

T H E BULLETIN

OF THE WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

The Significance of Titoism

THOMAS F. HARDEN

BRITISH GENERAL ELECTIONS

ARTHUR PRIEST

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND FOR DISSOLUTION OF BRITISH TROTSKYITES

C. P. STANTON

THE BORDIGA STALINITES

G. MARLEN

THE BULLETIN
of the
WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

Vol. XIII - No. I - (Whole Number 56)

July- August 1950

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

	<u>PAGE</u>
The Significance of Titoism -- Thomas F. Harden	1
The British General Election -- Arthur Priest	16
The Political Background for the Dissolution of The British Trotskyites -- C.P. Stanton	20
The Bordiga Stalinists -- George Marlen	36

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

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF TITOISM

The most important phenomenon in the world today is the clash between the private economy of capitalism on the one hand and the State economy of the USSR and its satellites on the other. The antagonism between these two contradictory forms leads steadily on to war. Only the emergence of a real third force opposed both to the bourgeoisie and to the Stalinist bureaucracy and striving for a single World Democratic Workers' State can prevent this war, or, should it break out, transform it into a war against both the Stalin system and the capitalist system, for the single World Democratic Workers' State.

It must be determined whether or not Titoism is such a third force, as his organizational break from the Cominform on one hand and his verbal denunciations of imperialism on the other have given some advanced workers that impression. The past few months have seen the creation of a Titoist "Independent Communist" party in Germany said to number a few thousand members. In Norway a portion of the former Central Committee of the Communist Party has reportedly established a Titoist party. The Tito issue has become a key issue within the ranks of the working class.

What is the real nature of Titoism, its relation to the Stalin system and to world imperialism, and an objective evaluation of its possibility of becoming an effective third force fighting capitalism and Stalinism and striving for Socialism?

As a result of the November 7, 1917 revolution in Russia the capitalist world was breached, the capitalists of Russia were expropriated and their property was statified. Unfortunately, the expropriation of the capitalists economically was not accompanied by the development of workers democracy. Instead the workers in Russia were politically expropriated with power centralized in the leadership of the Bolshevik party and eventually into the hands of Stalin. Nationalism and bureaucratism were the dominant features in this usurpation of power by the Bolshevik bureaucracy in Russia. When this nationalist-bureaucratic gang took over the property of the expropriated capitalists, it faced two dangers; military conquest by imperialism on the one hand, proletarian revolution with pressure for workers' democracy on the other. In order to counteract these dangers it resorted to all sorts of dickering, compromises, trades with the imperialist powers, and to keeping the potentially revolutionary workers in tow through its instruments, the Communist parties.

Now, the essential thing to be remembered about these Communist parties is that while preserving a "revolutionary" appearance, their real function was to prevent the workers from effecting revolution anywhere. A real democratically proletarian revolution in Germany, in China, anywhere, would set in motion an anti-bureaucratic process that might end by Stalin and company hanging from the Moscow lampposts, and therefore the task of the Fosters, the Thorezes, the Mao-Tze-Tungs, the Lovestones, the Erecolis, the Piecks, etc., was to prevent a genuine workers' revolution at all costs.

The Kremlin bureaucrats maintained their control of the machinery of these Communist parties in various ways. Even more important than financial control through

subsidies, Stalin instituted an intricate system of Communist International representatives and spies, who enjoyed the enormous prestige of being known as the people controlling an economy and a powerful state. In the eyes of the rank-and-file of the Comintern, the Russian bureaucratic leaders were surrounded with the halo of successful "revolutionists." Any disagreement with them was construed as a revolt against the incarnation of socialism. This, for instance, was very strikingly illustrated in the American CP in 1929. Before going to Moscow, Lovestone had almost ninety percent of the American party behind him. Upon his return, after being kicked out by Stalin, he could only assemble a handful to his banner, although his political policies remained fundamentally unaltered.

In 1948, for the first time in the history of the Comintern, there was a successful "revolt". Tito defied the edict of the Cominform and, to this day, Stalin has been unable to remove him. Nay, more, "Titoism" has become the symbol of resistance to the Stalin system not only in the minds of bourgeois statesmen and journalists, but also in the ranks of the Stalinists. The prospect of Mao-Tze-Tung taking the road of Tito fills the bourgeoisie with hope and Stalin with anxiety. What is this Titoism? The best way to reply to this question is to investigate the words and deeds of the Titoists.

The foundation of the dilemma in which the toilers of the world find themselves is rooted in the counter-revolutionary nature of Stalinism flowing from its nationalism and its bureaucracy. What attitude does Tito take to these two important questions? We shall first take up the attitude of Tito to nationalism.

Just a few days after the attack of the Cominform, Tito delivered the political report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia at the 5th Congress of the party at Belgrade. This long speech has been translated into English and we quote from the English edition circulated by the Yugoslav embassy:

"To these people (Cominform--TFH) nationalism is the fact that we pride ourselves on our sacrifices in the war, that we pride ourselves on our successes in the building up of the country, that we pride ourselves on our workers, our youth, our People's Front, because we are proud of everything that all honest people marvel at.....Now all that (the Cominform attack--TFH.) has taken on monstrous proportions in order to wreck the prestige of our Party and its leadership in that way, in order to take away from the Yugoslav peoples the glory of their heroic struggles, to trample on everything great that our peoples achieved with great sacrifices and rivers of blood, to break up the unity of our party which represents a guarantee for the successful building of socialism in our country and the realization of a happier future for our peoples." (P. 131-132; emphasis mine-TFH)

We see from the above that Tito puts forward the same doctrine of "socialism in one country" that was the rationalization of Stalin for the usurping of power. The above quotation is only a summary of similar statements throughout the speech.

At the same congress one of the principal Titoists, Edvard Kardelj, also delivered a report entitled "The Communist Party of Yugoslavia in the Struggle for New Yugoslavia, for Peoples' Authority and for Socialism." This has also been

translated into English by Tanjug the Yugoslavian news and publicity agency in the USA. After noting the division of the world into two camps and the adherence of Yugoslavia to the Russian camp, Kardelj says (P. 66):

"The Five Year Plan (of the CPY--TFH) however, means that our country has boldly set out on the course of socialist building (emphasis in original) a course of comprehensive and strong development of productive forces and the transformation of our country into an advanced industrial and agricultural country. The realization of our Five Year Plan will consist in its laying the economic and social foundations of a socialist society in our country, in the socialist sector's becoming the dominant sector of our economy in every sense." (My emphasis--TFH.)

But Kardelj, in accord with what we shall later show was the line at that time of trying to restore peace with Stalin, had qualified this statement of "socialism in one country" with the previous statement (on page 26.):

"We never asserted that we do not need the support of the USSR and the countries of people's democracy, but, on the contrary, we consider such mutual support and close cooperation as an essential condition for the development and strengthening of the socialist front."

On the question of nationalism we can see that at the time of the open split with Stalin, the line of Tito was to recognize the hegemony of the Kremlin bureaucrats, but to plead for the right, within that relationship, for the leadership of the CPY to establish a nationalist set-up in Yugoslavia with the cooperation of the USSR and the Cominform satellites.

But, as we know, Moscow would brook no sharing of its economic and political power. An economic blockade was set up around Yugoslavia. The "USSR and the countries of people's democracy" refused the "essential condition for the development and strengthening of the socialist front." Already by the time of the meeting of the Federal Assembly of the so-called Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia on December 27, 1948, it had become evident that Russia and the Cominform countries around Yugoslavia were not even going to fulfil their trade agreements with Yugoslavia, much less cooperate. What was the "Theoretical" result? The Titoists modified their original qualifications to assert that they could advance towards "socialism in a single country" in the speech of Tito on that day, concluding with the words:

"Our hard fight for the realization of the Five Year Plan for the building of Socialism in our country will end in victory."

Economic nationalism was thus definitely and unqualifiedly proclaimed.

So much for the question of whether or not Titoism is nationalist. But, some may argue, the decisive question is whether the regime within Yugoslavia is democratic or bureaucratic. From Belgrade, in books, in pictures, over the radio, emanate claims of the plebeian democracy that is building up a good life for all. Of course one could conduct an argument about the impossibility of nationalism and workers' democracy, but we do not have to resort to argumentation. Again we turn to the Titoists themselves on their words and deeds.

In this connection, even more than in the case of nationalism, there is always a big gap between the democratic pronouncements of bureaucrats and their actions. There are many examples of this in history. The elemental instinct of the masses is against bureaucratism, and therefore the bureaucrats are very careful about letting any inkling of their deeds creep into their words. But in the case of the Titoists we do not have to look very far to see the system of bureaucracy palpable both in words and deeds.

At the time of the Cominform blast against Tito one of Stalin's principal accusations was of lack of democracy in the CPY--reader, do not laugh! In the the reply of the Central Committee of the CPY, Tito inadvertently exposed the truth of this charge:

"The CC of the CPY emphasizes that the fact that certain party organizations have not yet held elections cannot give rise to the assertion that there is no democracy within the party." (Statement of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia in Regard to the Resolution of the Information Bureau of Communist Parties on the Situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia--page 7, English edition, published by Jugoslovenska Knjiga-Beograd. My emphasis--TFH.)

This seemingly innocent and insignificant admission requires analysis. No facts are submitted to prove the existence of party democracy in reply to the accusation of the Cominform bureaucrats. Second, in the very next sentence the CC of the CPY gives an "explanation" which is a lie on its face:

"These are the remnants of the war period and tempestuous post-war development through which the CPY passed and in their time had also existed in other parties and in the CPSU (B) as well."

The last part of this sentence is the "you're another" kind of argument, very true, but hardly refuting the charge. But we are particularly interested in the statement that lack of party elections was a remnant of the war period and the post-war development. This document was written on June 29, 1948, three years after the end of the war. What was there to prevent party elections at that time? Only one thing, ~~the~~ bureaucratic leadership of the CPY. Tito still further revealed and elaborated the Stalinist nature of his machine in his already cited report at the 5th Congress CPY. After devoting hundreds of words to the evils of "fractionalism" in a party, on page 44 Tito says of his leadership:

"The new leadership of the CPY which began to function at the end of 1937, had four fundamental tasks facing it: 1) to purge the Party most energetically of the remnants of the fractionalists and group formers." (My emphasis--TFH.)

It is significant from the standpoint of our investigation that Tito gives priority to the setting up of a bureaucratic, monolithic structure in the party. In the succeeding pages, Tito tells of the struggle for monolithism. On page 45 he speaks of the "exposure" of a certain Petko Miletic as a provocateur. We do not know whether his facts are correct or not in connection with this individual, but we are aware of the bureaucratic nature of the sentence reminiscent of Stalin:

"This shows the accuracy of the rule that almost every fractionalist is not far from being a provocateur or similar enemy of the working class."

Shades of the Moscow Purge Trials!

On page 47 Tito gives a glowing report of the 5th CPY Conference (October, 1940) in which he incidentally lets interesting information fall that this illegal conference was attended by 105 delegates (but in 1948, on the excuse of war conditions, elections could not be held.) Speaking of the work of the party he says:

" How could the CPY achieve such success in so short a time?

" It could achieve such great success: 1) because it had purged its ranks of fractionalists and spies of the class enemy (a typical Stalinist amalgam--TFH); 2) because there was a sound party cadre in the ranks of the Party which was then able to develop its initiative to the full--that is, sound party elements (read, Tito and Co.--TFH) came to expression; 3) because a unified leadership was now at the head of the Party, because there were no internal conflicts, namely there was complete unanimity on all questions." (My emphasis--TFH.)

It must be remembered that in this report Tito was not only reciting history but was pointing out to his adulatory followers what he conceived to be the principles of his movement. In addition to the prohibition of fractions, restriction of elections, a monolithic leadership, all the characteristics of burocratism, there was another essential characteristic of burocratic rule, concealment and deceit. That these weapons were used against the rank-and-file membership of the CPY is admitted in the same report of Tito. After stating that in the charges of the Cominform "They are making the same insinuations that Milan Grol and all the reactionaries inside the country and outside of it have already made" Tito clearly reveals his sense of responsibility to the burocrats of the Cominform on the one hand and caution with respect to the masses of his party members on the other in the following words:

"It is odd that the Resolution accuses us of hiding the criticism of our leadership by the CPSU(B) from the masses, intimating that we were afraid of the masses. No, we were not afraid for ourselves in regard to making it public, but were afraid that it would provoke still greater bitterness toward those who have accused us so unjustly. The signers of the Resolution know very well that we could not make public the letter written to us by the CC CPSU (B) on which 'strictly confidential' was written."

Take a good look at this. Tito and the other members of his Central Committee have received a letter in which they are falsely accused. The accusations, according to them, are monstrous. What do they do? They help to maintain the Cominform burocratic law of silence, concealment, deception, and do not bring out the facts until the public attack by the Cominform leaves them no other alternative.

So much for the burocratic system within the Yugoslav party. Was there any opposition to the Tito course? Two kinds were publicly admitted. The first was that of the Cominform, represented only by a few "tops," particularly Svetozar Zujovich and Andrija Hebrang. The second consisted, in the words of the statement of the CC CPY of a few "waverers" who did not accept the attack of the Cominform, but who thought that it would be best to agree with the criticism anyway, in order to avoid a conflict. The fate of Zujovich and Hebrang was decisive as far

as the attitude of this "marsh" was concerned. It was silent at the 5th Congress, and ever since. The important thing then is to find out what happened to Zujovich and Hebrang. In this connection, we shall have to give a few dates, since they are very revelatory.

According to the statement of the CC CPY in reply to the Cominform Bureau Resolution, we are informed that the basis of the open Cominform attack lay in a series of letters sent by the CPSU(B) to the CPY, that is, from one central committee to the other, the first of which was dated March 27, 1948. However, as far back as April 19, 1946, there is evidence that a fight was already developing between Stalin and Tito, that Zujovich and Hebrang were Stalin's undercover men, and that they were placed under charges for that reason. On that day the Politbureau of the CC CPY adopted in its entirety the report of a subcommittee headed by Rankovic, then and now a stooge of Tito. This April 19, 1946 was a very busy day, for the following happened: 1. The CC of the CPY formed a committee made up of Rankovic, Neskovic and Gosnjak to submit to the CC proposals with regard to Hebrang and Zujovich. 2. On the same day the subcommittee met, reported back, and 3. the Politbureau of the CC of the CPY adopted the report of the subcommittee. So revealing is the whole transaction that we publish in full the whole decision as it appears in English translation in Appendix 2 to the "Statement of the Central Committee" in reply to the Cominform Resolution:

"The Politbureau has received from the Party commission established in connection with the case of Andrija Hebrang and Sreten Zujovic the following report and proposal and adopts them in their entirety as follows:

"In connection with the decision of the CC of the CPY of April 19, 1946 to form a committee made up of Comrades Rankovic, Neskovic and Gosnjak with the task of submitting to the CC a proposal for the solution of the case in connection with the letter of Comrade Hebrang, the commission has come to the conclusion:

'1. That the letter of Comrade Hebrang, both as to the manner in which it is written and the way in which matters are put forth in it, is a unique case in the history of the Bureau of the CC of the CPY since its formation in 1937. In the letter, comrade Hebrang - in a manner which is unhealthy and impermissible in the Party, suspects comrade Tito of not tolerating him personally because he (Hebrang) also received a telegram from Moscow, and that accordingly the distrust which comrade Tito has for the economic policy of comrade Hebrang originates from this. The behavior of comrade Hebrang at the session of the CC of April 19th of that year was not auto-critical and confirms that in his letter it is not a matter of a personal conflict with comrade Tito, but rather of an attempt to transfer the political difference between comrade Tito, as bearer of the policy of the CC, and comrade Hebrang to a personal level and to introduce an incorrect relationship in the CC and an impermissible method into work. This is best confirmed by the inaccurate statements, which are strange to the CC, by comrade Hebrang at the session of the CC on April 19th, of that year to the effect that freedom of expressing opinion and of criticism and auto-criticism do not exist in the CC.

" '2. The behavior of comrade Zujovic at the session of the CC of April 19, of that year, regarding the letter of comrade Hebrang, was not only conciliatory but actually meant support for Hebrang in his unhealthy

attitude toward the CC and toward comrade Tito, both in regard to the internal relationship within the CC and to the mistaken economic and financial policy.

" 'In connection with the above, the commission proposes to the CC of the CPY that comrade Hebrang be removed from work in the Bureau of the CC of the CPY, besides other reasons, also for reasons of securing the correct execution of the party policy in economy and that he be punished by the party punishment of strict reprimand. The commission proposes that comrade Hebrang withdraw from his position of Minister of Industry in the federal government and president of the Economic Council. The commission considers that Comrade Hebrang can remain in the position of president of the Planning Commission.' "

"April 19th, 1946.

Politbureau CC of the CPY."

Several things are apparent from this illuminating document. It is obvious that before April, 1946, the conflict between Stalin and Tito had reached the point where Stalin was maintaining communication not only through the official sources, but with Hebrang, who was evidently slated to replace Tito. Tito could see that he was not only in danger of losing the party and state power but his life as well. He reacted by demoting Hebrang, just intimating to Zujovic that he had better watch his step. It is very significant that the resolution speaks of the separate economic and financial policies. Translating this into everyday parlance this meant that Tito was basing himself upon the nationalist resistance to the Russian plundering.

The conflict continued with Hebrang and Zujovic remaining in their role of Cominform men. In the meantime Russia was sacrificing Yugoslavian nationalist interests in the case of Carinthia to its own nationalist-bureaucratic interests. Recent reports, after the event, from Belgrade indicate that Russia was, about this time, urging Yugoslavia to reduce its armed forces and rely on the Russian army, an offer which was, of course, declined by the Yugoslav bureaucrats. The Cominform also charged that Tito refused to "integrate Yugoslavia into the international socialist economy," meaning, in the bureaucratic thieves' jargon, that Tito was not willing to have Yugoslavia remain an agricultural and raw material adjunct to Russia.

On March 27, 1948, convinced that stronger methods must be used, the Central Committee of the CPSU sent a letter to the CC of the CPY, and this letter "was also simultaneously dispatched to all other members of the Information Bureau, a fact of which the CC of the CPY had not been informed" according to the CPY statement already referred to. The inherent deceit and conniving nature of Tito is shown in the words just quoted above. He reveals the interesting fact that, up to that time, both he and Stalin had been officially concealing from their fellow-parties the internal conflicts, and Tito sees nothing unusual or irregular in this. The statement goes on to say:

"In addition a letter from the CC of the CP of Hungary was received through the CC of the CPSU(B) which supported the attitude of the CPSU(B) in its entirety. Similar letters were received by the CC of the CPY from the other members of the Information Bureau except from the French and Italian."
(Emphasis mine---TTC.)

It is obvious what had happened. Stalin approached his stooges in the Cominform and lined them up in a final effort to browbeat Tito. But, in the countries where there was not armed control, France and Italy, the pressure was not sufficient to immediately curb the nationalist-bureaucratic appetites of Thorez and Togliatti and company, whetted by the sight of Tito getting by with it.

The answer of Tito was swift. Less than a month later, on April 13, 1948, a commission was appointed by the Politbureau of the CC of the CPY to deal with Stalin's agents in Yugoslavia, Hebrang and Zujovic. It is interesting to note that two of the members of the old commission of April 1946, no punitive steps or disciplinary action was taken in regard to Zujovic and that Hebrang, although withdrawn from party and state work, was nevertheless allowed to hold the position of president of the Planning Commission, a bureaucratic plum. What had happened in the two years that not only demanded the expulsion of these two men, but their jailing? Let us first see what were the reasons given by the commission. Here again we see the fundamental kinship of the Tito bureaucrats with the bloody butchers of the Moscow-Purge Trials. We are now told:

" that in 1944, A. Hebrang was removed from the position of secretary of the CC of the CP of Croatia for chauvinist behavior towards the Serbs in Croatia, for an incorrect policy regarding the People's Front, for an incorrect policy towards the masses which were under the influence of the Croat Peasant Party (HSS) and for blunting the struggle against the ustashi (fascist murder gangs--TFH)." (Emphasis mine--TFH.)

Let us pause for a moment right here.

We see that two years before the April, 1946, commission Hebrang had been disciplined for chauvinism and for "appeasing" fascists. This was known to the CC of the CPY, but not only did they not expel Hebrang at that time, but they even allowed him to hold an important job. No doubt the seemingly innocuous words "besides other reasons" in the last paragraph of the commission's report in April, 1946, was a subtle hint by the Tito bureaucrats to Hebrang that unless he toed the line he would suffer. More and more the bureaucratic nature of the Tito gang becomes revealed.

But this is not all. Profiting by the lessons learned in the GPU, Tito sets about another "Moscow" trial. The same document recites:

that Hebrang, known to the ustashi as a high official of the CP was exchanged under totally suspicious circumstances in 1942, which is a unique case in our country" (Emphasis mine--TFH.)

The pattern is so familiar. Not only did Hebrang oppose Tito in the interest of Stalin but he must be also made to appear as an agent of the bourgeoisie by implication. The picture becomes complete when a few lines farther down we are informed that Hebrang was sabotaging economic work, that he was hostile to the peasants, that he "attempted to carry out an economic policy of state capitalism."

Either the various charges against Hebrang are fabrications, or they are true. In the latter instance we see the spectacle of both Stalin and Tito cynically being willing to use the filthiest sort of tool, and Tito only discarding and jailing a scoundrel when he was no longer of any service and had unequivocally declared finally and firmly for a rival gang.

What about Zujovic? As we have seen, in April, 1946, no measures were adopted against Zujovic. What were the reasons in his case that in 1948 sent him out of Tito's party and to jail? Again we quote from the report of the commission, which was adopted, needless to state, by the Politburo:

"Sreten Zujovic is an indurate fractionalist from the Gorkic (predecessor of Tito in the Stalinist leadership - TFH) camp and that Sreten Zujovic all this time been waging a secret struggle against the CPY, against the CC of the CPY, and against Comrade Tito." (Emphasis mine - TFH.)

Then we are given a bill of particulars which is true to the old Stalinist pattern; that Zujovic was punished "by the newly formed CC in the country, headed by comrade Tito, because of his fractionalist ties with the spy Gorkic," (emphasis mine - TFH) that he praised Gorkic even in 1940, and then, of course, that he had acted to break the military coordination in the fight against the encirclement (in 1944) that he had acted as a saboteur and a bureaucrat!

With the "shot while attempting to escape" of Arzo Yovanovic, the principal supporter in the Yugoslav army of the Stalin gang, the Stalin opposition seems to have been effectively liquidated.

The whole picture of Titoism reveals nationalism and bureaucratism. If Hebrang and Zujovic were treated the way they were, the statement of the Trotskyists, quoted in the previous issue of The Bulletin as to Tito's hands being red with the blood of hundreds of workers, including Trotskyists, becomes entirely credible. If we turn our attention to the so-called "mass" organs of the workers in Yugoslavia, such as trade unions, we find the same picture.

The unions developed in the period of the birth of capitalism as spontaneous organizations of the workers to protect their standard of living, as combinations of workers to withhold their labor power as a means of securing a larger share of the value being created by them. The principal weapon of the unions is, therefore, the strike. What function do the unions perform in Tito-ruled Yugoslavia? Light is thrown on this by a report of Edvard Kardelj, delivered at the 5th Congress of the CPY entitled "The Communist Party of Yugoslavia in the Struggle for New Yugoslavia for People's Authority and for Socialism," an English translation of which was issued at Belgrade in 1948. On pages 83-89 inclusive, much is said about the unions. We are told by Tito's "theoretician" a great deal about the role of unions in "socialist building" that "they are the direct organizers of the struggle of the working class for increase of production, for raising the productivity of work." (Emphasis mine - TFH.) We are told that:

"the task of the trade unions under the new conditions is to develop the new relationship of the working class and the working masses in general toward work, to organize socialist competition and shockwork, rationalization and innovation, to fight for work discipline, to improve the quality of work, to guard the peoples' property, to struggle against damage, against absenteeism, against careless work and similar things and to explain to the working masses that such a struggle is in their own interests, the interests of working masses in general." (Emphasis mine - TFH.)

Anyone familiar with the Russian bureaucratic literature on trade unions can see the identity of bureaucratic aims, to use the unions as speed up organs for the

economic enhancement of the bureaucracy and as an instrument to deceive and mislead the workers into believing that all this Stakhanovism is in their own interests. That this is true is shown both by what is in the report and by what is omitted. What is not in the report is the slightest reference to the right to strike. In fact the bureaucracy is so fearful and so careful in that respect that they have even left out all references to the CPY leadership of strikes in the period before 1945! Another most important omission is any reference to "workers' control of production." But, on this very important point, the report does have something very negative and decisive to say:

"The trade unions must fight for correct working of the enterprise, for the abolishment of all shortcomings which obstruct the production process and fulfillment of plans. They cannot, of course, directly interfere in the business of the management of the enterprise, which is responsible for the work of the enterprise, but it is their duty to point out to it all shortcomings which obstruct production, and to help it in their abolishment." (Pages 85 and 86—Emphasis mine - TFH.)

Our examination of the Tito internal structure has shown the same nationalism and bureaucratism characterizing its Russian parent. In one respect, at least, Titoism has jumped full fledged into the zenith of Stalinism, the cult of the leader. All the reports of the 5th Congress (and these are official, not the work of hostile reporters) are filled with constant interjections of "Tito-Tito-Tito-Hero" in the sickening style made infamous by the Stalinist lackeys. The resolutions we have cited contain numerous references to the crime of disagreeing with or railing at "comrade Tito." From all this we can see that the statement in the Trotskyist MILITANT of July 19, 1948, was 100% correct:

Tito and Stalin want the workers to choose between them----Regardless of what Tito and Stalin want, the workers will surely reject this trap of choosing between the type of gold braid worn in Belgrade as against the type Stalin prefers in the Kremlin."

All the more contemptible then becomes the effort of the Trotsky leadership to paint the Belgrade swindlers and exploiters of the working class as potential revolutionists (recorded in the Nov.-Dec. 1949 issue of The Bulletin.)

But the falsification of the role of Tito on the internal Yugoslavian scene, the pulling of groping workers into the Tito trap as an alternative to Stalinism on the national scale, is still not the worst crime of the Trotsky bureaucrats. Yugoslavia does not exist in a vacuum. It is today playing a most important role in the sphere of the conflict between Russia and capitalism. In order to understand the Tito trap fully in this most important sphere, we shall have to look not only at current history, but also briefly to review the past.

The first thing that strikes the analyst of the Yugoslav scene is that Tito came to power as the result of a deal. With the failure of the Nazi spearhead of imperialism to crush Stalin, a revision of the imperialist plans became necessary. Stalin had to be made to appear as the new Hitler if an ideological base was to be laid for an all-out attack by capitalism on the new economic form under Stalin's control. In order to build up Stalin as the aggressor various territories were turned over to him, including Yugoslavia. In the Nov-Dec. 1946 issue of The Bulletin we have shown just how this was done in the case of Yugoslavia. Suf-

fine it to say that Tito came to power as the result of a deal by which the Western capitalists allowed the Yugoslav capitalist state to be dissolved, and even sold their man, Mihailovich, down the river and to death, so that Stalin, then represented by Tito, might be made to appear as the "new aggressor" who must be stopped. At the time it seems certain that the bourgeoisie did not count on any "Titoist" development. and it is unquestioned that it came as a complete surprise to Stalin who certainly would not have withdrawn his Russian troops if he had even imagined the future developments. From all the available documents it is most likely that not even Tito and Company had any idea of their future role.

But, as we have seen, the conflict did arise and come out into the open, the bourgeoisie saw the literally tremendous consequences of Titoism for Stalin and proceeded to exploit the situation to the full. Credits were extended to Tito by the USA, by Great Britain, by the International Bank, Yugoslavia was given a seat on the Security Council of the UN. At the same time Stalin was raging in every issue of the Cominform organ and, on the occasion of the 70th birthday celebration of Stalin, Molotov bluntly stated that the days of Tito were numbered. Yugoslavia thus becomes one of the focal points of conflict in the cold war. In this position what is the line of the Tito bureaucrats, the potential "mobilization point for this mass of revolutionary workers" according to the Open letter of the Fourth International to the "comrades" of the CPY? No more authoritative source for an answer could be given than Edvard Kardelj, Vice Premier of Yugoslavia and its Minister of Foreign Affairs. On December 29, 1948, he delivered an address to the Yugoslav Federal Assembly, which was translated into English in Belgrade in 1949 under the title "Yugoslavia's Foreign Policy." Before looking at this, let us recall the Trotskyist prognoses given in the Open Letter. In that document, published in full in the August 1948 number of the Fourth International, the Trotsky leadership, addressing the Tito bureaucrats as "Comrades" says that they have three roads before them.

"The first road--to maintain a complete monolithic unity with the policies and ideology of the Russian Communist Party.

Of course this was so much rhetoric. Cannon and Company well knew that Tito would be merely sticking his head into a literal noose by the so-called "first road." If the "first road" was abstract-academic, what are we to think of the "third road" addressed to the Belgrade nationalist bureaucrats?

"The third road--socialist revolution--class struggle--Soviet democracy--workers and peasants militia--complete sovereignty of the factory committees--genuine workers' control of production."

But it is the "second road" in which we are particularly interested in view of the actual developments. In the Open Letter, the Cannon-Trotsky leaders thus defined the "second road:"

"A second road will certainly be suggested, consisting essentially of retreating into Yugoslavia, repelling the attacks and the eventual violence and provocations of the Cominform and its agents, and attempting to build 'Socialism' in your own country, while concluding trade relations with the powers of Eastern Europe as well as with those of the imperialist West. We will not conceal from you, Comrades, that we consider the second road just as pernicious as the first." (Emphasis mine--TFH.)

Now let us return to the report of Kardelj and see which of the "three roads" was followed by the Tito gang, Cannon's new "comrades." On page 5, Kardelj starts out with the Stalinist thesis:

" The second world war has proved that states with different social systems can cooperate even in war to say nothing of peace. Hence, the task of the allies who won the war under the slogan, among other things, of struggle for the elimination of aggression, for peace and democracy, was to do everything after the war to establish a firm peace and such a mode of international political and economic cooperation as would indeed ensure such a peace. It was for this purpose that the United Nations Organization was founded." (Emphasis mine--TFH.)

Already it begins to look as if "the mobilization point for the revolutionary workers" is going to be the UN! But Cannon's "comrade" Kardelj goes still further along the "second road." Confronted with incitement by the Cominform on the one hand and the ultimate impossibility of peaceful cohabitation with capitalism on the other hand (since their power rests on the expropriation of the Yugoslav bourgeoisie) the Belgrade bureaucrats, speaking through Kardelj, indicated the following line:

"To fight for the consolidation of the UN, for the defense of the basic principles which are formulated in the Charter of the United Nations (P. 10)

"To fight for the abolition of every discrimination in economic cooperation and for the organization of economic aid to countries which need such aid on the basis of the Charter's principles and through the UN (Emphasis mine--TFH.) and under conditions which would not encroach on the economic and political independence of countries. (P. 11)

"To fight for the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, for their independence and for the principles of equality and sovereignty." (P. 11.)

As Kardelj himself stated on page 11, these are among the guiding principles of the work of foreign affairs of the Yugoslav government. This report was made in December 1948, a few months after the open break with the Cominform. In this report Kardelj took a purely Stalinist position on the questions of Germany, Korea, Greece. In the matter of Carinthia he deliberately lied, concealing the role of Stalin:

"The most important question in our relations with Austria, the question of the Slovene Carinthia, is still not solved. At all the conferences of the big four powers held so far on Austria, in London and Moscow in 1947 and at this year's conference in London, we persistently brought out and explained our views and the just claims of the Carinthian Slovenes wherein we always met with the full understanding and support of the Soviet Union." (Emphasis mine--TFH.)

But after the economic blockade by the Stalinist satellites, the provocations, the border incidents, and the growing "western orientation" the Tito bureaucrats began to let out a little of the truth, thereby unwittingly revealing their own deceit and perfidy. On September 1, 1949, the "Yugoslav Fortnightly" published in English in Belgrade and circulated in the US. by Tanjug, carried a

note of the Yugoslav Government of August 20, 1949, to the Soviet Government. It will be noted that in the quotation above from Kardelj's report, he states that as late as 1948 "we always met with the full understanding and support of the Soviet Union" with reference to Carinthia. Now let us turn to the note of August 20, 1949. This shows that Kardelj was aware at the time of his report on December 29, 1948 of the following letter sent by Stalin in May 1945 to Chancellor Renner of Austria:

"To his Excellency
State Chancellor of Austria

Mr. Renner:

I thank you highly, esteemed comrade, for your message of April 15.

Do not doubt that your concern for the independence, integrity (the Russian word used was 'tselotnest'--Yugoslav note interpellation) and progress of Austria is also my concern. Any aid which Austria may need I am ready to offer to you to the extent of my power and possibilities. Please excuse this belated reply.

(Signed) Stalin"

The text of the Yugoslav note of August 20, 1949 not only shows that Kardelj was familiar with this letter shortly after its writing (it was obtained on the request of the Yugoslav ambassador to Moscow) but that he considered it favored Austria as against Yugoslavia on the question of Carinthia, and that he took this hostile attitude of Russia into account at least by April 1947, in suggesting a compromise. But a year and a half later he could get up calmly in Belgrade and lie to those of his fellow bureaucrats (the lesser fry) not "in the know" and have his lies circulated at least in English, and we certainly presume in many other languages.

And this is one of the "comrades" of Cannon and Co., who is going to serve as a potential mobilization point for the revolutionary workers!

More and more the Tito bureaucracy becomes objectively an aid to the war plans of imperialism at the same time that, in Yugoslavia and out, it puts into practice everything of Stalinism except Russian domination. But the very existence of Tito represents a constant menace to Stalin. The Molotovs and others cannot keep on repeating the story of Tito's days being numbered without either proceeding to action or making themselves ridiculous and Tito thereby more powerful. The example of Tito is contagious, it is already shaking the Stalin system. The menace of a Chinese Tito hangs over the Kremlin like a nightmare. Armed force may ultimately settle the question of Stalin and Tito. In such a conflict the workers of the world have nothing to choose. To advocate that the Yugoslav and other workers should die for Tito as against Stalin is worse than ridiculous, it is criminal.

But it is precisely this crime that is committed not only by Cannon . but by the Shachtmanites. In Labor Action, organ of the Shachtman Trotskyites, the Independent Socialist League, in the issue of September 12, 1949, we find the following veiled promise to line up the workers behind Tito to fight for his "right" to exploit the Yugoslav masses:

"To support Tito as against Moscow's drive to crush Yugoslav national independence is one thing. To whitewash him is another. Independent Socialists were quite willing to give military support even to a hangman like Chiang-kai-chek as against Japan's pre-World-War II assaults on China's national independence. But we are not prepared to gild totalitarian dictators merely because of a new line-up in the imperialist cold war."

Shachtman is all for support, but wants this pill made palatable by some noisy criticism.

Let us now return to the Open Letter of the Trotsky Fourth International to its Yugoslav "comrades," the CPY of Tito, Kardelj and Co. We recall that the Trotsky leaders spoke of the second road, or "Socialism in one country" which Tito is clearly following, and which he has to follow, as being as "pernicious" as the road of complete subjection to Stalin. But they sent this open letter eighteen months ago. To this date, despite the fact that more and more workers are being drawn into the Tito trap of war, of surrender to both capitalism and Stalinism, the Trotsky leaders have not retracted one word, have not, by a single line, pointed out the "second road" have kept silent when they have not openly aided Tito. Of these leaders, who have been in the cortege of Stalin, Chiang-kai-chek, the imperialist resistance movements, we expect nothing else. But a grave responsibility devolves upon the honest rank-and-file of the Trotsky workers. In the vanguard of those workers who have subjectively broken with Stalin, it is up to them to cease giving support to the Tito trap. They should now start a campaign to drive out the Cannons, Shachtmans and others who propose to support the nationalist-burocrat Tito against the nationalist-burocrat Stalin. They should join with us of the WLRP in carrying to the workers wherever possible the true story of the Stalin-Trotsky-Tito politics and in posing against these anti-proletarian movements a single World Democratic Workers' State. In the USA, where there are large masses of Yugoslav workers, the exposure of the real nature of the Tito trap would not only protect the workers immediately approached but would also have consequences in Yugoslavia. But the first step for the Trotsky workers is to learn the truth themselves, not only about Tito, but about the protectors of Tito, Cannon, Shachtman and Co.

In conclusion the writer submits the following summary on his own behalf since not all of the members of the WLRP may agree with the conclusions in point three of this last paragraph. I believe that the lessons of the Tito events are the following:

1. That wherever a Comintern "party" leadership gets control of the state and the economy, and without the presence of Russian armed forces, there exists the basis for and the probability of Titoism.

2. That this Titoism is the expression of the demand of the local nationalist-bureaucratic forces to rule over and exploit "their" workers and peasants without having to divide up with the Kremlin.

3. That there is an immediate prospect of Titoism in China and that the bourgeoisie is banking upon that contingency.

4. That it becomes an urgent task of the WIRP to expose this trap among as broad circles as possible.

Thomas F. Harden

February, 1950.

THE BRITISH GENERAL ELECTION

The result of the recent election in Britain has shown that the country is almost equally divided between the Conservative and Labour Parties. This is a reflection of the fact that they are both capitalist parties and as far as their policies are concerned, the vast majority of the people perceive no important difference between them. A similar situation arises to that which exists in the U.S.A. where the capitalists divide the electorate between the Democratic and Republican parties. On foreign policy both Conservative and Labour politicians are for the Marshall Plan and the continuation of the cold war. Consequently the whole election was swung around the question of home policy. In the main the electorate took sides on the basis of the false slogans of for or against nationalisation.

Nationalisation of decrepit industry is in the interest of British capitalism as a whole. Conservative propaganda against nationalization serves a two-fold purpose. Firstly by making a disturbance of the issue they hope to secure greater compensation for the owners of undertakings scheduled for possible nationalisation. Secondly this anti-nationalisation propaganda serves the interests of the Labour capitalist Attlees and Bevans. It serves to mislead large sections of workers into believing that nationalisation is a measure which the capitalists are very much against and that consequently the nationalisation measures of the Labourites must be in the interests of the workers. It was largely on this "issue" of nationalisation coupled with all the usual capitalist election hoop that the election took place. The major problem confronting the peoples of the world, the problem of world war--with Russia and the U.S.A. as the main contesting forces in an atomic conflict--was not an issue in the election. Both the Labour Party and the Conservatives are lined up behind the Atlantic Pact with the U.S.A. against Russia.

The small majority gained by the Labour Party makes the position of administration untenable for any considerable period. The huge poll of 84% of the electorate shows the fear of the people in the face of impending war or slump -- an awakening of political consciousness of large sections of the population was accompanied by the fact that the only choice before the people was a vote for one of the three capitalist parties (i.e. Labour, Conservative or Liberal) or a vote for Stalinism represented by the British Communist Party.

The Stalinists and the election.

The British C.P. put forward 100 candidates out of a possible 625. It did not gain a single seat and lost the two that it had gained in 1945. Its representation in parliament is now nil and most of its fellow travellers have also been eliminated. Is this to be considered a defeat for Stalinism? It is possible that the C.P. leaders expected better election results but it is a certainty that they did not expect to gain anything like 100 seats. Their purpose was to use the election for propaganda purposes and as far as possible to embarrass the Labour machine. The British C.P. applied an advanced worker orientation -- regarding the L.P. as advanced workers. Their propaganda was anti-Labour in emphasis and the Conservatives received only the tail end of their attack.

The Stalinist election tactics were based for propaganda purposes mainly upon criticism of Labour Government responsibility for "shooting unarmed natives in Malay" and upon a strong urging of all round wage increases to raise the purchasing power of the workers and so create a demand for great productivity. The Stalinists demanded the ending of Britains economic ties with U.S. imperialism and the establishing in its stead of trade agreements with Russia and the so-called "People's Democracies" of Eastern Europe--and the new Chinese Government. They called for an ending of the warmongering policies of U.S. and British politicians in the interests of "world peace."

The Communist hecklers were mainly at Labour meetings. The C.P. contested seats where the L.P. would lose more by their intervention. An example is Bexley Heath, London, where the conservative majority over Labour was 133, and the Stalinist made 481 votes. If the Stalinist had not entered this would have consequently been a Labour gain.

These figures prove that the intervention of the Stalinist candidate took enough votes from the Labourite to ensure a conservative victory. In Glasgow constituencies where the Conservatives gained small majorities over the Labourites, they were assisted by the Stalinists' intervention. The figures follow:

Govan: Conservative majority over Labour, 373; Communist vote 1,547.

Shipley: Conservative majority, 81; Communist vote 237.

Scotstoun: Conservative majority, 279; Communist vote 1,088.

These figures are quoted in the March issue of the union magazine of the Transport and General Workers Union, in an article by Arthur Deaken, general secretary of the union.

This Stalinist policy was obviously directed not only at winning supporters for the C.P. from the L.P., but was aimed at a possible Conservative victory. This would mean the open rule of the right wing section of British Capitalism where the class struggle would probably take sharper forms than under a Labour administration. That the Stalinists hope to make gains in such a situation is obvious from their strong urging of strike action in support of the engineers' claim of wage increase.

The Trotskyites and the election.

The official organ of American Trotskyism "THE MILITANT" gave prominence in its issue of 6th Feb. 1950 to "Why Revolutionary Socialists favour victory of British Labor Party." This remarkable article by Paul G. Stevens starts off from the correct premise that the British Labour Party acts essentially in the interest of British capitalism. Does the author deduce from this that the British Labour Party acts against the interests of the British workers? On the contrary, he asserts that the victory of the L.P. is of importance to the workers.

"For revolutionary socialists, for class-conscious workers, it is clear that the British Labor Party government has acted essentially in the interests of the capitalists during the four and a half years it has been in power. Nevertheless, the world as well as the domestic relationship of forces renders the victory of this party in the coming elections important for workers everywhere."

The article continues with a list of the "achievements" of the Labour government during its term of office 1945-1950. It refers to social security measures and the national health scheme but is forced to admit that such measures are common to capitalist governments. In fact the article states that even as far as nationalisation is concerned--only decrepit industries have been nationalised with large scale compensation to the former owners and without the slightest vestige of workers' control. The article admits that even the granting of independence to India, Burma and Ceylon are concessions forced from the weakened British imperialism by ^{the} rising tide of the Asiatic masses. In the international arena the Labour Government has carried on the policy of Churchill. In spite of this record of administering capitalism so well in the interests of the capitalists it is the opinion of "THE MILITANT" that the Conservative Party is waging a life and death struggle against the Labour Party in order that the right wing of British capitalism can take over the reins of office. In actual fact the British capitalist class have implicit faith in their Labour arm to lead the workers away from revolutionary action. Only when this fails will the right be needed.

The Socialist Outlook.

This British "left" Labour paper is quoted by John G. Wright in his article in "THE MILITANT" at length. This affection is understandable when we realise that the British Trotskyite Revolutionary Communist Party dissolved last year and entered the Labour Party and that its rallying point in the Labour movement is the "SOCIALIST OUTLOOK" with its respectable front of a couple of M.P.'s of the 1945-50 Parliament. "THE MILITANT" article quotes the "SOCIALIST OUTLOOK" as follows:

"If the Tories win it will be a defeat for the international working class. Reaction throughout the world will be encouraged. Our own movement will be forced into a rearguard action to defend itself from the capitalist attacks which will inevitably follow. . . .

"If Labour is returned to office, then the valuable experience of the last four years will be continued. The fallacy of trying to make capitalism work will become more and more apparent to the organised workers. The demand for a more socialist policy will be irresistible. The possibility will open up for the transformation of the Party into a powerful instrument of social change--the ideal of those who pioneered the movement.

"For this possibility to become fact it is necessary to rout the Tories at the general election. That is our first and most urgent task."

In the opinion of the "SOCIALIST OUTLOOK" a win for the Tories is a defeat for the international working class and to prevent this the solution is to put into power the equally capitalist Labour Party. This line flows logically from the old RCP line of putting Labour into power, whereby the workers will have a free demonstration of its reactionary policy and will then turn to the Trotskyites. In the meantime they just have to carry on suffering. The primary task of the British Trotsky workers is thus to use up their energy in rallying round the Labour Party, or, as "THE MILITANT" puts it:

"No doubt, class-conscious workers in Britain will for these reasons rally behind the Labor Party, despite its record, just as the capitalists rally behind the Tories." (Ibid.)

The W.L.R.P. and the election.

British members of the W.L.R.P. when discussing the election with the workers point out that a vote for either Labour or Conservative parties is a vote for capitalism. A vote for the C.P. is a vote for Stalin. This election provides no alternative. The task of creating the third force is the work of the W.L.R.P.

Class conscious workers realise that in the struggle to overcome capitalism and establish the classless society they have to overcome tremendous obstacles. Chief of these impediments is the fact that the working class movement is not free, and has never been free, from the obstacles of nationalism and bureaucracy and opportunism with which the reactionary leadership have always and consistently led them away from a revolutionary policy. The W.L.R.P. alone points the way to the building of the world party of workers revolution.

Arthur Priest

England. March, 1950.

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND FOR THE
DISSOLUTION OF THE BRITISH TROTSKYITES

The Revolutionary Communist Party of Great Britain, (Trotskyites) carrying out a decision adopted at a special National Conference on June 4/6, 1949, have formally dissolved their organization and entered the British Labour Party as individuals. This act provides the culmination of a long series of ideological manipulations and organizational maneuvers evolved over a period of many years. For a proper understanding of the perspectives now facing the advanced anti-Stalinist workers in Britain, the role of the Labour Party and the relation of the Trotskyites to it has to be evaluated.

To most advanced workers, the evaluation and role of the Labour Party is well known. As British capitalism developed and gradually broadened the democratic cover of its class dictatorship, it bribed the upper section of the proletariat, which then formed its organization to protect its interests. As the interests of this stratum of the proletariat are inextricably bound to that of the capitalist class, this organization (Labour Party) acts as an agency of the ruling class within the ranks of the workers. It puts a brake on the struggle of the workers and diverts the latter from their real historic task- the overthrow of capitalism- and channels their energy toward the task of extorting increasing bribes from the capitalists for the benefit of the aristocracy of labour. The Labour leaders act in a thousand ways to transmit capitalist ideology into the minds of the workers.

While the interests of the Labour Party leadership are in conflict with the mass of the workers, it has succeeded in gaining the leadership of these very workers. This has been accomplished by an outward expressed policy of loyal opposition to the British capitalists and by putting across the idea that the Labour Party program, if implemented by state power, would eventually lead to Socialism. The British capitalists lend a hand in this game by publicly pretending that these Labour leaders represent an actual threat to capitalism. In truth, as the British imperialists fully understand, the real policy of the British Labour Party leadership is loyalty to the British capitalist system in deeds and a few meaningless oppositional gestures in words.

To carry out its function, the Labour Party leadership is compelled to "sub-contract out" part of its work. That is, it is obliged to allow within its ranks a left wing which acts as a loyal opposition to the Labour Party, critical in words, loyal in deeds. It ties back to the Labour Party those workers who are moving or starting to move- or even those who show signs of starting to move- out of the orbit of the ideology of the aristocracy of labour towards a revolutionary proletarian position.

The economic interests of the Stalinist bureaucracy are politically represented by the C.P.S.U., by the Stalin-led organizations in the satellite states and in the capitalist countries. These latter collect around them sincere workers and petty bourgeois elements who are attracted by the glamour of the Russian Revolution and by the falsehood that Socialism is being built in Russia. But the Stalinist organizations themselves throw up loyal oppositions varying in size and political importance. The essentially pro-Stalin character of these oppositions are determined by some point of attachment to Stalinist politics in its historical development in Russia.

One effective means among others used by the Stalin system to mislead the workers is to distort the role of Social Democracy, which in Britain is represented by the Labour Party. In its left swing, the Stalin leaders identify the Labour leaders with fascism, whereas in its right swing, it calls for unity with the Labourites whom it then characterizes as a progressive force. After the wild ultra-left zigzag of 1928-32 culminated in the victory of Hitler, the Stalinists

very cautiously began a swing to the right beginning with a modest proposal for a political non-aggression pact with the Social Democracy in March 1933. The swing developed gradually until the Stalinists began to openly support the policies and leaders of unashamed pro-capitalist organizations. With pro-Rightist poison being dimmed into their ears day in and day out, the British workers were given a completely distorted perspective of the role of the Labourites and the aims of the British Labour Party. Within this general context, it would be enlightening to study the activities of the British Trotskyites in this connection.

The Revolutionary Communist Party of Great Britain was the result of a combination between the Workers International League and the Revolutionary Socialist League, which in turn developed as a product of a number of complex fusions of various groups. For one thing, the rightist pro-Labour Party ideology poisoned this combination from its foundations as can be seen from the evolution of a bewildering number of mutually contradictory positions.

The masses of the organized workers believe that the Labour Party, in power through a parliamentary majority, can improve their standard of living. Some of them believe it can (but won't) bring Socialism. Some of them believe it can (and will) bring Socialism. For a variety of reasons a large proportion (today a majority) of the masses support the Labour Party. This shows that the Labour Party is doing its job efficiently and that the Labour Party leadership is correctly carrying its task of tying back to the capitalist ideology those workers who are starting to move to the left.

Many workers begin to see the truth of this and start to move away from support of the Labour Party. It is possible to tie them back to the Labour Party by telling them:

1. It is a working class party but it has a wrong program which can and must be changed, or
2. It is a working class party which somehow has gotten itself a bad leadership which can and must be changed, or
3. It is a working class party with a good programme which its leaders do not intend to carry out. This can only be proved by supporting the Party into power, and so giving the leaders a chance to carry out this good programme, or
4. It is a working class party with a good programme which cannot be fulfilled under capitalism so we must support it into power so that this fact will be proved to the masses whereupon... the leaders will change to anti-capitalism
5. ditto ... the leadership will be changed
6. ditto ... the masses will leave the Labour Party
7. It is a working class party with a bad programme (or leadership) which must be proven by supporting the L.P. into power. (Whereupon the workers will then change the programme or the leaders, thus turning the L.P. into a Socialist party or they will leave the L.P. and, of course, join the loyal opposition which is putting forward this line.)
8. It is not a working class party so we must support it into power in order that it may prove this by its actions to the workers who will then leave it or change it.
9. It is not a working class party and we must prove this by demanding (!) that it carry out measures for the benefit of the working class. When it refuses to do this, - or to say it will do this- then the workers will change or leave it.
10. ... some variety or combination of the above.

Now a sincere but confused individual might honestly put forward any of the above lines. But anyone that put forward two or three... or all! ... of these lines would obviously not be an honest individual. The Labour Party cannot

be both a party representing the historic interests of the proletariat and one representing the interests of their oppressors, the capitalist class. It cannot have a Socialist program which the leaders do not intend to carry out and have an anti-working class policy. If its leaders are agents of the capitalist class then they must carry out a capitalist policy and no amount of pressure or demanding can make them carry out an anti-capitalist policy. If it is a capitalist party with capitalist leaders carrying out a capitalist policy, then the task of workers must be to oppose it and not support it.

Finally, if it is an intrinsic, unalterable capitalist agency, then it is only deception of the masses to advocate that it adopt a socialist policy. Indeed, if it is an agency of the capitalist class acting within the ranks of the workers, then it is our task to denounce every policy it adopts. For the more to the left its policy, the more it is leaning leftwards in order to drag the workers back into the orbit of the ideology of its capitalist masters.

But it is not the task of this article to argue against any one of the many lines put forward by the Trotskyists on this question, but instead to demonstrate the subjective, conscious dishonesty of the Trotskyist bureau which puts forward the variety of self-contradictory lines that are intended only to tie back to the Labour Party machine the workers who are leaving it for whatever reason.

All quotations are from the Socialist Appeal (which before its Vol. 3 No. 9 issue of June 1941 was called Youth For Socialism, and from 1942 called itself Organ of the Workers International League, Fourth International, and from its Vol. 5 No. 20 issue of April 1944, called itself Organ of the Revolutionary Communist Party, British section of the Fourth International.)

In May 1941 the Trotskyist paper after criticising the present policy of the Labour Party leaders says:

"The workers must force the Labour leaders to break with the treacherous ruling class...Only the working class...can push the Labour leaders into power or completely expose their impotence. The failure of the Labour leaders to respond to this demand of the workers will reveal the hollowness of their claim to represent their interests...Labour to Power on the following Programme" (here follow six slogans, including 'Granting freedom to India and the Colonies!', 'Nationalization without compensation of arms industries, banks, mines and railways', 'Control of production by workers', etc. - C.P.S.) (p.4)

This suggests that the Labour leaders, at that time allied in governmental coalition with the Tories, were at that time carrying out a policy not in the interests of the workers, but it might be possible for the workers "by mobilizing their forces, to push the Labour leaders to power..." on a working class program say the Trotskyites. In other words, the Labour leaders are betrayers and liars, paralyzing the working class, but they can be pushed into power on a socialist programme if the workers mobilize their forces. The following month, after the usual criticism, the line of a breach between the Labour leaders (agents of capitalism!) and the capitalists is put forward and "If the Labour leaders are sincere this is the only road which they can take...Labour to Power on the following programme..." (p.4). The slogans are the same as above, extended to seven, the new one being establishment of army officers training camps controlled by the trade unions. The Trotskyites here give the impression that the Labour leaders are sincere but mistaken in their viewpoint. Incidentally the last of the Trotskyite demands in each case is for "A socialist appeal to the workers of Germany and Europe for the socialist struggle against Hitler," and without further

amplification the article here ends: "Only workers power and Socialism can fight fascism in all its forms." This suggests to the readers of the Socialist Appeal, that if the labour leaders are sincere and so decide to "break" with the Tories and take power on the above seven demands...that they (the Labour agents of capitalism) will be operating Socialism and that that would be workers control!

Within a few months the Trotskyists had found for themselves a programme and from Autumn 1941 onwards the Socialist Appeal published more or less regularly a column which went something like this as per issue of November 1941 p.1:

"The Socialist Appeal continues Lenin's policy:

"An end to the coalition with the bosses. Labour and Trade Union leaders must break with the capitalist government and wage a campaign for power on the following programme:

- 1) Dispatch of arms to the USSR under Trade Union and factory committee control.
- 2) Nationalization (as quoted above-C.P.S.)
- 3) Confiscation of all war profit- all company books to be open for Trade Union inspection
- 4) Workers control of industry. (As above-C.P.S.)
- 5) Equal distribution of food etc. under control of committees of housewives, small shopkeepers, workers.
- 6) Sliding scale of wages with guaranteed minimum
- 7) Repeal of anti-working class legislation.
- 8) Clear out pro-fascist officers. Election of officers by rank and file (as above-C.P.S.)
- 9) Military academies under Trade Union control (as above.)
- 10) Arming of workers under control of committees of workers elected in factories and streets against danger of invasion or Petainism. (As above-C.P.S.)
- 11) Freedom for India, Ireland, etc. (As above-C.P.S.)
- 12) A Socialist Appeal to the workers of Germany and Europe on the basis of this programme to join the Socialist struggle against Hitler for the Socialist United States of Europe. (As above-C.P.S.)

The Trotskyite policy is quite clear. The leaders of the Labour Party are capable of breaking with the capitalists, and of taking power (in parliament?) on a programme which, according to point 12 in the foregoing, is a socialist one. In other words, there is nothing to prevent the Labour Party from becoming a Socialist Party or the Labour leaders from becoming revolutionists! Incidentally, it might be noted that the programme itself is a hash of slogans bundled together in a manner intended to attract workers from all varieties of the political compass without regard to logic or dialectics. Point No. 1 urges that the workers send arms to the treacherous anti-working class Stalinist bureaucrats, Points No. 2, 5, 8, 11, and 12 are only possible at the peak point of a revolutionary period, all of which signify the end of the capitalist system. Points No. 9, and 10 are first possible in a period of disintegration of capitalist rule just before the proletarian revolution. Point No. 3 asks for the confiscation of the profits and the opening of the books of companies... which have already been nationalized under Point No. 2! Then there are Points 6 and 7 which are impossible under capitalism and needless after capitalism has been overthrown. Point No. 4 is a trap which can be found exposed in the very same issue of the Socialist Appeal where it is proposed!

The Workers Control called for in Point No. 4 is a traditional slogan of the Lenin, Stalin, Trotsky tendency. Trotsky calls it a transitional demand that leads to the taking over of industry by the workers. The RCP, at this writing, poses it as a slogan of dual power. The entire tendency has always put "Workers

Control" as something involving to one extent or another the taking of power out of the hands of the capitalists. In any case, this has been called by them continuously as a "revolutionary demand." In their issue for June 1941, the editorial states:

"...the solution (being) in the control being taken out of the hands of the bourgeoisie and vested in the hands of those who can run industry efficiently and in the interests of the community- the working class." (p. 2, my Emp.-C.P.S.)

In the same issue of the Socialist Appeal which calls for workers control of industry as part of the Socialist programme to be operated by the Labour leaders, the Trotsky leadership gives an example of what they mean by Workers Control. In a lengthy article they discuss how the workers in a (capitalist) state armaments factory in the midlands had agreed to increase the production (of arms!) by working harder and by re-arranging machinery, schedules, etc., providing part of the technical management of the factory was vested in the Shop Stewards (some being trotskyists) and if an agreement concerning wages and other issues was agreed to:

"At first the men were reluctant to accept an agreement which involved increased exertions on their part. But when the stewards had explained the conditions, and that the management would not be able to utilize the position to lower the standards and rates under the terms of the agreement they enthusiastically endorsed the action of the stewards." (November 1941, p. 2)

The article then details the "benefits" which resulted from such a plan:

"Given these conditions and with virtual control of production in the hands of the shop stewards the production quota was easily realized. The management admitted that the factory had produced 33% more than was deemed possible... This result demonstrates the efficiency and necessity of workers control of production." (Ibid.)

The Trotsky leaders waxed lyrical over this version of "Workers Control":

"But this was not just an isolated and exceptional fortnight. Due to the unrivalled militancy and leadership of the shop stewards this factory has achieved the highest wage rate and the best conditions in Britain; and due to the measure of control achieved by the shop stewards produces the cheapest, and per head of production, the highest standard of any factory in Britain." (Ibid.)

Actually, this was how the workers in this particular factory met an urgent demand personally telephoned by Winston Churchill for increased production. The Trotsky leaders, however, preferred a different interpretation:

"Here we have in practice a solution to the problem of production...operation under workers control." (Ibid.)

So we see that what the Trotskyites mean by workers control is that under capitalism, the workers should voluntarily agree to take over the foreman's job, re-organize the works for the bosses, speed themselves up, work harder, produce more goods for the bosses, all for a temporary increase in wages. Significantly, the article was sub-headed "Higher Output plus Better Conditions." As if this was not plain enough, the article further admitted that "today workers control may mean more profits." (Ibid. My emphasis- C.P.S.)

Of course, a few months later, the Socialist Appeal was busy explaining

the circumstances under which the workers were kicked out. They were compulsorily transferred to another factory and had their wages cut.

In Feb. 1942 the Trotskyites attack Joint Production Committees as they were called because as the Trotskyites complain this "means they give the illusion that the workers are having some say in industry, and at the same time they can demand more concessions from the bosses through these committees. Production will not be increased this way but the slavery of the workers will." (Socialist Appeal, Vol. 4 No. 5) The Trotskyites comment:

"This is not a solution that the workers can welcome. If the Labour leaders were honest and explained this to the workers they would gain an immediate widespread support for the only progressive alternative-workers control." (Ibid.)

Thus the Trotskyites are not only offering to the capitalist class their own solution to the capitalists' problem of production (Workers Control in place of Joint Productive Committees in order to get the workers to toil harder and produce more profits) but the Trotskyites even go the extent of begging the labour bureaucrats to adopt this measure as their own.

The above-cited article continues with such phrases as:

"the capitalist class is forced to lean on the Labour leaders...the treachery of the labour leaders...instead of truthfully pointing out...they rallied in support of Churchill..." (Ibid.)

And the Trotskyite solution?

"Workers, Trade Unionists, demand that your leaders (these dishonest, untruthful, treacherous leaders- C.P.S.) fight for the interests of the workers..." (Ibid.)

So apparently, if the workers demand hard enough they could persuade the crooks, liars and traitors to fight for the workers demands! This is the way that the Trotskyites function to tie back the leftward moving militants to the tails of the social democracy in this situation.

The March 1942 issue of the Socialist Appeal has a half inch heading: "FOR A SOCIALIST BRITAIN" followed by a quarter inch sub-head: "Demand the Labour Leaders End Truce and Take Power." (p. 1)

Surely there can be no two ways of understanding this! Clearly the Trotsky leaders are telling the workers that if the Labour leaders take power they are capable of creating a Socialist Britain. The Trotsky leaders know that the Labour leaders are agents of the capitalist class and they know that even if the Labour leaders did take power they could take no steps whatsoever to create socialism. The heading is not a mistake or an errant policy but sheer deception. The article quoted which is mainly an attack on the ILP for putting forward a similar policy, suggests that revolutionists should "table a series of demands and approach the Labour leaders with them proposing that they break with the Tories and wage a struggle for power. Simultaneously a campaign would be waged to draw the rank and file of the Labour movement throughout the country to achieve these aims and thus expose their leaders...If such action compelled the Labour leaders to break with the Tories so much the better. This would be a prelude to a struggle for power." (Ibid.)

Here the Trotskyites again follow criticism of the Labour leaders by suggesting that the latter can be compelled to break with the Tories and wage a

'struggle for power- on the basis of working class demands. Thus they delude the workers that it is possible to change the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class into anti-capitalists, and that it is possible (under pressure) for the Labour leaders to fight for the interests of the masses.

Incidentally, it should be noted that up to now the demand of the Trotskyites is for the Labour leaders to take power on a working class programme, not on the Labour Party programme.

In its April 1941 issue, the Socialist Appeal says:

"This is the position of the Labour leaders: they prefer to co-operate with the bosses till they will not be needed any more...The Labour leaders claim to represent the interests of the workers: Then let them break now with the capitalists...End the Coalition! For a General Election! Labour must take power!" (P. 4)

In other words, the Labour leaders just happen to prefer the wrong thing. They must be persuaded to change their minds. In April 1942, the lead article ends:

"Workers International League (The Trotskyites- C.P.S.) believes that the **solution** of the problems which confront the working class can only be solved by the workers taking power into their own hands. But the first step in this direction must be the re-establishment of the independence of the organizations of the working class from subordination to the bosses... The coalition must be ended. Labour must take power! Put into force the programme of the Socialist Appeal."

Here then there is no equating of the Labour leaders in power with the establishment of Socialism. First Labour To Power in order to put the leaders to the test, so to speak. Then the workers must take power into their own hands.

In a report on the Labour Party Conference, in Socialist Appeal for June 1942, we are informed that the workers are pressing for a break in the Labour-Tory alliance and that "This is probably the last Conference in which the Labour Party will be represented in the Government. The Labour leaders by the next Conference will probably be forced into opposition. This is the next step for the working class towards the taking of power by those who claim to represent the interests of the workers. W.I.L. is fighting to lead the workers on to this road...We will fight for the demand that the Labour leaders put into force a programme of socialist demands. By this means, the workers will become convinced from their own experience that the Labour leaders cannot show them a way out of the misery of capitalism and its wars. They will begin to see the need for the Fourth International and its programme as the only means of conquering power and instituting the Socialist rule of the working class."

In view of the wrong prognosis at the beginning of the above citation (the Labour leaders never at any time broke from the Tories- it was the Tories that broke the coalition, three years later) it almost appears here that the Trotskyites were beginning to believe their own lying propoganda that the workers could force the Labour leaders to do anything of benefit to the working class! In the same vein as previously, the article suggests that the ending of the coalition would be a step forward for the workers (and in actual fact the coalition was eventually ended- by Churchill!!) and pretends that a breach of the Labour-Tory alliance meant independence of the working class! The Trotsky leaders still suggest that the workers should believe in the possibility of the Labour leaders putting forward a Revolutionary Socialist programme. But they suggest (ambiguously) either that the Labour leaders won't adopt it or else that

they will adopt it and then not carry it out. (The wording is phrased to allow either interpretation according to the political level of the individual reader.)

Meanwhile, in the Editorial of the same issue which discusses the coal situation, we read:

"It is time that this farce was ended. It is time that the leaders of the workers be forced to act in the interests of the workers... Not a rotten compromise but the expropriation of the mines without compensation and their operation under the control of the miners." (p.3)

In other words, the Labour leaders can be forced to carry out part of the so-called Socialist programme of the Fourth International. Three contrary policies in one issue of the paper!

With the August 1942 issue of the Socialist Appeal there occasionally begin to appear such paragraphs as the following:

"Join the ranks of the W.I.L. and help us to build a party that will make the programme of the Socialist Appeal a living reality." (p.4)

But what is that programme? Why here it is at the top of the page, the usual "Our programme for power. An end to the coalition with the bosses. Labour and Trade Union leaders must break with the Capitalist Government and wage a struggle for power on the following..." (Then come the 12 points cited before-C.P.S.)

This, then, is the double demand of the Trotskyites to the Labour workers: 1.) Do not break with the Labour Party. Work for Labour to Power. 2) Break with the treacherous Labour Party, join our ranks and ...work for Labour to Power!!

In the Sept. 1942 issue of the Socialist Appeal there is a report of the W.I.L. National Conference. It comments that "the traditional mass organisations of the working class, the Labour and Communist Parties, have gone over to open support of the class enemy..." (Vol. 4 No. 12) The report then gives extracts from the main conference document: "A split in the Labour Party is inevitable... the thoroughly rotten and decayed elements of the extreme right wing will step over into the camp of the ruling class as did MacDonalld. The left will be driven to break the coalition (It was the Tories that broke the coalition three years after-C.P.S.) and form an open opposition in parliament." (Ibid.)

You pays your tuppence and you takes your choice. The Labour leaders are already in the camp of capitalism. They aren't already in the camp of capitalism but "inevitably" some of them soon will be. They won't break the coalition. They will break the coalition... What have you?

In February 1943 the leading article of the Trotskyite paper ends with: "A workers government is the only means of destroying fascism forever and establishing a socialist world of peace and plenty for all." And how is this to be obtained? On Page 2 of the same issue we get the good old Trotskyist solution in thick lettering- "**OUR PROGRAMME FOR POWER.** An end to the coalition with the bosses. Labour and Trade Union leaders must break with the capitalist government and wage a campaign for power." There is more in the same vein. You can equate the goal of Workers Government with the programmatic solution if you like. One is in the leading article, the other the programme. Both appear in the same issue. All things to all men. The Trotskyites have a programme to suit everyone.

In March 1943 the Socialist Appeal became a twice monthly paper and celebrated this by a slight turn in policy at the end of their leading article:

"Workers...the time has come to exert your pressure now. We appeal to you. Don't put your trust in the capitalists or **their** politicians. Watch the actions of your own leaders. Rely on your own strength, your own forces..."

The workers are told to rely on their own strength, to distrust their leaders and yet the article ends with the demand for Labour to Power. In May 1943 the Socialist Appeal gives the principles of the Trotsky organization:

"Workers International League is a revolutionary Marxian organisation based on a definite programme whose aim is the organisation of the working class in the struggle for power and the transformation of the existing social order!"

And how is this to be achieved? As usual, just turn back a page to "Break the **Coalition**. Labour to Power on the following programme." (Then comes the W.I.L. 12 points.) But what has happened to that headline? Its changed!! Up until March 1943 the headline was "OUR PROGRAMME FOR POWER." In March 1943 where signs of a slight change were shown, the 12 points were just headed "OUR PROGRAMME" and from then on the new heading of the 12 points is this: "Break the Coalition, Labour to Power on the following programme:"

Aren't the Labour leaders to be pressurised any longer to adopt a trots-kyite policy? Apparently not. The specific wording of Labour and Trade Union leaders have been changed to the abstraction "Labour." It is along these lines that the leading article of Mid May 1943 ends that the Labour and Trade Union movement cannot "tolerate the threats of its 'leaders'". It must cleanse the ranks of blackmailers and splitters and insure against a stab in the back later." (Vol. 5 No. 11)

Although this is followed by the usual demand of Labour to Power it is obvious that the Trotskyists are now telling the workers that the Labour leaders are enemies who must be expelled from the Labour Party. Incidentally, this could mean by implication that these positions of leadership are to be taken over by the equally treacherous 'Labour Lefts.'

In any case, it now appears that the Labour Party can become a workers revolutionary party with a Trotskyite program, provided the workers take the initiative. However, it is first necessary to get rid of the present leaders. But we read in a short article on Ireland elsewhere in the issue that "Labour has now a wonderful opportunity to win the majority of the workers and farmers by a campaign around a fighting socialist programme... The Labour members in Stormont should resign and force bye-elections... The Irish workers in Ulster have an opportunity of giving the lead to the workers of all Britain. W.I.L. in Ireland will fight for Labour to take power as the next stage in the struggle whilst putting forth our own programme of socialist demands." (Ibid.)

That is, in Northern Ireland, the Labour Party must be supported into power on their own programme, leaving the peddling of the Trotskyite 12 points to the W.I.L. Now you know.

The June 1943 issue discussed the coming Labour Party Conference and gives the following line:

"Some of the Labour leaders want the coalition to be continued after the war is over! Those who stand with the class enemy must be driven from the ranks of the Labour Movement. If there is to be a split, let it be now... Then let them (the labour leaders who should be driven out-C.P.S.) break with the government of bankers and capitalists! Restore the independence of the working class. Labour must take power! W.I.L. will fight side by side with the Labour workers to put this programme into force..."

They're good, they're bad, they can't be worse, they could be better... Take your choice. Preparing to change back to the old policy of urging that the Labour Leaders take power (this heading was restored as of the Mid July 1943 issue of the Socialist Appeal) the first July 1943 issue lumps all the different policies together in the leading article:

"The next step forwards in convincing the workers of our programme lies in demonstrating to them that the Labour leadership cannot achieve their aims of a world of peace, of plenty and security...(i.e. The Labour leaders want a world of peace and plenty but are unable to achieve it-C.P.S.)
"The Labour leaders do not want to take power...(i.e. The trouble with the Labour leaders is that they are afraid of responsibility.-C.P.S.)
"For a General Election. Labour must take power and put into force the programme of the Socialist Appeal...(i.e. The Labour Leaders are workers representatives with a wrong policy who must be- and so presumably can be- persuaded to adopt a revolutionary socialist policy-C.P.S.)
"By this the Labour leaders demonstrate that far from being socialists they are not even consistent democrats...(i.e. The Labour Leaders have no place in a Social-Democratic organisation. This is the previous, but disappearing line of kick out the leaders.-C.P.S.)
"It is clearly seen that it is the leaders who are apathetic and indifferent to the struggle for social change. Indeed they are fighting tooth and nail against it...(i.e. They are capitalist agents of the ruling class functioning within the ranks of the workers to hold them back.-C.P.S.)
"Demand that your leaders change Socialist words into Socialist deeds. W.I.L. will fight side by side with the workers to achieve this..!"(i.e. The Labour Leaders have a socialist policy which they cannot or do not want to -take your choice- put into operation.-C.P.S.)

The Mid-July 1943 issue says boldly in a leading article that the Labour Leaders are a pack of traitors and deceivers who are playing the game of the capitalists. Workers, they say, you have nothing to gain from this putrid Labour leadership; join the W.I.L. and fight for its programme. But when the reader turns to page 2 of the Socialist Appeal to see what this program is, he finds that the Trotsky leadership is calling for this self-same treacherous Labour and Union leaders to break the political coalition with the openly capitalist politicians and take power in the name of Labour.

The Editorial in the next issue of the Socialist Appeal calls for no less than the overthrow of capitalism. Since it is the Labour and Trade Union leaders who the Trotskyites want to take power, it is implied that if the British workers struggle hard enough, they can force the Labour leaders (traitors, capitalist agents, not socialists, not even democrats) to take power on a revolutionary Socialist programme and achieve no less than the overthrow of capitalism. **THERE IS NOT A TROTSKY LEADER WHO COULD POSSIBLY BELIEVE THIS TO BE A TRUE STATEMENT OF FACT.** Yet this is published week after week in the Trotsky organ, with, of course, minor and major variations to please all different tendencies.

The January 1944 Socialist Appeal carries a major article by Harold Atkinson explaining the line, "Why Labour To Power?" The excuse for the line is:

"...they are afraid to take power! When they are forced to take power by the masses of the workers, they will be incapable of taking one real step against the capitalist class. Our whole object ... is to show this fact to the workers who support the old corrupt leaderships..."

It is instructive to note that a year and half later, when the Labour Leaders took power- due to Churchill's decision- the Socialist Appeal hailed

this as "A smashing victory for the working class." Three years later still, when the Labour Leaders prepared to nationalize Steel for the capitalists, the Trotsky writers cheered this as follows: "Steel Nationalization marks a big step forward...The Labour Party has gone forward in the implementation of its programme further than could have been expected. The capitalists have not been in a position ... to prevent this development..."

The Socialist Appeal of April 1944 announced that "all Trotskyist organisations in Britain united into one party!" (Vol. 5 No. 20) The new organisation was named the Revolutionary Communist Party. This "unification" meant in effect that one or two tiny grouplets and a few individuals were admitted into the W.I.L. on condition it changed its name to R.C.P. A bold "FUSION RESOLUTION" was published which concluded:

"Socialist Workers! Communist Workers! The Fourth International is the World Party of Socialist Revolution. It is the ONLY international Socialist or Communist Party of the working class..." (Ibid. Emphasis in Original)

And its programme? What was the proposed programme of the ONLY Communist party of the working class? You will never guess!: "OUR PROGRAMME FOR POWER. AN END TO THE COALITION WITH THE BOSSES. LABOUR AND TRADE UNION LEADERS MUST BREAK WITH THE CAPITALISTS AND WAGE A CAMPAIGN FOR POWER ON THE FOLLOWING PROGRAM:" (Ibid.) The programme is no less than the 12 points slightly reworded; two pairs of points are removed and the number made up by added demands against race hatred and Electoral rights from 18 years of age and for soldiers, etc.

So now we know why it is necessary to form the ONLY party of the workers; so as to elect a government of traitors, capitalist agents, splitters, black-mailers, non-socialists, not even democrats, allies of the class enemy.

In the November 1944 issue of the Socialist Appeal, there is stated, among other things:

"The main task of revolutionaries consists in helping to mobilise the masses in the reassertion of their class independence on an independent class programme. Labour workers must force the leaders to take power. Once the workers have been mobilised on this road they would not easily be prevented by their treacherous leaders from carrying a socialist programme into effect... (At this time of writing, four years later, the workers are worse off than ever. There is not even a faint hint of socialism.-C.P.S.) the struggle to place the Labour leaders in power on a socialist programme is the best means of exposing these leaders as lackeys of the capitalist class."

A subsequent issue of the Socialist Appeal is interesting inasmuch as it gives a straight-forward statement of one of the many Trotsky policies that rarely found its way into publication. It is in the Editorial written by E. Grant. There we find the usual patter assuring the doubtful that the Trotsky leaders do not believe that a Labour Government will solve the problems of the workers. But the workers do, says Grant. Therefore the Trotskyites unite with the workers to demand that the Labour Leaders take power on a Socialist Programme. Grant then goes on to add:

"We will give them (the labour leaders-C.P.S.) critical support even on their own programme." (Dec. 1944, Vol. 6, No. 9 My emphasis-C.P.S.)

The above admission is a result of the engulfing by the W.I.L. of the older Trotskyist factions. It represents a policy foreign to the W.I.L. and one which had rarely appeared even after the so-called fusion although it was a

regular line with the other groups. It is a plain statement that when it comes to the showdown, the Trotskyites will support the Labour Leaders regardless of their programme. Not Labour to power on a socialist programme- the slogan to hook the unwary- but Labour to power on any old programme. Both these lines were kept going at the same time, with the bulk of the R.C.P. membership unaware of the actual policy.

In the Mid-December 1944 issue, the Trotsky leaders announced the decision of the R.C.P. to contest a parliamentary election. The line advocated here was that Labour take power on a Socialist program. This was a verbal concession to the leftward minded Trotsky workers. As a matter of fact, the Editorial in this issue went even further and stated that:

"The masses need a Socialist Programme and mass socialist parties to fight for that programme...only the Parties of the Fourth International in Europe have such a programme and policy today. Only the Trotskyist parties call upon the workers to take power into their own hands."

Coupled with the above sentiments, the Trotsky leaders unfolded a seemingly ferocious attack on the Labour leaders. In his election address to the workers at Neath, Haston used strong language:

"...the Labour leaders help the capitalists to confuse the workers, to undermine their class consciousness, to destroy their socialist aspirations. They prepare the way for reaction...forget about socialism and pursue a policy of capitalist reforms...The Labour leaders have turned to the right...they propose to keep the capitalist parasites living on the backs of the workers... Their proposals have nothing in common with socialism. They are state capitalist measures. They could not solve the crisis of capitalism but only place its burdens on the backs of the workers...it is necessary to destroy first and foremost capitalist property rights...the workers can have nothing to do with the capitalist programme." (Socialist Appeal May 1945)

However, on page 2 as usual in the same issue, we find the same line for Labour to Power. Thus Haston gave red hot talk for the electors of Neath, but beneath it all was the grovelling lie that the Labour Party can carry out a Socialist policy.

After the election, the Trotsky leaders analyzed their own infinitesimal vote and noted that the workers were still loyal to the Labour leadership, despite disillusion with it. The R.C.P.'s alternative was as follows:

"We explained that if the Neath Labour Party had issued a declaration opposing the coalition and proposing to contest the election independently on Labour's programme (the one that had nothing in common with socialism and would keep the capitalist parasites living on the backs of the workers, among other things -C.P.S.)...we would have supported the Labour Party against any possible Liberal or Tory opponent. We explained that in the General Election when the Labour Party was standing on an independent platform, we would call on the workers to support the Labour Party and to vote Labour..."(Socialist Appeal, Mid-May 1945)

So you see that although "in the meetings the greatest applause was forthcoming when our speakers attacked the policy of the Labour Leaders", yet the workers still would not support a party which was offering to "call on the workers to support the Labour Party and to vote Labour." How dense of the workers, according to the logic of the Trotsky leaders!

It will be seen that by now the policy of "Labour to Power on its own programme" had been accepted in full by the party tops. But the rank and file were far from clear on this and were not at all helped by the continual printing of the demand for Labour to take power on the "revolutionary socialist" programme advanced in the Socialist Appeal. (The 12 points.) However, a month before the General Election in 1945, the 12 point programme was scrapped for a week in order to allow a General Election Statement of the Political Bureau, Revolutionary Communist Party. Here the Trotsky leaders stated clearly:

"The R.C.P. believes that the Labour Party, with its present policy, leadership, and form of organization, cannot succeed in overthrowing capitalism and bringing about the advent of socialism either nationally or internationally." (Socialist Appeal, June 1945)

And what is the conclusion they draw from this indisputable fact?

"The task of the revolutionary communists is to unite with these workers... to pass through the experience of putting Labour Into Power... to test the Labour leaders and their programme in practice, ... Without making ourselves responsible for the General Election programme of the Labour Party... we call on the working class... to place Labour in Power even on the basis of Labour's declared programme..." (Ibid.)

The following fortnight, the Socialist Appeal again introduced the slogan of Labour to Power on a supposedly socialist programme- the 12 points. However, this issue also continued the tack of Labour to Power on the Labour programme and acknowledged:

"The R.C.P. says, Labour to Power with a clear majority. We believe that the Labour leaders will act in exactly the same way as they did in the previous Labour Governments whether they have a majority or not." (Ibid-June 1945)

This above thought might be compared with the article previously cited by H. Atkinson. There Atkinson pointed out that Labour to Power on Labour's own programme would constitute betrayal of the working class:

"We do not demand a Third Labour Government to follow in the footsteps of the two previous ones. This would be gross opportunism and could only lead the workers to disillusionment and defeat..." (Socialist Appeal, January 1944)

Yet now in Mid-June 1945 the Trotsky leaders say "we support the Labour Party in this election and fight for a Majority Labour Government" (on their own programme-C.P.S.) which we believe "...will act in exactly the same way as they did in the previous Labour Governments."

Now Mr. Atkinson and readers of the Socialist Appeal, the above policy is admittedly gross opportunism which can lead the workers to disillusionment and defeat. How did the Trotsky leaders expect a Third Labour Government to behave if elected? To use their own words they expected it to "fail to raise the standards of the workers. Use police to break strikes. Shoot down and imprison Indian workers. Continue the policy of the capitalist class." History showed these words to be truly prophetic. The Labour Leaders were elected with the enthusiastic help of the Trotsky leaders and they did all that the Trotskyites formerly predicted they would do.

The Trotsky policy was successful- a Labour Government was actually put into power as a result of the General Election of 1945. The Labour Leaders set out immediately as if to vindicate the earlier words of the Trotskyites. The same issue of the Socialist Appeal which announced the victory of the Labour Party

at the polls, also stated:

"One of the first acts of the new Labour Government has been to send troops to the Surrey Docks..." (August 1945)

The strikebreaking nature of this move was obvious. The Labour Government also maintained the British forces in Greece to crush the Greek workers, among other crimes. Now how did the Trotsky press proclaim the success of the Labour butchers of the working class? How did it greet the inception of a government which it expected to lower the standards of the masses, smash strikes and shoot down workers? It did it this way:

"A SMASHING VICTORY FOR THE WORKING CLASS"

"CHURCHILL AND HIS FOLLOWING HAVE BEEN DEFEATED"

"...Labour is in power...defeat of the conservative party...smashing blow sustained by the liberals...not only the basic strata of the working class but even large sections of the middle class have swung decisively away from the capitalist parties..." (Ibid.)

In spite of being led by traitors, blackmailers, capitalist agents, non-socialist, not even democrats, who help the capitalists confuse the workers, undermine their class consciousness and destroy their socialist aspirations; in spite of the Labour Leaders having a programme of state capitalist measures, which will keep the capitalist parasites living on the backs of the workers, and which cannot solve the crisis of capitalism but only place its burdens on the backs of the workers, and in spite of the fact that it can now be expected to lower the standards of the masses, use troops against strikers and shoot down workers- in spite of all this the Labour Party is not a capitalist party and its success is a SMASHING VICTORY for the working class!

Alongside of this article, the 12 points reappear duly polished up. They are re-arranged and somewhat amplified. Nationalisation of the banks appears as an item separate from all other nationalisation demands. "Abolition of the Monarchy and the House of Lords" appears for the first time. Moreover, there now appears a slogan entirely new to the Marx-Lenin-Trotsky-Stalin tradition. "Abolish Con-scription." But most interesting is the new heading. This now runs:

"THE ONLY PROGRAMME FOR THE WORKERS

DEMAND THE LABOUR LEADERS CARRY OUT THEIR PROMISES

ON GUARD AGAINST CAPITALIST SABOTAGE

URGE STRONG MEASURES AGAINST BIG BUSINESS AND THE MONOPOLISTS

FIGHT FOR OUR PROGRAMME:" (Followed by the 12 points-C.P.S.)

Thus now we are told(1) It is possible for the Labour Leaders to carry out their programme. (2) The capitalists might sabotage the workings of the Labour Leaders (!) (3) The Labour leaders are capable of attacking Big Business and the monopolies (if only they are urged to do so) and (4) It is reasonable for the workers to fight to get the LABOUR PARTY Government to carry out a so-called revolutionary Socialist programme. (With pacifist and reformist additions)

No Trotsky or Stalin leader that ever lived could possibly believe the last three points to be possible; and the R.C.P. leadership is lying when it pretends otherwise.

As for the first item. Demand that the Labour Leaders carry out their promises... this of course means actually "to keep the capitalist parasites living on the backs of the workers and as a drag on industry. Even if they carried out their avowed policy, any progressive significance it may have would be destroyed at the

outset by the retention of the capitalist class. Their proposals have nothing in common with socialism. They are state capitalist measures. They could not solve the crisis of capitalism, but only place its burdens on the backs of the workers." (Socialist Appeal, May 1945)

And that is what the workers should demand the Labour leaders to do, according to the Trotskyite line. That is "The Only Programme For The Workers." No more, no less.

Still, it might be doubted that these varied interpretations of the Socialist Appeal lines do exist. In order to check on whether the rank and file of the R.C.P. are factually diverted into many different and contrary directions by following the political gyrations of their leadership, let us see how the R.C.P. branches acted during the election campaign.

Only one brief report was given (Socialist Appeal, Mid-July 1945) and this shows the following:

In Nottingham the line of "Labour to Power on its own programme" (critical support) was operated:

"Our comrades assisted the Labour Party in its election campaign and contact made with Labour Party members. The work in the district was appreciated by the Labour Party members who saw that the Trotskyists were prepared to work alongside the rank and file Labour workers in spite of their criticisms."

In Newcastle the line of "Labour To Power On A Socialist Programme" was operated:

"Our critical attitude towards the Labour Party and our demand of 'Labour To Power on a Socialist Programme' was unanimously endorsed by the workers." (Ibid.)

In Glasgow and Edinburgh the policy of "Labour To Power as the next step forward" was operated: (And who the devil cares about programme as long as the Tories are beaten at the polls)

"Our main slogans were, 'Remember Greece', 'Down with Churchill and his Tories', 'Remember 1926', and 'Labour to Power' (the Glasgow and Edinburgh report was made by the same organiser-C.P.S.) Attacks on Churchill were listened to without opposition, and in fact with a measure of support mainly from working class housewives." (Ibid.)

Whilst in Sheffield:

"On receipt of the election directive from the centre, the branch members reported for work to the central division of the Labour Party...All members have put in 2 to 4 evenings per week canvassing. One member was a full time helper in charge of the Central Committee. I was asked to attend the Committee as the R.C.P. delegate... (Ibid.)

And in case there is any doubt that this branch operated a policy of full support to the Labour Party without any criticism at all:

"The whole Branch of the R.C.P. was invited to a social function after the election Party and were thanked personally by Morris in appreciation of the work put in for the Labour Candidate for Central..." (Ibid.)

It should be quite clear by now that whilst tailending behind the chief agents of British Imperialism, the Trotskyist leadership throws out criticism of varying quantity and quality intended to rope in dissidents in various stages of disillusionment. Instead of educating their members and supporters to an understanding of the capitalist system of wage slavery and oppression, the R.C.P. throws out all sorts of contradictory policies which unite workers who have advanced beyond Labour Politics to varying degrees and which unites them only in their agreement to aid in one way or another the Labour lieutenants of the capitalist class.

Whilst we denounce the double talk of the Grants and Hastons and Atkinsons of the R.C.P., we hold out a hand to the rank and file of the Trotsky movement, to examine with us the past traps and deceptions of the tendency within which they have become entangled and to work with us for the formation of a working class party. Such a party, having the interests of the workers in view, and being thus backed by the line of progress of living history, shall not need to deal in lies and trickery.

C.P. STANTON
JUNE 1949

THE BORDIGA STALINISTS

The internal history of the Comintern is marked by numerous factional convulsions resulting in the elimination of many leaders by Stalin from positions of power and from the Comintern itself. All these leaders, including Trotsky, bent their efforts to stay and work with Stalin, but the bureaucratic process of centralization of power expressed in Stalin's relentless pursuit of absolute personal dictatorship worked against their efforts. Individually or in groups they were booted out of the Comintern. Some of these leaders formed organizations outside the Comintern; one of these is the Bordiga Left Communist International.

The Bordiga group originated as a Left Wing of the Italian Socialist Party during the War of 1914-18 and having entered the Comintern followed the line of rejecting the Rightist features of the Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev Trio policy but supporting its Leftist features. The group for many years existed as a Left fraction of the Stalin Party of Italy. Eventually it founded the Left Communist International with branches in France and Belgium.

Some time ago our group conducted a discussion with a representative of the Bordiga group in the United States. We presented to him much of the evidence which we have unearthed and among other things showed that in 1918 Lenin by decree appointed Stalin dictator over the territory of Southern Russia. This decree clearly demonstrated that Stalin was a powerful bureaucrat already, as early as 1918 and that was a bureaucratic procedure in the Bolshevik government. We further offered substantiation that the Comintern under Zinoviev's bureaucratic guidance was an instrument of the Russian Soviet bureaucracy, not a democratic organization for the liberation of the masses. The Bordiga representative made no attempt to refute our evidence. In fact, it seemed that the disagreements with him were reduced to the theoretical understanding of the class nature of the Stalin-ruled State and to the issue known among the advanced workers under the phrase "revolutionary defeatism." On this the discussions broke off.

In the summer of 1949 we found cause to dispatch the following letter to the representative of the Bordiga tendency:

Dear -----:

I feel it my duty to take issue with you on the article Bordiga wrote in May, 1924, reprinted by you in the International Bulletin # 3, 1949.

In our discussions you fully agreed that the Comintern from the outset was a bureaucratic Russian-dominated body serving the ends of the Kremlin usurpers. We cited material evidence--which you made no attempt to deny--that the Comintern bureaucrats deliberately betrayed the world revolution and under Stalin's control in 1923 sold out the German proletariat through Rightist and Leftist maneuvers. By 1924 the Comintern had its hands dripping with the blood of thousands of revolutionary workers. You agreed that it is the duty of proletarian revolutionists to expose that monstrous instrument of the Russian bureaucracy, and you further agreed that a political movement which either maintains silence about the true

nature of the Comintern or paints this counter-revolutionary trap as having been at a certain phase of its history a revolutionary organization, aids Stalin and causes great injury to the working class. And now see what you have done. You print Bordiga's article in which he presents the Comintern in May 1924 as a revolutionary organization of the proletariat! Here is what he says:

"It must be recognized that the International is not functioning as a united world communist party. It is on the way to accomplish this result, without doubt, and has made gigantic steps in comparison to the old International. But for us, to assure that it proceeds effectively in the desired direction, the objective of our communist activity, we must have confidence in the revolutionary capacity of our glorious world organization to continue working while basing itself on the control and the rational evaluation of all that arises in the rank-and-file including political positions." (My emphasis--G.M.)

If you, at least had made suitable editorial comment warning the workers against accepting in this article the false view of the Stalinist bureaucracy and its Comintern, the damage would have been avoided. But you published the article without a single word of comment. By doing this you performed a service to Cannon, Shaachtman and Co., who lie to the workers that up to 1924, the Comintern was revolutionary. By the same token you obstruct the work of enlightenment of the workers which our organization alone is conducting. To say to the workers in 1924 "We must have confidence" etc., was to drug them and make them insensible to the preparations for the betrayal of the British General Strike, for selling out the Chinese Revolution to the Kuomintang. Be it remembered that "our glorious organization" began to entomb the Chinese Communist workers within the Kuomintang already in 1923, and in 1924 it formed the Anglo-Russian committee with the Trade Union agents of British Imperialism. You might argue that Bordiga did not know all that. Then say so openly to the workers instead of letting the article stand without a syllable of explanation. As it stands, the article is nothing but Stalinist poison. In addition to the basic distortion about the nature of the Comintern it contains other equally damaging false statements: "The International is the World Communist Party and should be given the fidelity to that which emanates from the central organisms." When the date May 1924 is remembered, it is obvious that Bordiga spoke of no other than the Stalin Comintern, admonishing the workers to take orders from the Kremlin and from the Lovestones and Cachins. And if there is any doubt about this, it is dispelled by the following formula: "In consequence, we are able to adopt the formula, certainly rich enough in advantages, of absolute obedience in the execution of directives from the summits." The "summits" at that time was the Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev clique ruling the Comintern.

What was your reason for publishing this article? I, for one, can see no other than that the author of it was Bordiga. In plain words, you were governed by the feeling of hero-worship for the leader of your organization when you translated and published this Stalinist piece and refrained from criticising it.

Our group, on the other hand, rejects and repudiates^s all hero-worship of "big" leaders, be they Marx and Engels, Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin or Bordiga. We accept only those ideas which have been proved correct by the test of history and expose the false notions which do harm to the proletariat no matter who the author of those ideas might be. Evidently you do not hold to this thesis. And yet the interests of the proletariat demand that this thesis be put into

operation. Life shows that some people in words agree to this thesis as well as to the need of exposure and destruction of the Stalinist bureaucracy, but in deeds they carry out the very opposite policy.

Yours,

G. Marlen

July 17, 1949

Several days later we received a reply, as follows:

Dear Marlen:

Our group discussed your letter.

We welcome either positive or negative criticism, as it shows that our Revolutionary Marxist propaganda is being read.

An exact duplicate of your letter has been forwarded to our party in Italy, (International Communist Party,) for study and reply. The American section intends to reply as well. You will receive our answers to your criticism in due time.

We agree that suitable editorial comment should have been published with the article by Bordiga, "Organization and Communist Discipline, Premises of the Problem." However, we support unconditionally the content of Bordiga's article because the struggle against opportunism inside the Communist International at that time had not yet been finished. Not to understand this is to substitute static thinking for historical materialism.

The basic point of the article deals with the principles of organization and its corollary, discipline. The lesson it teaches is "break with democracy" in any form, as it is essentially a product of the capitalist system of exploitation.

You have yet to learn that the principles of proletarian revolutionary organization are the antithesis of Trotsky's and Stalin's "democratic centralism." On the other hand, organic centralism is the specific form of proletarian administration, which eliminates bureaucracy, and establishes workers control.

For the American Section of
The Left Communist International

July 25, 1949.

Our reply followed:

Dear -----:

In your reply to my letter of July 17, 1949, you did not answer a single point I raised.

Let us recapitulate the points contained in my letter in more clearly defined terms.

1. The Comintern was organized in March 1919. We have produced documentary evidence which shows that the Bolshevik leadership which launched the Comintern was Russian-nationalist and bureaucratic. The specific material proving the case is Lenin's article on the pride of the Great Russians written in 1915, and the appointment of Stalin as dictator of entire South Russia in 1918. The Comintern was a Russian-bureaucratic organization serving not the interest of the workers but of the bureaucratic usurpers and dictators, Stalin among them.
2. You agreed with our presentation of the case. You made no effort to refute the material.
3. In 1923 the Comintern, dominated by the Stalin-Kamenev-Zinoviev Trio, with the collaboration of Trotsky, betrayed the revolution in Germany.
4. At the same time the Comintern sent the Chinese Communist workers into the Kuomintang.
5. Early in 1924 the leadership of the Comintern chained the British vanguard workers to imperialism through the formation of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

I may add that the Comintern in 1923 was poisoned with a new virus: "Anti-Trotskyism." At the time Bordiga wrote that the Comintern was on its way to become a united Communist Party, the real process was ^{that} the Comintern was on its way to become a highly centralized Stalinist machine. You knew very well that this is a fact, yet you state you support unconditionally the contents of Bordiga's article. Your excuse: "The struggle against opportunism inside the Communist International at that time, had not yet been finished." By this you imply that there was a tendency, perhaps a group of individuals within the Comintern that was truly proletarian-revolutionary. Who? Trotsky? But Trotsky at the Twelfth Congress of the party helped the Trio to conceal Lenin's anti-Stalin documents. He supported Stalin in every policy. He consciously helped the Trio to betray the German proletariat. At the time Bordiga published his article, Trotsky aided Stalin with the "Lenin Levy" whereby Stalin recruited adventurers, opportunists and reactionary elements into the party. Trotsky concealed the conspiracy against him, attacked Eastman's exposure of the Stalin leadership, lied to the proletariat that Lenin had left no "Testament." Trotsky was part and parcel of the Stalinist rotteness which permeated the Comintern. Who then, in your estimation, represented the authentic proletarian politics? Bordiga? But it was Stalinist deception that Bordiga peddled to the workers when he called the putrid, treacherous, counter-revolutionary Comintern "Our glorious world organization." If Bordiga did not know the whole truth--and he probably didn't--this does not change the black nature of the Comintern. You may stand unconditionally on the contents of Bordiga's article; we reject and denounce this article as vicious deception of the workers and objective aid to the Cannon-Shachtman falsification of history and their concealment of Trotsky's criminal part in the counter-revolution.....

And now I'll take up a different matter. You say in your letter: "The basic point of the article deals with the principles of organization and its corollary, discipline. The lesson it teaches is 'break with democracy' in any form,

as it is essentially a product of the capitalist system of exploitation." This is false. First, the capitalist system of exploitation does not produce democracy even for the bourgeoisie as a whole. Second, the proletariat must not "break with democracy in any form," but must develop proletarian democracy. This form of democracy is essential in the struggle for Socialism. Bordiga's article teaches "absolute obedience in the execution of directives from the summits." Leaving aside for the moment the fact that the article was produced and circulated within the Stalinist Comintern and therefore called upon the proletarian membership to obey the Kremlin, it is obvious that this formula of Bordiga, representing, in your own words, the thesis of breaking with democracy in any form, would promote an iron-clad bureaucratic dictatorship of leaders or a leader over the membership.

It is this form of leadership that has plagued the proletariat since the inception of the labor movement. The building of an organization based on the principle of workers democratic control of leadership is the task of the revolutionists today. One of the first steps in this direction is exposure of overt or covert "teachers" of bureaucratic principles of organization.

G. Marlen

August 1, 1949