETARIAN VANGUARD \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

The problem of how to save humanity by preventing the oncoming war, or, if this war should break out, by stopping it at the earliest possible moment, resolves itself into three broad questions. One, how did this situation come about? Without a correct answer to this first question, the war development can not be fought. To combat an effect, one must know its cause. Two, what are the perspectives in case of war? Three, what can the proletarian vanguard do about it?

Each of the contending parties in the impending conflict endeavors to place the blame upon the other. Day in, day out, the imperialists shout that Russia is provoking the conflict by its aggression and policy of expansion. The Stalinists, on the other hand, claim that they are merely taking defensive measures against the "reactionary warmongers" who are allegedly creating the war situation.

Just how did Stalin come into possession of a vast chain of territories in Europe and Asia, acquired in 1943-45? An objective examination of this fundamental question will provide not only an answer to the question of how the present situation came about but will also definitely fix the question of whether the imperialists or the Stalinists or both are responsible for the oncoming war. From the vast amount of material at hand we select two typical examples: Poland and Yugoslavia.

#### POLAND

A great deal of light is thrown on the Polish situation by a recent book "I Saw Poland Betrayed" by Arthur Bliss Lane, American ambassador to Poland in 1945 to 1947. In the foreword to his book he states:

"Immediately following the election of January 19, 1947, in Poland, I determined to resign my position as American ambassador. My mission-- to insure that 'free and unfettered' elections' should be held-- had been a failure. To remain in Warsaw would be interpreted as tacit acquiescence in the fraudulent methods employed in the elections.

"Furthermore, I felt strongly that the facts which had brought about the tragedy of the Polish situation should be placed publicly on record. This could not be done so long as I remained an official of the United States Government; for the facts would indicate not only the intellectual dishonesty of the Soviet and Polish governments, but also the grievous errors which our own government had made in following a policy of appeasement in its dealings with Stalin. My resignation was accepted, to take effect on March 31, 1947, with the understanding of President Truman and of the acting secretary of state (Dean Acheson) that I would tell the story as I had seen it."

According to Lane "the British and American appeasement of Stalin had begun at Teheran." (Page 54), Churchill attempted to have Premier Mikolajczyk and Foreign Minister Romer agree to the following five points on January 22, 1944, shortly after his return to London from Teheran:

"1. The Polish Government to agree to accept the so-called Curzon line (prolonged through Eastern Galicia) as a basis for negotiations with the Soviet Government.

2. The final settlement of the Eastern frontier to be linked with the grant to Poland of East Prussia, Danzig and Upper Silesia to the Oder River,
3. All Poles left on the Soviet side of Poland's Eastern frontier would be given the right to return to Poland.
4. All the German population within Poland's new boundaries to be removed from Poland.
5. The solutions as enumerated above would receive the approval and guarantee of the three principal United Nations. (I Saw Poland Betrayed, pages 55-56; Defeat In Victory, by Jan Ciechanowski, page 269. My Emphasis-TFH)

Lane makes the obvious and correct comment on this on page 56. as follows:

"As Point No. 5 obligated the three nations which had just participated in the Tehran conference to guarantee the first four points, it is clear that Churchill would not have committed the United States and the USSR to a course which did not previously have their approval. And, as these points were later publicly agreed on at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences by the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and the USSR, it is logical to conclude that the framework had been constructed at Tehran for the final disposition of the question of Polish frontiers." (My emphasis, TFH)

Nor does the evidence end there. We have seen that on January 22, 1944, Churchill had showed the representatives of the Polish Government in London that the Big Three had agreed on the boundaries of Poland. In October 1944, at Moscow, Molotov bluntly informed Mikolajczyk, in the presence of Churchill, Eden, and the American representative Harriman, that the Big Three had made that agreement and challenged the three listeners to deny it. They remained silent.

From the foregoing it can be seen that as early as November-December 1943, Roosevelt and Churchill, at Tehran, agreed that 70,000 square miles of Eastern Poland would go to Stalin. Was there anything in the military situation at that time which would have compelled the imperialists to make this enormous concession to Stalin? In November-December 1943, the German armies were still deep in Russia, the Polish underground army was under the control of forces favorable to Great Britain and the United States and opposed to Stalin. Manifestly, to put the imperialist-Stalin agreement on Poland into effect, it was necessary to bring the Polish capitalist leaders into line and to break down the resistance that would be forthcoming from the well-organized Polish underground.

Having been given the go-ahead signal at Tehran, Stalin began to make preparations to establish a stooge government in Poland. On July 29, 1944 at 8.15 P.M., radio Moscow broadcast a message in Polish:

"Poles, the time of liberation is at hand! Poles, to arms! Make every Polish home a stronghold in the fight against the invader! There is not a moment to lose."

This purported to be signed by Molotov and Osobka-Morawski of the Moscow controlled "Committee of National Liberation." The Stalin Government never officially admitted responsibility for this call to arms, but since it was broadcast over the Moscow radio, there can be no doubt as to its authenticity or as to its having been authorized by Stalin.

On the next day, July 30, a similar radio appeal was broadcast from Moscow, but this time addressed specifically to the inhabitants of Warsaw, urging them to assist the approaching Red Army to cross the Vistula, and enter Warsaw. At that time the Red Army was at Praga, a suburb of Warsaw, just across the Vistula from the city proper; the sound of the Russian cannonading was distinct and continuous and Russian planes passed over the city from bases twenty minutes distant by air. Only one German division was holding Praga. In the eyes of the Polish masses, the feeling was that the situation was ripe for an uprising against the Nazis. From all outward indications, it appeared that the end of the war situation was imminent as in the west also, the Nazi power was seemingly crumbling. The British, American armies at this time were advancing rapidly through France.

Acting on the call to arms from Moscow, and on the advice of the British Broadcasting Company General Bor ordered the insurrection to start at five P.M. August 1.

The insurrection achieved immediate success. During the first day Bor's army captured all the important buildings in the central section of the city. By the second day the underground or Home Army, as it was called, held two-thirds of Warsaw, including the western suburb of Wola through which any reinforcements for the Nazis had to pass. On August third German planes started bombing Bor's positions in Warsaw. Meanwhile, Soviet planes which for ten days previous had been attacking Germans in Warsaw almost every night, ceased attacking at all. No attempt was made to advance from Praga by the Russians; indeed, Stalin's army was ordered to withdraw from advanced positions leading to Warsaw.

Mikolajczyk had previously been assured by Stalin on August 1st that the Russian army would enter Warsaw on August Sixth. However, on August Fourth he was called to Moscow and given an ultimatum that unless he immediately came to some sort of agreement with Stalin's Lublin Committee of National Liberation, Stalin would recognize that committee as the sole government of Poland. Mikolajczyk agreed and returned to London to place Stalin's concrete proposal before the London Polish Government. These proposals were that Stalin's Lublin Committee must have 50% of the Cabinet posts, and that the Curzon line was to be the frontier.

Mikolajczyk was assured that military aid would be given Bor's forces. All this time the Russian army was standing idle while the Nazis threw every force they could muster against the Warsaw insurrectionists. No assistance came from the American or British air forces. For sixty-three days the Poles fought on in Warsaw, during which time there was one flight of two planes from the Americans and another flight of seven planes from the Americans and British. Even in this case, the bulk of the meager supplies dropped into the hands of the Nazis. During the whole time that the Nazis were systematically butchering the inhabitants of Warsaw there was actually collaboration among Hitler, Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt to allow Bor's forces to be exterminated by the Nazi troops. After the slaughter of about 200,000 and the virtual razing of Warsaw, the remnants of the Polish Home Army capitulated.

With the internal obstacle thus eliminated, Stalin was free to move into Warsaw, which he did in January 1945.

Having opened the door to Stalin's entry into Poland by the Tehran agreement, Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin met at Yalta in Feb. 1945 and set up a legal basis for Stalin's Polish stooges to take over the new government of Poland. The imperialists spoke of a "new situation" being created due to Stalin's occupation of Poland. Of course, they hypocritically omitted any mention of the fact that they themselves had set up this "new situation" by their

secret deal with Stalin at Teheran:

"A new situation has been created in Poland, as a result of her complete liberation by the Red Army. This calls for the establishment of a Polish provisional government which can be more broadly based than was possible before the recent liberation of western Poland. The provisional government which is now functioning in Poland should therefore be reorganized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad. This new government should then be called the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity.

"M. Molotov, Mr. Harriman and Sir A. Clarke-Kerr are authorized as a commission to consult in the first instance in Moscow with members of the present Provisional Government and with other Polish democratic leaders from within Poland, and from abroad, with a view to the reorganization of the present government along the above lines. This Polish Provisional Government of National Unity shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. In these elections all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and put forward candidates."

It will be well to analyze this particular portion of the document since it is indicative of a whole line on the part of the imperialists and the Stalinists. It will be noted that Stalin got the green light from the imperialists to go ahead with the formation of a stooge government in Poland. On the other hand, it is significant that Roosevelt and Churchill obtained a pledge of "free and unfettered elections."

Stalin's domination of Poland was achieved not as a result of military advances but due to the policy of Roosevelt and Churchill from 1943 to 1945. From then on Stalin proceeded to move in, shove aside the so-called democratic politicians, such as Sikorski, and consolidate his own regime. At the proper moment, Great Britain and the U.S.A. made use of the pledge of "free and unfettered elections" as part of a campaign to blacken their erstwhile ally and to build up a feeling that Stalin is a new aggressor.

Is it possible that Churchill and Roosevelt were misled into believing that Stalin was honest and would keep his word? Both Churchill and Roosevelt had seen Hitler and Stalin divide Poland in 1939 and had subsequently seen Stalin take over Latvia, Lithuania and Esthonia in 1940 after having promised their independence.

The manipulation with Poland exemplifies a certain imperialist strategy. Give Stalin territory under the familiar pattern of "appeasement" but couple every "gift" with a provision for "democracy", "free and unfettered elections", etc. The imperialists rightly calculated that Stalin, being the opportunist he is, would "grab" the territory involved, that the very essence of the Stalinist system, bureaucratic suppression and control, would cause him to disregard the pledges for "democracy" and that Stalin would thus build himself up in the eyes of the masses of the capitalist countries as a new Hitler. Then would come the ideological justification of a new war to stop the new Hitler. In addition, the imperialists, well knowing that Stalin would impose a terror upon the given territories for the benefit of the Russian bureaucracy, counted on the fact that in the coming war they would be able to rely not only on their own armed forces but upon internal opposition to Russia in the annexed territories.

#### YUGOSLAVIA

When the Nazis occupied Yugoslavia, Mikhaïlovitch was at first boosted  
by

the imperialists of Great Britain and the U.S.A. as the great Yugoslavian patriot. In ideology Mikhailovitch was monarchist, anti-Stalinist, pro-capitalist. After Stalingrad, if the purpose of the imperialists had been to preserve as much territory as possible under the bourgeois form of economy, Mikhailovitch was their ideal instrument for Yugoslavia. Already built up in the popular imagination as a great hero, the savior of Yugoslavian "national honor", his admitted "incidental" collaborations with the Nazis, ignored at first, could have been continued to be concealed or played down with Yugoslavia and practically the whole Balkans saved for capitalism. But instead we witnessed the apparently amazing spectacle of the imperialist tool, Mikhailovitch, being sold down the river and ultimately handed over to Tito for execution. Still more "amazing" was the fantastic sight of the imperialists building up Stalin's stooge, Tito, with propaganda, military advice and material aid, and cooperating with Stalin in building up a Moscow outpost in Yugoslavia.

In June 1943 it was announced over the B.B.C. and in the British press that Great Britain was dividing its support between Tito and Mikhailovitch. On July 22, 1943 the Nazis offered a reward of 100,000 gold marks each for the heads of Tito and Mikhailovitch. The B.B.C. reported only the offer for Tito, to build up the latter as an anti-Nazi. By August-September, 1943, the B.B.C. was making it a definite policy to disregard Mikhailovitch and to constantly boost Tito. By 1944 it was daily pounding at Mikhailovitch as a traitor and Axis-collaborator and praising Tito as the new national hero.

Almost immediately after the Teheran Conference (November-December, 1943) the B.B.C. began to broadcast Partisan communiques accusing Mikhailovitch of collaborating with the Germans.

In January, 1944, Major Randolph Churchill, Winston Churchill's son, was sent to Tito's headquarters. All during this time the great question for the Yugoslav "resistance" was whether to go with the Partisans (Tito) or the Chetniks (Mikhailovitch). The arrival of the son of Winston Churchill was of immense psychological value. It was living proof of the switch- virtually a personal emissary had come right from the British Prime Minister.

On April 15, 1944, an Anglo-American mission was parachuted into Yugoslavia. According to David Martin in a well-documented book "Ally Betrayed" (p. 241) this mission told the villagers that America and Britain wanted the Serbs to join the Tito forces.

These are but a few of the examples showing the deliberate design of the imperialists to turn Yugoslavia and also the contiguous Albania over to Stalin. German evacuation of Albania took place in the latter part of 1944. Despite prior entry of British units, that country was handed over to Stalin's forces.

The general formula of the Yalta declaration promised the "liberated" European countries "governmental authorities broadly representative of the democratic elements of the population." In addition to this general declaration there was a specific declaration with regard to Yugoslavia which stressed the implementing of agreement between Tito and Subasitch of the London Yugoslav Government, at the earliest possible date, for the organization of the government in Yugoslavia.

In the case of Yugoslavia we see exactly the same line as with Poland. Stalin was given that country but had to pledge "democracy", etc. The purpose of this pledge was that when it was broken as the imperialists knew it would be, the second stage of incitement to war against the "new Hitler" could take place.



After Churchill and Roosevelt had agreed to Stalin's occupation of various territories in Europe and the Far East, a policy that is now called "appeasement", the attitude was changed to a "get tough with Russia" policy. The imperialists are spreading the notion that Stalin is on a rampage, preparing to seize the entire world. The events in Eastern Europe seem to lend substance to this claim. This would imply that there is a possibility of the Stalinist system superseding the capitalist system. This idea has also been penetrating into the ranks of many advanced workers in various forms. Is it true that Stalin is out to seize the entire world, or to destroy the capitalist economy? The recent events in France and Italy are a clear indication that the Stalinist bureaucracy does not pursue a policy of removing the capitalist system in vital industrial countries.

#### FRANCE AND ITALY

As a result of the Russian victories over the Nazis, the Communist Party of France attained enormous prestige. The greater mass of the French working class, breaking subjectively from capitalism, flocked to the Stalinist organization, seeing in it a fighter for Socialism. The labor unions came under the practically complete control of the Stalinists. The parliamentary elections gave a tremendous number of votes to the Stalinist candidates. Stalinist ministers sat cheek by jowl with the bourgeois ministers in the French Cabinet.

The French and international imperialists could not permit a continuance of this situation. As the policy of "appeasement" gave way to the "get tough" policy and "cold war" policy, as the prelude to a shooting war, it became necessary to line up France definitely on the imperialist side. The imperialists could not launch an attack on the Soviet Union without taking care of the truly tremendous Stalinist movement in France.

In May, 1947, the Stalinist ministers were eliminated from the French Cabinet, the excuse being the issue of the wage freeze. At that very time the French Stalinist party had skyrocketed to a membership of 1,000,000. Its vote had reached 7,000,000. It had complete control of the C.G.T., the French labor union federation, with a membership of 6,000,000. It claimed the allegiance of one third of the Paris police force and it is a fact that members of the Paris police force openly participated in the Stalinist parades and demonstrations. Even among the French peasantry, noted for its conservatism, Stalinism made heavy inroads.

The three prerequisites for a revolutionary situation existed at that time- even according to an outline cited by Stalin himself in his "Foundations of Leninism:" 1. The ruling class was no longer able to rule as before. Permutation and combination succeeded each other in the French Cabinet. 2. There was a more than usual increase in the needs and misery of the masses, not only among the workers, but within the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie as well. Inflation, high prices, and shortages of commodities added to the post V-E Day disillusionment with capitalism. 3. The masses were in motion and the decisive class, the urban working class, was flowing en masse to the C.P. of France, conceiving it to be a revolutionary opponent of capitalism. The whole situation was pregnant with civil war, with every chance of victory for the Stalinists.

However, politically advanced workers are long since familiar with the counter-revolutionary nature of Stalinism. We are aware that the primary object of the whole Stalinist system is to prevent a real, proletarian revolution anywhere, any time. But it would appear plausible that the Stalinists would at least pour into the streets for the retention of the Stalinist ministers. The subsequent November-December strikes showed the possibility of this. The Kremlin masters of Thorez, Duclos and Co. were aware that the "appeasement" stage in international politics had passed. They and their French stooges knew perfectly

well that the ousting of the ministers was actually a pre-war move. They knew that the imperialists had to consolidate their position in France before an attack on Stalin would be possible and that civil war in France could postpone this attack for a long time.

Notwithstanding all this, what happened? The answer is given in the words of Jacques Duclos, the leading "theoretician" of the Stalin gang in France. Not only did he not call for revolt, but he proclaimed that "the Communists would not be stupid enough to plunge into opposition!" He said they would collaborate with the Government wherever they could! (The New York Times, July 13, 1947)

The nature of the strike wave that subsequently took place confirms our thesis that the Stalinists deliberately held back the masses from struggle. These strikes occurred after the "Cominform", under the guise of relieving the workers from economic pressure, had decided on such means merely as a gesture against the Marshall Plan. The Stalinists dragged out the strikes until a rotten settlement was reached with the Schuman government. Demonstrations and barricade fighting and even seizures of government offices were "allowed" to peter out.

The recent events in Italy show that the Italian Stalinist line is identical with the pro-capitalist policy of the French Stalinists. After VE day the Italian Communist Party mushroomed on a scale unequalled in the whole Stalinist world. By the early part of 1947 the membership had risen to a figure of 2,300,000, second in numbers only to the Russian party. The delegates to the Florence convention of the Italian General Confederation of Labor in June, 1947 contained 57.2% Stalinist party members. This gave the Stalinists complete control of the 6,000,000 members. Giuseppe Di Vittorio, one of the old Stalinist war horses, was elected secretary general.

The National Association of Italian Partisans has over 200,000 members and follows Stalinist leadership on all important political issues. Early in 1947 the Italian Socialists split. The larger portion of the SP, headed by Pietro Manri, formed a "united front" with the Stalinists. In the South of Italy, long noted for its backwardness and reaction, the Stalinists began to make deep inroads into the ranks of the peasantry and share-croppers.

After the fall of Mussolini the two principal political forces in Italy were the Christian Democrats and the Stalinists. The Stalinists were given posts in the Cabinet and outdid all of the so-called left parties in subservience to the monarchy and the Pope.

But despite the obsequiousness of the Kremlin stooges, the scarcity of food, the high cost of living, etc. pressed the masses into struggle. In the summer of 1946, under Stalinist leadership, strikes occurred in Milan and Turin. Armed workers took possession of several plants. Alcide De Gasperi, Christian Democratic Premier threatened the use of armed force. After some blustering the Stalinists backed down.

Even after that there were militant demonstrations in the southern part of Italy, the most backward section of the country, as late as February, 1947. Police stations and government buildings were attacked and the officials threatened. "Order" was restored by the De Gasperi government which included Stalinist ministers.

Having taken full measure of his Stalinist opponents, De Gasperi, in May 1947, kicked out both the Stalinists and the Manri Socialists. Let it be remembered that at this time the Stalinists had a membership of over two million,

—complete control of the labor movement, and a big chunk of the peasantry on their side. The same prerequisites for a revolutionary situation existed as in France. Yet the strikes were curbed by the Stalinist bureaucrats. The masses were told to rely on the parliamentary victory of the "Popular Front."

Finally elections for the Italian Parliament were set for April, 1948. For weeks beforehand the press of the whole world was full of "the contest between Truman and Stalin." Talk was rife of leftist coups and with this excuse De Gasperi called out thousands of troops and carabinieri. The Pope lent a hand by stigmatizing a vote for the Stalinists as a mortal sin.

Since Italy plays a very important role in the plans of the imperialists in the war preparations against Stalin due to its immediate proximity to the Balkans and Austria, so in the last stages of the election campaign, visible efforts were made by the imperialists to sway the voters. The U.S.A., Great Britain, and France proposed that Trieste be returned to Italy despite contrary provisions in the peace treaty. Previously, so fierce were the nationalist sentiments of the Italian people that in 1947 Togliatti had been compelled to advocate the return of Trieste to Italy rather than the line of turning it over to Russia's then stooge, Yugoslavia. The proposal of the three imperialist countries to turn Trieste over to Italy was made public and a joint note containing the proposal was addressed to Russia. The object, of course, was to put the Stalinists in an untenable position insofar as the elections were concerned. The Stalinists of course knew this. They also knew that the danger of attack on them had immeasurably sharpened. This was after the Czechoslovak coup and after a period of Stalin-imperialist friction in Berlin. Yet, the Stalin government, just four days before the elections, came out with a flat rejection of the proposal. It has been confidently expected by the bourgeois commentators that Russia would wait until after the elections to give an answer on the question of Trieste. When, therefore, the answer came just four days before, almost as if timed to throw the elections, astute political commentators frankly announced their mystification.

Here again, even more pointedly than in the case of France, we see the ironic dilemma of the Stalinists. Not daring even to take the chance of winning bourgeois parliamentary elections, the Kremlin was forced to allow Italy to fall deeper into the hands of the imperialists in the midst of a pre-war situation. And this despite the fact that capitalism had definitely thrown down the gage of battle, that the winning of the Italian elections not only meant the definite passing over of Italy into the camp of the Western imperialists on the eve of war, but also dealt a tremendous blow to Stalin's prestige. Stalin was compelled by the necessities of the situation to weaken the talking points of his own Italian stooges by his reply on Trieste.

What was the cause of Stalin's apparently incomprehensible political line in France and Italy? Stalin and his henchmen understand that if the workers moved forward against the bourgeoisie in such key countries as France and Italy, they would get out of hand. Subjectively, these key workers had not surged into the Stalinist ranks merely to serve the Kremlin interests, but to fight for Socialism. A proletarian uprising would have influenced the toiling drudges in the Soviet Union who would have shaken the foundations of the Stalinist bureaucracy. With the capitalists, Stalinism can make deals, with a revolutionary proletariat, never.

It appears certain that Stalinism needs a capitalist context for its survival. This context serves Stalinism as a perennial justification for its bloody rule. This being the case, and as "war is only the continuation of politics by forcible means" it follows that the practical alternatives in the threatened war are either the total victory of imperialism or a continuation

of the present division of the world into capitalist and Stalinist sectors. A continuation of the present division of the world into two antagonistic economic systems only guarantees continued war.

What is the alternative of a total victory for capitalism? Would there then be a guarantee or even a reasonable prospect of peace? The answer is obvious. It is true that there would then be an elimination of the fundamental economic political antagonism of today, that of the nationalized property form in Russia and the form of property in the capitalist world, but in its place there would immediately arise the fight of the imperialist powers among themselves for colonies and markets as in the days before 1914. All this would be in a context of a devastated world with a sharpening of the antagonism of the proletariat and peasant masses to the bourgeoisie. Even today the antagonisms between the imperialist powers are not eliminated. They are temporarily subordinated to the need of smashing a completely alien form of economy existing in the Soviet Union. However, even in this framework the dominant capitalist country, the U.S.A., takes advantage of the economic and political weakness of its allies, England and France, to gain economic advantages for its own bankers, manufacturers, merchants, etc. The extinction of the Soviet Union would only serve to remove this subordination and once again make the imperialist antagonisms the source of another and still more terrible war.

For the masses of the world either imperialist or Stalinist military victory means not only enormous destruction of life and culture in the process of the war but preparations for new wars

#### WHAT CAN THE WORKERS DO?

Confronted with the horrible prospect of the current "cold war" developing into a shooting war, the question inevitably arises: What can the workers do? If both the imperialists and Stalinists have brought on the war situation; if the military victory of either the Stalinists or the imperialists would mean only the continued guarantee of new and more horrible wars, it is unquestionable that only the overthrow of both camps of war mongers can bring about permanent peace. What is to replace the rule of the bourgeoisie or the Stalinist bureaucracy? Only the planned and conscious cooperation of the whole human race for production instead of destruction, for international consciousness instead of nationalism, for production for use instead of war, can save not only the cultural values but the lives of millions of human beings.

What stands in the way? Organized and polarized political forces standing for one or another vested interest! On the one hand, there are the political forces supporting capitalism; on the other, the political forces upholding the Stalinist bureaucracy. The prevention of the war, which is always possible until the actual outbreak, or of stopping it once it starts, depends upon the political analysis and resultant actions of the organized political forces. In this connection, as is practically inevitable in such situations, a polarization is taking place among all the major political tendencies. On the side of the imperialists is aligned the Pope, the landlords, the openly bourgeois parties, the Social Democrats, among others. On the side of the Stalinist bureaucrats, are not only the Stalinist parties but also their various camp followers.

The masses of people of Europe and Asia particularly, and of the whole world in general, sick of slaughter and devastation since 1914, are looking for a way out. But the vanguard, the thinking, active section of the decisive section of modern society, the working class, is in the hands of the opportunists, particularly the Stalinists. It is the task of real revolutionists to reach these vanguard masses, to organize them into a real World Party for Revolutionary Socialism,

against both capitalism and Stalinism.

The Trotskyite workers are an important section of the proletarian vanguard and want to break both with capitalism and Stalinism, but are hamstrung by their leadership. As war comes ever nearer, the process of polarization sharpens. Today the Cannon branch of the Trotskyites is practically an open supporter of the Stalinists. Not only has it supported Stalinist candidates for office but it represented the Stalinist rape of the Czechoslovakian workers as a working class victory. (Socialist Appeal, organ of the British Trotskyites, March 1948)

For the workers to support this indirect agency of Stalinism means to line up with a force that is bringing death and destruction to the masses; tomorrow, it literally means working, fighting, striking, for the right of the Soviet bureaucracy to drain the last drop of sweat and blood from the slave laborers, the Stakhanovite-driven factory workers, the agricultural slaves-- and to maintain the necessary milieu for the continued existence of the bureaucracy- capitalist exploitation in the rest of the world.

In the opposing camp are to be found the adherents of capitalism as the "lesser evil" to Stalinism. The Shachtman Trotskyite Workers Party for example, "hailed" the victory of the German Social Democrats at the same time that it recognized them as the agents of German and international capitalism. (Nov. 4, 1946 issue of Labor Action, p. 4)

On the issue of Trieste the W.P. anticipated the strategy of the imperialists, advocating that Trieste be given to Italy, which they recognized as a "wretched and unstable bourgeois democracy." (Labor Action, December 9, 1946, p. 7)

On the issue of Poland the Shachtman group supported the bourgeois opposition to Stalinism in the person of Mikolajczyk until he ran away to seek haven with his imperialist backers, whereupon it denounced him for not being personally strong enough to support capitalism on the scene in Poland. This statement is proved by the following written before Mikolajczyk escaped:

"The political line of the Marxists must, therefore, be one of critical support to the Mikolajczyk camp. (The New International, July 1947, p. 138)

In the very page before (p. 137) the Workers Party admitted "the predominant character of the opposition is that of a bourgeois-democratic movement, mainly composed of peasants." (My emphasis- T.F.H.)

That these opportunist supporters of the imperialist camp know what they were doing is shown in the columns of the very same magazine for April, three months before, on page 110:

"We affirm rather that support of either democratic capitalism or Stalinism in a war means support to the social forces leading humanity to the abysses of barbarism." (My emphasis- T.F.H.)

In April, 1947 the W.P. leadership stated categorically that support of democratic capitalism meant support to the social forces leading to barbarism. In July, 1947 the same leadership called for support to the same barbarism by advocating "critical support" to the "bourgeois democratic" camp.

Recognizing the self-exposure they tried to justify their position by stating the following in the July 1947 issue:

"It is a fact that the Anglo-Saxon imperialism tries to take advantage of the Mikolajczyk opposition for its own ends, but this does not mean that the worker-peasant opposition is a mere instrument of imperialism and represents the reactionary Polish bourgeoisie. The proletariat also has the right to take advantage of the inter-imperialist contradictions for its own ends without being bound to either imperialist camp." (p. 146)

The best expose of this position is inadvertently given by the W.P. in the Nov. 24, 1947 issue of its weekly paper Labor Action. By that time, Mikolajczyk had escaped from Poland and fled to London. It would have been ludicrous to claim him any more as representative of an independent opposition to Stalinism and imperialism. In fact in the Nov. 24 article A. Rudzinski, the Polish "expert" of the W.P. says that "Fleeing to exile, Mikolajczyk will have to submit peremptorily to the American and English baton in order to declare open war on Stalinism."

Thus in this new Shachtmanite position, Mr. Mikolajczyk is a tool of Anglo-American imperialism. But what was he before? The W.P. reevaluation is illuminating:

"Mikolajczyk tried to create a bridge in Poland between Russia and Anglo-American capitalism. The architect of this bridge was to be the Mikolajczyk government and the peasant movement; a democratic, petty-bourgeois government, autonomous, but friendly toward Russia, though more inclined to Anglo-American capitalism." (My emphasis- T.F.H.)

By their own words are these opportunists exposed. What is an independent opposition? Apparently one that combines the horrors and brutalities of both the imperialists and the Stalinists. The W.P. in effect said the following:

Workers and peasants of Poland! Support Mikolajczyk who wants to turn you over to both imperialism and Stalinism!

True to its line of supporting imperialism as the lesser evil to Stalinism, the Shachtmanite orphans abandoned by Mikolajczyk advocate the support of the P.P.S. (Polish Socialist Party). (Labor Action, Nov. 24, 1947). Let us quote Rudzinski's own definition:

"The Socialist oppositionists belong in the main to the old P.P.S. dividing into those who supported the reformist Right or the centrist Left."

This is not our terminology. It is that of the Shachtmanites who adhere to the 1915 definition of reformists as supporters of capitalism, and centrists as reformists in deed, revolutionists in words.

Only a complete break with imperialism and Stalinism and all its supporting agencies can enable the vanguard workers to form a truly independent International that can lead the world to real socialist peace. Such an International will break the workers away from nationalism in every form and will break them away from the policy of left-handed support to the Stalinist bureaucracy and to the bourgeoisie. This latter support is also rendered through various political instruments labelled Socialist Party, Labor Party, and other opportunist parties.

The creation of such an International is more indispensable than ever before. Every person who is conscious of the imperativeness of the task should join with us in working for the creation of the World Party that will not equivocate or compromise but will unflinchingly march toward a world peace based on the foundation of the world brotherhood of all the masses, freed from every form of exploitation and oppression.

Thomas F. Harden  
April 1948

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* ON THE BRITISH TROTSKYITES \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

A LETTER TO THE W.L.R.P. FROM ARTHUR PRIEST, MARCH 6, 1948

- AN INTERVIEW WITH HEATON LEE -

On March 2nd, I was visited by Heaton Lee, a leading British Trotskyite, South Wales organizer of the Revolutionary Communist Party. It seems that the object of his visit was to determine what my political position was and if possible, to win me for support to the R.C.P.

Discussion began upon the question of the Trotskyist support of the Labour Government. I pointed out that their slogan of "Labour To Power" in the 1945 General Election and their subsequent policy of "critical support" to the Social Democracy was a counter revolutionary position. Heaton Lee replied that the R.C.P. considered that the Labour Government "nationalization schemes" were a "progressive" step because they took the big industrial undertakings off the capitalists- and (he hastily added) handed them over to the capitalist state. The line of the R.C.P. that the Labour Party "nationalization" fraud is "progressive" lends a hand to the deceptions of Attlee-Bevin and Co.

The British Labour Government can not be likened to the government in Russia during the period of "dual power." The British Labour Government is the masked rule of the capitalist class. The task of overthrowing imperialism can not be separated from a revolutionary overthrow of the British Labour Government. The policy of electioneering for the Labour Party pursued by the British Trotskyite R.C.P. under the slogan of "Labour to Power" and "critical support" of the Labour Government constituted direct support to a capitalist government.

#### THE R.C.P. SUPPORTS THE STALINISTS

Heaton Lee defended the line of Trotskyite support to the British Stalinist Party put forward in the "Socialist Appeal", British Trotskyite organ. There was the question of the January 1948 issue which featured a front page article by Jock Haston, secretary of the R.C.P., on the new "left" zigzag of the British C.P. Among other things, Haston stated:

"This change if seriously pursued, will make a considerable difference to the struggle of the workers against the employers in the coming period."

And again:

"Their (the C.P. members-A.P.) best fighting instincts will have a chance of expression...they will find themselves lined up with the Trotskyists." (Ibid.)

After pointing out the R.C.P.'s sympathy and solidarity for Pollitt and the C.P. in the face of the Labour "Daily Herald" attack upon the C.P.'s new turn, and without once drawing attention to the counter revolutionary nature of Stalinism and its method of ultra left to ultra right zigzags, the article concluded:

"...there are many issues upon which the Trotskyists and Stalinists can fight together. Let us unite where we can, and fight together..."(Ibid.)

It was pointed out to Heaton Lee that this line of the R.C.P. was the continuation of the basic attachment of Trotskyism to the Stalinist system.

I asked him if he considered Stalinism to be a counter revolutionary force and he replied by stating that at times it carried out a "progressive" role. In whose interests Stalinism was "progressive" he could not say.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

As an example of the line Lee was defending, there was the February 1948 issue of the Socialist Appeal which continued the policy of support to the Stalin organization:

"...insofar as the C.P. in the present conflict, (for whatever motives) advance reforms on behalf of the workers and stand to the left of the Labour leaders, the task of socialists is to have a united front with the Stalinists against the right wing of the Labour Party."

"Whatever the motives" of Stalinism may be, they receive Trotskyite support. Instead of exposing the counter-revolutionary nature of the Stalinist left turn which can only lead the workers into the hungry grip of the Stalinist bureaucrats, the British Trotskyites support Stalinism "whatever the motives." The consciously counter revolutionary nature of the Stalinist line is thus effectively concealed by the Trotskyite leaders. By ignoring the motives, the British workers have no guide to test the sincerity of the Stalinist bureaucrats. If the counter revolutionary intentions of the Stalinists bureaucrats are not exposed, the British and other workers will be easy prey for any criminal Stalinist adventure.

A further illustration of this Trotskyite line appears in the March 1948 issue of the "Socialist Appeal" under the headline "Capitalists Routed in Czechoslovakia." This article comments on the recent events in Czechoslovakia as follows:

"This completes the nationalization of the means of production of the country, with the exception of petty enterprise, and constitutes an important victory for the working class." (Iy emphasis- A.P.)

After greeting the domination of the Czechoslovakian workers by Stalinism, the Socialist Appeal hypocritically urges "tremendous vigilance to guard and extend their traditions and practices of workers' democracy." (Ibid.) The Czech workers are advised to struggle against the "totalitarian vice" whose ascendancy to power in Czechoslovakia the Trotskyites had just hailed.

In a review of the recent British C.P. conference in the same issue of the Socialist Appeal, an acknowledgment is made that the new left turn of the C.P. is not a "return to a real revolutionary internationalist policy." However, the basic support of the R.C.P. to Stalinism is again declared: "We will stand together with the C.P. members in a united front on the daily demands of the working class..." (Ibid.)

#### THE SPLIT IN THE R.C.P.

In discussion Heaton Lee admitted that the R.C.P. had recently split on the question of "The Labour Party Tactic." It should be noted that the R.C.P. had been formed through the amalgamation of two groups which had conflicting opinions on this very question. One group was the old Revolutionary Socialist League which had adopted the position of entry into the Labour Party while the Workers International League had been against this move. The present split among the British Trotskyites is along these lines.

While the R.C.P. is undoubtedly split upon the issue and both groups



are carrying out independent activity, they do so behind a screen of unity within one party. The Socialist Appeal for 1948 carries no news of the split and to what extent the 100 odd members are divided between the two camps it is impossible to say at this time. It is difficult to ascertain the strength of the minority or even to determine whether it is a "majority." The official R.C.P. line is against entry into the Labour Party. The "minority" believes that the R.C.P. should be dissolved as a party and that the membership should enter the Labour Party (the "French Turn" all over again.)

Attention was drawn to the split in 1940 in the American Trotskyite Party. In reply, Heaton Lee stated that he did not agree with the policy of the Cannonites in preventing a successful conclusion of the recent unity negotiations with the Shachtmanites. He admitted that the reason for the split in the American Trotskyite camp was caused by the struggle for bureaucratic control of the party between Cannon and Shachtman, and that Shachtman's differences on the question of the role of the Soviet State "were not the real reason."

#### HEATON LEE GIVES ADVICE

Heaton Lee gave it as his opinion that, holding the political line that I do, I would be best advised to move closer to "those organizations which are nearest to my political position" and find a "niche" for myself within their organization. I believe that Heaton Lee was putting forward a genuine opinion when he spoke these words because they reveal his own bureaucratic manner of seeking alliances irrespective of how far apart political positions may be.

He stated that in his opinion there was little difference between my political position and that of the anarchists. He suggested that I should work with them.

I pointed out that I disagreed with the anarchists on basic political premises—I stand on Marxian principles and dialectical materialism; I can conceive occasions where participation in bourgeois parliaments is necessary; I believe in the need for building the revolutionary party, I uphold the necessity for a revolutionary proletarian state. On all these questions I am poles apart from the anarchists. Heaton Lee stated that in his opinion these WERE NOT IMPORTANT questions and should not prevent unity.

I pointed out that on the contrary, I considered ALL the existing organizations within the working class in Britain to be opportunist. My main task I asserted was to be directed towards the formation of a group in Britain to work for the formation of a Revolutionary Party directed against all opportunists, including the anarchists and the R.C.P. with its Heaton Lees.

Lee replied that the correctness of a political line can only be gauged by the amount of support received from the workers and as I had failed to form a group I must be wrong. I asked him if the Bolsheviks were wrong when they did not receive the support of the workers prior to November 1917. I asked him if the Stalinists were more "right" than the Trotskyites as they received greater support than the R.C.P. On these questions he merely smiled.

#### CONCLUSION

I summed up our discussion by drawing attention again to the basic role of Trotskyism as a branch of the Stalinist system. Lee answered this by asking "Who else exposes the Stalinists?" I replied that Trotskyism only "exposes" Stalinism as a cover for its basic support to the bureaucracy. Further, I quoted the I.L.P. the Anarchists and the whole capitalist press as "exposers" of

Stalin. This he ADMITTED.

Heaton Lee concluded our discussion by correctly pointing out that there was no basis for collaboration between us. He would "strike me off" his list.

I answered that there was no possible basis for collaboration between myself and any opportunist organization. My task is to struggle against and expose the opportunists. I replied that I did not "strike any worker off my list" but that I considered there was little hope for conscious counter-revolutionary bureaucrats.

\*\*\* \*\*

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* THE ROOTS OF STALINIST RUSSIAN PATRIOTISM \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

During the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union the Stalin gang conducted the military defense under the banner "Defense of the Motherland"; the war itself was labelled "The Great Patriotic War." Russian patriotism was the keynote of all the Stalinist propaganda, and today there is hardly a work rolling off the Soviet presses that does not sustain the national sentiments which were aroused to the highest pitch during the war.

Stalin's whole educational system is shot through with Russian nationalism because the youth represents a basic medium for inculcating the whole population with a given ideology. An example of the technical devices to achieve this end is Pedagogy, a Soviet textbook for teachers by B.P. and N.K. Goncharov. Portions have been translated and issued in the United States under the title "I Want To Be Like Stalin." In it one reads:

"The Communist Party was able to rally all the people of the Union in the struggle for the freedom and independence of the Motherland. During the Great Patriotic War patriotism was manifested in extraordinary force, the national self-consciousness of the people grew, and the feeling of pride in the powerful Soviet fatherland became stronger. Hence the task of rearing the younger generation in the spirit of Soviet patriotism has become yet more responsible." (p. 37)

In a chapter "For Our Beloved Motherland" Pedagogy takes up the problem of "Development of patriotic sentiments in the child" and offers some suggestions:

"It is important first of all to develop in children that intimate feeling of love of family, of home, of native village or city, and of natural surroundings.

"Recollections of childhood by some of our best Russian writers can serve this purpose superbly; also literary descriptions of nature in the verses of poets and in beautiful Russian prose. The Russian people have put into their folklore much love of the Russian land. Through the medium of all these treasures in the native tongue a conscious effort should be made to awaken and develop in children the sacred feeling of love for the Motherland." (p. 53)

To a true proletarian revolutionist this Russian-patriotic propaganda is a sign of the reactionary nature of Stalin and his system. Proletarian

revolutionary politics excludes national patriotism. Due to the universal nature of the proletarian cause, a leader of the working class must be a world revolutionist. No person who is imbued with nationalism can guide the struggle for socialism. By design or not, such a person is more concerned with the problems confronting him on the national scale than with the fundamental problem of the world working class as a whole. The illusion that one can combine both nationalism and internationalism within one policy dissolves into thin air when the policy is applied in practice.

The popular belief among the anti-Stalin revolutionary workers is that the Russian Communist patriotic sentiments have been originated by the Stalin faction, an idea, incidentally, which we shared for years. However, an excursion into the history of Bolshevism discloses who the originator of Russian proletarian nationalism really was.

Prior to the War of 1914 Social Democracy wore the attire of internationalism. With the outbreak of the War, however, Social Democracy was compelled, due to the ingrained nationalism of its sections, to cast aside its international disguise and reveal itself as chauvinist and patriotic. At that time a Left Wing of Social Democracy led by Lenin broke away from the main body, denounced the leadership of the Second International as "social chauvinist" and raised the slogan for the formation of an internationalist international.

Was this left tendency, however, free of the nationalist-patriotic sentiment with which the whole Second International was imbued? A reply to this question can be found in Lenin's article "On the National Pride of the Great Russians," published in December, 1914. In that work we read phrases which sound strange, to speak mildly, coming from the pen of a declared internationalist:

"Are we enlightened Great-Russian proletarians impervious to the feeling of national pride? Certainly not! We love our language and our motherland; we, more than any other group, are working to raise its laboring masses (i.e., nine-tenths of its population) to the level of intelligent democrats and Socialists. We, more than anybody, are grieved to see and feel to what violence, oppression and mockery our beautiful motherland is being subjected by the tsarist hangmen, the nobles and the capitalists. (Col. Works, Vol. XVIII p. 100)

These are nationalist, patriotic words expressing a deep-rooted Great-Russian sentiment, not proletarian world revolution. A Russian proletarian nationalist loves Russia and the Russian language; a German loves Germany, an Englishman, England, but a proletarian world revolutionist loves the whole earth, as man's home and as belonging to those who work but which is dominated by a small privileged portion of the human race. A proletarian world revolutionist does not hold a certain language dear to him on national grounds. Language is an instrument for conveying thought, and any language is all right if it performs this function.

The Stalin gang leans heavily on Lenin's authority to disseminate Russian-patriotic propaganda. In Pedagogy, the Stalin bureaucrats say: "Pupils must become acquainted with the great past of our Motherland which fills the workers of our country with pride. Lenin in his work on The National Pride of the Great Russians wrote: Is the feeling of national pride alien to us, Great Russians, conscious proletarians? Certainly not! We love our language and our motherland.. " etc. (p. 58)

It is obvious that Lenin's thoughts were permeated with Russian proletarian nationalism. The leaders of the Bolshevik Party always claimed to be internationalists, but they always emphasized their Russian character. Thus Zinoviev gave

the following description of Lenin:

"Lenin was great both as a Russian and a world revolutionary. He was Russian from top to toe. He was the embodiment of Russia. He knew and felt Russia. Despite the many years of exile and life as an emigrant, this person breathed of Russia. While residing in Krakow, about six miles from the Russian border, Lenin frequently took a trip across the frontier to 'get a gulp of Russian air. The very essence of his life was Russia, he felt Russia, he felt every blade of grass on the Russian road, he was Russian to the marrow of his bones.'" (The Communist International, Jubilee Number p. 13)

What was particularly superior about the Russian air as compared with the air across the frontier? Evidently to a Great Russian patriot the air of his "beautiful motherland" contained something no other air in the world possessed.

Naturally no pro-nationalist policy can lead to Socialism. Lenin could guide himself either by the interests of a national or an international revolution. In actual practice the division was introduced and the policy of the Bolshevik party was crystallized more and more patently as a Russian policy. The Brest Litovsk Peace negotiations with the Kaiser Government in 1918 revolved around the idea of securing peace for Russia, not the international proletariat. Lenin said in his Theses on Peace: "On the one side there will be the bourgeois system engaged in a strife between two coalitions of confessed plunderers, and on the other side a Socialist Soviet Republic living in peace."

Following the Brest Peace, the Lenin Government sought to establish peace and trade with the capitalist countries as an aid to Russian recovery. Growing out of this policy came the startling proposal which the Soviet Commissar Chicherin submitted to the imperialist conference held in Genoa in 1922. The Conference had been called for the purposes of finding ways and means of reconstructing the shattered capitalist economy of Europe, and Chicherin, in announcing the aim of the Soviet Delegation, declared:

"First of all, it deems it necessary to declare that it has arrived here in the interests of peace and the general reestablishment of the economy of Europe shattered by the long war and the post-war politics." (Materials of the Genoa Conference, Russ., p. 78 My Emphasis- G.M.)

The idea of restoring the international capitalist economy was not born in the head of Chicherin. Lenin, who viewed the world situation from the angle of the interests of Russia, actually offered a plan to the imperialists to aid in the restoration of capitalism in exchange for trade with the world bourgeoisie. In a speech to the secretaries of the Moscow section of the Bolshevik party, he stated:

"If you carefully read the decree on concessions of November 23 again and again, you will see that we stress the significance of the world economy, and we do so intentionally. This is undoubtedly a correct standpoint. In order to restore world economy, Russian raw material must be utilized. You cannot get along without utilizing them-- that is economically true. This is admitted by the purest bourgeois who studies economy and regards things from a purely bourgeois point of view. This is admitted by Keynes, who wrote the book The Economic Consequences of the Peace, and by Vanderlip, who has travelled all over Europe as a financial magnate; for the reason that there has proved to be very little raw materials available in the world, they having been dissipated in the war. He says they must rely on Russia. And Russia now comes forward and declares to the world: We undertake to restore international economy-- here is our plan." (Selected Works, Vol. VIII, p. 291)

Lenin was aware, of course, that the sentiment within the capitalist world was antagonistic toward the Bolsheviks, but he counted on the sympathy of a "sensible" section of the bourgeoisie, the capitalists who understood that a Bolshevik plan for the restoration of their economy was something altogether different from a plan of arousing the masses for the overthrow of their form of economy. Lenin knew that such a plan, advanced by the Bolshevik leadership, would secure the support of petty bourgeois elements:

"During this period the Soviet power has grown stronger; and not only has it grown stronger, but it comes forward with a plan for the restoration of the whole world economy. The rehabilitation of international economy with a plan of electrification rests on a scientifically correct basis. With our plan we shall most certainly attract the sympathy not only of the workers but also of sensible capitalists, irrespective of the fact that for them we are 'these terrible Bolshevik terrorists,' and so forth. Our economic plan is therefore a correct one, and when they read this plan, the whole petty bourgeois democracy will waver to our side; for the imperialists have already fallen out among themselves, while here a plan is being put forward to which the engineers and the economists can have nothing to object. We are passing to the realm of economy and are proposing a positive constructive programme to the whole world." (Ibid.)

Why did Lenin introduce the program of stabilizing world capitalism? Obviously he was prompted purely by the desire to strengthen the economy of Russia. Yet a closer examination of this policy shows that at bottom Lenin was moved by his excessive love for Russia, for "our beautiful motherland." In 1914, living in Switzerland, Lenin regarded the Bolsheviks, supposedly internationalist in their outlook, as "representatives of a great nation of Eastern Europe and a goodly portion of Asia"-- how much more did he think so after he assumed power!

We see that Lenin adjusted the interests of the world proletariat to the interests of Russia and not the other way around, and proceeding on this basis he was ready to pull the international bourgeoisie out of economic collapse provided this corresponded to the simultaneous strengthening of Russian economy.

The state headed by Lenin was regarded as international in character, the property, so to speak, of the world proletariat. But it is a matter of record that the personnel of the Soviet government was drawn from people born only in the old Russian Empire. There was not a single Negro, Chinese, American, Frenchman, or any other member of some "foreign" Communist Party in the ruling circles of Soviet Russia. In the Communist International there was established a dividing line separating the Russian Communist Party, as a ruling party, from all the others. This situation was unwittingly accepted by the revolutionary workers who were not conscious of the fact that the purely Russian Party rule was a manifestation of the nationalism of the Russian leaders.

True internationalists must strive to create one united whole out of all countries, to organize the world economy under the control of the working class and to raise the material well being of all the toilers throughout the globe. A nationalist, however, thinks in terms of placing the country which he, for patriotic reasons, imagines to be better than all the others, in advance of all the others. The Stalin gang upon introducing the first five year plan of economic expansion raised the slogan to catch up with and overtake the advanced capitalist countries. This slogan was contrary to the idea of international proletarian revolution. It meant placing Russia on a competitive basis with capitalism under the deceptive sign of building socialism in the country. The sentiment behind the whole affair was Great Russian nationalism.

When one digs down to the source of the Great Russian nationalist idea

of catching up and overtaking the advanced capitalist countries one discovers that it too was introduced by Lenin a short while before the Bolsheviks seized power. In the work "The Threatening Catastrophe and How to Fight It" Lenin posed the problem of rejuvenating Russia, not along the line of the international proletarian overthrow of capitalism but by keeping that country ahead of the capitalist countries as a separate national entity. He recalled the example of the French Revolution:

"The example of France tells us one thing and one only: to make Russia capable of defending herself, to achieve 'marvels' of mass heroism here, all the old must be swept away with 'Jacobin' ruthlessness. Russia must be rejuvenated, regenerated economically..."

"Due to the revolution, Russia, in its political structure, has caught up with the advanced countries in the course of a few months.

"But this is not enough. War is implacable; it puts the question with merciless sharpness: either overtake the advanced countries and surpass them also economically, or perish." (Col. Works. Vol. XXI Book 1 pp.214,216)

Needless to argue, a revolution in the rest of the world would leave Russia far behind in the first stages of Socialist reconstruction of world economy. Therefore, when Lenin spoke of surpassing all other countries economically he implied a continued coexistence of Bolshevik Russia and world capitalism. Thus we see, in the final analysis, that Lenin and the rest of the Bolshevik leadership were Russian both in feeling and policy, that as such the October Revolution unfolded not along the path of establishing one united proletarian state but along the road of preservation of multi-Statism: a "Union of Socialist Soviet Republics" on the one hand and a large group of bourgeois States on the other. This is the political basis of Stalinist policies today.

G.M.  
SEPT. 1948

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* STALIN A DICTATOR IN 1918 \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

The present regime in Russia is a brutal bureaucratic dictatorship of the leaders of the Russian Communist Party headed by Stalin. In complete personal control of the economic and political life of the country, Stalin exercises his iron rule through a system of appointing officials who subordinate themselves to him unconditionally and absolutely. This system is the very basis and method of his power. It is in the interests of the workers to ascertain at what point in the history of the state, which was set up by Lenin and Trotsky in 1917, Stalin became a bureaucratic dictator. Every worker who is familiar with Bolshevik literature knows that the policy of administering the State through a system of appointments was contrary to the language and spirit of the pre-October agitation of the Bolshevik Party. In his work State and Revolution written in August 1917, Lenin said:

"All officials, without exception, elected and subject to recall at any time, their salaries reduced to the level of 'workmen's wages',- these simple and 'self-evident' measures, while completely uniting the interests of the workers and the majority of the peasants, at the same time serve as the bridge between capitalism and socialism."

Naturally a complete about face on so vital a question as election of officials could not but produce the opposite results from those promised to the masses before October. That the system of appointments is a pernicious

system leading to autocracy was clearly recognized by Lenin in May 1917:

"The idea that it is necessary to "guide" through officials "appointed" from above is, at bottom, false, undemocratic, autocratic, or it is a Blanquist adventure. Engels was fully right when, criticizing in 1891 the proposed programme of the German Social Democracy who had become badly infected with bureaucratism, he insistently demanded that there be no supervision from above over local self-government. Engels was right when he referred to the experience of France, which, though governed between the years 1792 and 1798 by local elective bodies without any supervision from above, was, instead of falling apart, instead of 'disintegrating,' gaining strength through democratic consolidation and organization." (Col. Works, Vol. XX, Book 2, p. 17)

Lenin then pointed to a period of French history when the country was confronted by the military might of all the big powers of Europe, and was embroiled in a widespread civil war, as well. In his 1917 writings Lenin rejected even a hint at a policy of establishing a government based on the reactionary principle of appointing officials.

It is generally believed that the pernicious system which invariably corrupts both the appointees and the men who appoint them was instituted by Stalin. This belief is not borne out by historical records. On May 31, 1918, the Soviet of People's Commissars, presided over by Lenin, issued a decree which unquestionably marks a significant stage in the early bureaucratic corruption of Stalin and other leaders of the Soviet regime. The decree reads:

"31 of May 1918

"Member of the Soviet of People's Commissars, the People's Commissar Joseph Vissarianovich Stalin is appointed by the Soviet of People's Commissars as the general supervisor of the problem of supply in the South of Russia, with extraordinary rights. The local and regional Sovnarcoms, Soviet departments, Revolutionary Committees, Staffs and commanders of military detachments, railroad organizations and station masters, the organizations of the merchant fleet, river and marine, post office and telegraph and supply organizations, all commissars and emissars are obligated to carry out the orders of Comrade Stalin.

Chairman of the People's Commissars, V. Ulianov (Lenin)  
Director of the Soviet Affairs, Vlad. Bonch-Bruевич"

If Stalin was invested with unlimited dictatorial powers in the entire South of Russia held by the Bolsheviki, can it be said that the Soviet of People's Commissars, the supreme Government organ, pursued a proletarian-democratic policy? Certainly not! The Bolshevik policy was one of transforming Party leaders into despotic functionaries of the State as the above decree illustrated. In such circumstances not only workers but even lesser officials were hamstrung and had no choice but to submit to "Comrade" Stalin's absolute authority.

We see that Lenin abandoned the simple proletarian democratic idea of electing all officials without exception. An appointment of the nature contained in the Decree of May 31, 1918 could not but promote a bureaucratic dictatorial development.

The workers who followed the Bolshevik Party in 1917 and overthrew the Russian capitalists and landlords naturally took for granted that the Bolshevik leaders would fulfill their proletarian democratic pledges. When these leaders secured the posts of power and promptly set aside the promises of electing all officials and carried out the line of appointments, the most advanced workers

in the Party and many lesser leaders objected very strenuously. In March 1918 there developed a furious internal struggle against the Government's decrees which gave dictatorial powers to individual officials. Lenin took cognizance of the struggle in these words:

"The struggle that is developing around the recent decree on management of the railways, the decree which grants individual leaders dictatorial powers (or 'unlimited powers') is characteristic." ("Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government" March-April 1918)

The Lenin-Trotsky regime early after the seizure of power instituted not an elective system in the management of railways and other industries but an appointive system with virtually unlimited dictatorial powers of the appointed bureaucrats. That this development was in contradiction with the principles of proletarian revolution, was quite obvious. But Lenin, contrary to his expressed position of 1917 on this matter, took an opposite view:

"The question has become one of really enormous significance: first, the question of principle, viz. is the appointment of individual persons, dictators with unlimited powers, in general compatible with the fundamental principles of Soviet Government?" And after recounting a number of arguments in favor of the system he concluded: "Hence, there is absolutely no contradiction in principle between Soviet (i.e. socialist) democracy and the existence of dictatorial powers by individual persons." (Sol. Works, Vol. VII p. 341)

The reactionary system of appointing officials, and with unlimited dictatorial powers at that, was instituted throughout the entire territory of the Soviet State. In reply to the bitter clamor among the party membership, Lenin declared at the Ninth Party Congress:

"All these outcries against appointments, all this old and dangerous rubbish which finds its way into resolutions and conversations must be swept aside." Sol. Works, Vol. VIII p. 92)

While Stalin and other dictators appointed by the Lenin-Trotsky regime were sweeping aside every concrete attempt on the part of the workers to introduce proletarian democracy, the head of the Government was demanding that even the protest against the system of appointed dictators should be stopped.

The Comintern bureaucrats have been capturing millions of workers throughout the world by telling their victims that the present Russian regime is run by the workers and is founded on workers democracy. The Trotsky bureaucrats, of the orthodox as well as the anti-Cannon persuasion have been capturing thousands of the more advanced workers by peddling the story that under the Lenin-Trotsky regime the Russian masses enjoyed workers democracy. To Trotsky the system of appointing officials, which Lenin and he instituted immediately upon assumption of power, was a normal condition of "Soviet democracy." It became bureaucratic, on Trotsky's political calendar only when Stalin ousted him in power. Then Trotsky could not exercise the "democratic" prerogatives he enjoyed when he had stood a step higher than the more fortunate climber, Stalin. Here is Trotsky's testimony to the effect that he regarded the system of individual dictators as a fairly correct method of Soviet administration: "During Lenin's period the line was correct." (Bulletin Oppositsii, Nov.-Dec. 1929 p.9) And again:

"Under a more or less normal Party and State regime, such as prevailed during the first period after the October Revolution (1917-1922), the tendency I represent would be able to find normal and legal channels of expression within the framework of Party and Soviet Democracy." (The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 269)

(Continued on p. 33)



THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* TROTSKY'S ALLEGED FIGHT \*  
\* AGAINST STALIN IN 1923 \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Historically the present Trotsky tendency originated in the Soviet Union in the Autumn of 1923 when the ruling Trio- Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev unfolded a secret campaign to undermine Trotsky. Today it is generally accepted among anti-Stalin advanced workers that in that period Trotsky opened a struggle in the Bolshevik Party for the eradication of bureaucratism and the system of appointments and for the introduction of workers democracy in the Party and State institutions. Indeed, the political and organizational structure of the present-day Trotsky movement, which includes various allied and branch currents such as those represented by Shachtman and Oehler, rests on this alleged historical rock of Gibraltar of 1923.

An objective investigation of the testimony furnished by no less an authority in the Trotsky movement than Trotsky himself sheds light on this 1923 tradition and brings out the true character of his line toward Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev. One of the best sources of information on the question is Trotsky's auto-biography. In it we find that the Stalin ring had been carrying on an intrigue against Trotsky as early as 1918-1919, (pp.436-450) that by the second half of 1922 bureaucratic corruption promulgated by the organizational department headed by Stalin had reached frightful proportions, and that Lenin, though seriously ill, proposed to Trotsky a bloc for the struggle to remove Stalin from power. (pp. 470-488).

As we study the records left by Trotsky we see a picture that no amount of lying can change or erase. Lenin was preparing to shatter Stalin politically and organizationally, and chose the approaching Twelfth Party Congress as the battlefield. However, about a month before the Congress, on March 9, 1923 he suffered a stroke. At the Congress, Trotsky, according to his own testimony, not only did not come forth with a struggle against the head bureaucrat of the Party but actually turned over the leadership of the Congress to the Trio. (pp. 489-490). As a matter of record (Stenographic Report of the Congress and the official Party press) all the resolutions of the Congress, which were drawn up under the supervision of the Trio, were adopted unanimously. There was not a single abstention.

As we continue examining that period we see that though Trotsky did not fulfill the anti-Stalin agreement with Lenin and carried out instead the policy he had conveyed to a representative of the Stalin ring "I am against removing Stalin" (p. 486), the chief bureaucrat and his partners unfolded a secret drive to tear down Trotsky. Reacting to this intrigue, Trotsky, in a secret letter complained of the monstrous growth of bureaucratism but omitted all reference to the obvious remedy of removing Stalin and every other Party bureaucrat and establishing workers democracy as promised to the masses in 1917. Parts of this letter were later revealed by Max Eastman and many years after that by Trotsky himself. Officially, however, Trotsky maintained complete silence both about the bureaucratism of the entire party leaders and about the Trio's intrigue against him.

On October 15, 1923 a group of Trotsky supporters, called the Moscow Opposition, sent a secret message to the Stalin Central Committee stressing the need of workers' democracy, but leaving out the issue of the removal of Stalin, his staff and all the bureaucracy. The Stalin clique, profiting greatly by this ambiguous line of Trotsky and the Opposition started a discussion on workers' democracy in the official press, and under the cover of this discussion brought the attack on Trotsky into the open. At this time Trotsky officially stood apart from the Moscow Opposition and adopted a tactic of issuing a united resolution on

workers democracy which was signed by Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev and other Stalin adherents and himself. During the Party discussion, the Opposition headed by Preobrajensky introduced a resolution of its own. The Party membership took the introduction of separate resolutions to mean a wide divergence of views between the ruling Trio and the Opposition, and because the Trio conducted a vicious campaign against Trotsky, the revolutionary workers saw him as the head and the personification of the struggle against bureaucratism.

By 1925 Stalin had not only succeeded in elbowing Trotsky from power but began to undermine his original partners in the Trio, Zinoviev and Kamenev. The actual ousting of these two former allies of Stalin from power occurred at the Fourteenth Congress of the Party in Dec. 1925, and in the Spring of 1926 Zinoviev and Kamenev, in their new capacity of "oppositionists" formed a bloc with Trotsky.

Owing to their previous role as the foremost persecutors against the Trotsky Opposition, Zinoviev and Kamenev now found themselves in a very difficult position. The Stalin clique very effectively cited their writings of 1923-5 in which they lied about Trotsky's supposed underestimation of the peasantry and about Trotsky representing a variety of Menshevism. These writings constituted a powerful weapon in Stalin's hands against both Trotsky and Trotsky's new allies. The reply which Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky gave to the Stalin gang adequately establishes the true attitude of Trotsky toward his "fight" of 1923 and leaves no room for doubt as to whether the Trotsky movement stands on a historical Rock of Gibraltar or on a sheerest myth. In September 1927 the Opposition Bloc presented to the Central Committee a platform called The Real Situation in Russia. In this document the leaders of the Opposition declared that the 1923 "differences", which had been pictured as Trotsky's struggle against bureaucratism had now in 1927, lost their significance!

"We note as unfair fighting, the attempt of the Stalin group to distract attention from the views of the Opposition, as expounded in the present platform, by references to earlier disagreements between the groups existing in 1923 and 1925. These disagreements have now lost their significance." ( p. 181)

What then was that "fight" in 1923 all about if, with Stalin more in control than ever, that "fight" no longer had any significance? What of the series of articles, the so-called "New Course", which Trotsky had written in 1923 and which, without touching upon the concrete bureaucratism of Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev, spoke, in abstract, on the subject of workers' democracy? It turned out, according to the 1927 Platform, that Trotsky had exaggerated and erred, and so had Zinoviev and Kamenev and, by implication, Stalin!

"These disagreements have now lost their significance. The mistakes and exaggerations committed by both groups of Bolsheviks in the dispute of 1923-24, as a result of a series of obscurities in the state of affairs in the party and in the country, are now corrected, and offer no obstacle to a hearty cooperation in the struggle against opportunism for Leninism." (Ibid.)

Thus, what Trotsky and his aides later presented as his big fight against the Stalin bureaucracy in 1923, had been mistakes and exaggerations as a result of obscurities-- so said the Platform of the Opposition. By 1927, the past mistakes committed by both sides had been corrected! However, a further insight into the "mistakes", the "exaggerations" and "obscurities" of 1923 is given by Trotsky with his revelation of the admission made by Zinoviev that the whole 1923/1924 anti-Trotsky affair had been cooked up by the Trio--primarily by Zinoviev in order to tear Trotsky down and entrench the Trio more firmly in power. Trotsky records a conversation among the Oppositionists after he and Zinoviev had formed a bloc:

"Zinoviev in his turn said: 'You must keep the circumstances in mind. You must understand it was a struggle for power. The trick was to string together old

disagreements with new issues. For this purpose "Trotskyism" was invented."  
(The Stalin School of Falsification by Leon Trotsky p. 92)

This dishonest game on the part of Zinoviev in 1923-4 Trotsky agreed to describe in the 1927 Platform as "mistakes" and "exaggerations."

A word about the methods of Trotsky's apologists. The Platform was translated into English by Max Eastman. A devout Trotskyist at the time, Eastman took the liberty of placing the glaringly revealing paragraph in brackets, to give it the air of unimportance. As a matter of fact, he actually asked the reader to ignore it on the ground that it represented a concession on Trotsky's part to the ousted members of the former ruling Trio. In a note Eastman said: "The paragraph in brackets should be ignored by those who want to know Trotsky's thought. It was inserted in the Platform at the instance of Zinoviev and Kamenev and their followers, who fought against Trotsky with Stalin in 1923 and 1925."

The implication is that Trotsky did not really believe what he said in the Platform but that he inserted this paragraph to clear the way for the formation of the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev bloc. Indeed, Eastman virtually says as much only he calls Trotsky's unprincipled act a "minor concession":

"Trotsky made this and some other minor concessions in gaining their adherence to his platform.

"The fact is, of course, that the issues in this struggle have been fundamentally the same since Lenin's departure from political life in 1923. The Opposition surrounding Trotsky made no mistakes in principle--and least of all any "exaggerations"-- in 1923-24". (The Real Situation in Russia p. 181)

The reader is confronted with the choice of either regarding the statement in the Platform about exaggerations as a lie or Trotsky's fight of 1923-24 as a myth. The truth, which is quite ascertainable through Trotsky's own records, is that the disagreements of 1923 never had any basic political significance insofar as the issue of bureaucratism was concerned. Although the policy of the Trio was an unscrupulous "theoretical" attack upon Trotsky, his line always consisted of attempts to make peace with Stalin by agreeing to suppress Lenin's letters and covering up for Stalin at every turn. He protected Stalin by denouncing Eastman for publishing Lenin's Testament in which Lenin laid down the line to remove Stalin. Up to his very expulsion, Trotsky's line as expressly stated in his Platform was: unity with Stalin and his faction: "Our task is to preserve the unity of the Party at all costs." (Ibid. p. 125-6.) This was Trotsky's consistent line, and no amount of lying by his sycophants can change this fact.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

(Continued from page 30) Stalin A Dictator In 1918

It is this system of dictators with virtually unlimited powers which the leaders of the Bolshevik Party planted in Russia in flagrant disregard of their own pledges in 1917. That system, finally crystallized into the regime of ONE dictator. The story which Trotsky introduced after losing power, that the Soviet regime had degenerated, is fabricated out of the whole cloth. It never degenerated because it never was a healthy regime. It was bureaucratic from the moment it saw the light of day, and the knowledge of this poses the problem of closely examining the true nature of the leadership which introduced this diseased regime. Be it remembered that as early as the Civil War, not only Stalin but all the other high leaders had virtually unlimited bureaucratic power. Trotsky testifies for himself: "During the war I had practically unlimited power." (My Life, p.467) The revolutionary task of the workers is to expose the myths about the origin of the bureaucratic regime in Bolshevik Russia.

G.M.