





**THE MILITANT**  
Published Weekly in the Interests of the Working People  
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION  
116 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. Phone: AL 5-7469  
Editor: GEORGE BREITMAN  
Business Manager: JOSEPH HANSEN

Subscriptions: \$5 per year; \$1.50 per month. Foreign: \$4.50 per year; \$2.25 for 6 months. Canadian: \$3.50 per year; \$1.75 for 6 months. Single Copies: 5 or more copies 6c each in U.S., 7c each in foreign countries.

Vol. XVII - No. 48      Monday, November 30, 1953

# A Stalinophile Warms Up to a -- Stalinophobe

## Nixon's Apologies to the Mikado

Speaking for the American capitalists, Vice President Richard Nixon, in his Nov. 19 Tokyo speech, indulged in some pious self-criticism. He told the gathering of 700 militarists, industrialists and government dignitaries that the United States "made a mistake" in 1946 when it imposed total disarmament on Japan.

Nixon "admitted" that out of motives of purity, good will, high-minded principles and the desire to live in peace, the United States "advised" the Japanese to disarm. But in 1946, Nixon says, "We misjudged the intentions of the Soviet leaders." Now "the threat from Communist nations" makes it impossible to live in peace.

There isn't a word of truth to this.

(1) If American Big Business was so bent on living in peace, why did they disarm Japan and Germany and not the United States? Why did their alleged "illusions" about the Soviet leaders prompt them to disarm others but not themselves?

(2) Japan and Germany were given every encouragement to arm, establish fascist-militarist governments, crush with bloody violence all working-class and democratic resistance within their countries and prepare for war against the Soviet Union. Proof? How could Germany, for example, which was totally disarmed after

## "Closer to the Heart of the Soviet Union"

To read the daily capitalist press, listen to radio or TV, you would think that the Soviet Army is at our very doorstep. The opposite is the little publicized truth. It is the United States army, navy and airforce which is encircling the globe and reaching ever closer to the Soviet Union.

The recent move to establish a U.S. military base in Pakistan sheds light upon this step-by-step build-up of American Big Business preparations for World War III. Pakistan would offer "the use of bases closer to the heart of the Soviet Union than any at present available." (N. Y. Times, Nov. 17).

The other bases not so close to the "heart of the Soviet Union" was described by U.S. News and World Report in an article last June 12 that speaks of the "vast gradual expansion of U.S. overseas commitments little realized at home." American troops, according to this article, are serving in "sizable numbers" in more than half the 97 countries in the world. Written before the deal with Franco for air bases in Spain, the article speaks of 89 major air bases built or being built in Europe, Asia, North Africa and the Arctic.

Russia's nearest military base is thousands of miles from the U.S. But the nearest U.S. army base to the Soviet Union

## Iran -- Betrayal and Cover Up

Since last August we have repeatedly shown how the Stalinists in Iran, prompted by their subordination to the Kremlin's foreign policy, betrayed the aspiration of the Iranian masses to take power. The workers and peasants of Iran wanted to clean out the landlords and capitalists who subject them to the worst poverty and exploitation. They were stopped by the Stalinist leaders who preferred diplomatic maneuvers with the Western powers that stand behind the royalists. The counter-revolutionary royalist coup of Aug. 19 was the tragic result of this Stalinist betrayal.

The Iranian masses have paid bitterly. Tens of thousands of their best militants have been imprisoned, clubbed or shot by the Wall Street-backed royalists. Now after three months silent pondering over this new reality comes word from the Trotskyist Pablo group in Paris finally recognizing that something has gone amiss in Iran.

In the November issue of their magazine, *Quatrieme Internationale*, they devote a total of eight brief paragraphs to an "analysis" of this setback to the revolutionary colonial movement. They speak of the "criminal inactivity" of the Stalinist-dominated Tudeh party. They admit that the Tudeh has been "held back for a long time by the Kremlin from all inclination to genuinely revolutionary politics." Then they make a statement that is utterly astounding to revolutionists: "The coup essentially profited American imperialism. . . it is not likely that the Kremlin, despite all its desire to compromise and its particular flirtation with London, would intervene at the last hour and prevent the Tudeh from acting."

Why is it "unlikely" that the Kremlin would sell out a revolution even though this weakens the position of the Soviet Union? Isn't that exactly what the Stalinists have done repeatedly during the entire post-Second World War period? Didn't they sell the Greek revolution down the river because of their "flirtation" with Churchill? Didn't they sell the Italian and

**By Joseph Hansen**

Readers of the Militant know that the Socialist Workers Party at its recent National Committee meeting suspended the disloyal leaders of the Cochranite faction for organizing a boycott of the party's 25th Anniversary Celebration and Election Wind-up Rally in New York on Oct. 30.

To class-conscious workers the reasons for an action like this are self-evident. Our anniversary meeting was in effect an SWP picket line. It was a demonstration against the capitalist warmakers of today and the Stalinist traitors who expelled the founding group of Trotskyists from the Communist Party in 1928. By their boycott, the Cochranites crossed this picket line. The party was prepared, and despite the Cochranite sabotage, the meeting was one of the most successful we have held in years.

To anyone who will listen, the Cochranites are now complaining about the unmerited experience of being suspended from membership. However, their hypocritical complaints are not very convincing, for they are not seeking reinstatement or appealing the action to a convention. The reason for that, of course, is that they deliberately organized their split, preparing for it over a considerable period by sabotaging party finances and activities and whipping up a frenzied factional attitude among their ranks. The boycott was simply the culmination of a long series of provocations.

While in the SWP the Cochranites complained just as bitterly about the rejection of their pro-Stalinist line by the overwhelming majority of the party. They tried to rationalize their inability to win a majority by accusing the SWP of succumbing to "Stalinophilia"; i.e., an opposition to Stalinism so unreasonable that it refuses to defend what is progressive in the Soviet Union and will not stop at supporting the war-mongering foreign policy of Big Business in order to get at the Kremlin bureaucracy.

In reality the Cochranites could be correctly accused of "Stalinophilia"; i.e., the strange political disease that sees progressiveness in Stalinism no matter what its crimes. They pushed this view in the SWP as acolytes of Pablo, seeking under the slogan of

**THEIR FIRST PUBLIC ACT**

But what was the first public political act of the Cochranites after they walked out of the SWP? From the talk of some of their leaders, it might have been supposed they were on their way to Marcantonio's headquarters to join this faction in the American Labor Party. But apparently Marcantonio avoided this fate by resigning from the ALP the day after the election.

Nothing daunted, the Cochranites made an adroit tactical adjustment. They turned up at a meeting of genuine Stalinophobes, the so-called Independent Socialist League (Shachtmanites) and distributed their mimeographed complaints to this milieu.

This, however, was only preparation for a more ambitious venture. The principal leader, Cochran himself, sent a lengthy political statement to Labor Action, Shachtman's paper. He listed his grievances against the SWP to these Stalinophobes in evident expectation of a sympathetic response.

And just to make sure of eliciting a friendly pat on the back from Stalinophobe Shachtman, Cochran assiduously refrained from mentioning what had previously been one of his main grievances; namely, that the SWP had allegedly succumbed to Stalinophilia. As the saying goes, one does not speak of the rope in the house of the hanged.

With a politeness that undoubtedly pleased and flattered the editor of Labor Action, Cochran also delicately refrained from attacking Shachtman for his refusal to defend the Soviet Union from imperialist attack, and likewise refrained from pointing out that Labor Action is part of the Social Democratic press whose chief function is to assist the State Department in preparing a military assault on the Soviet bloc.

This sensitive restraint is evidence, we may assume, of Cochran's real feelings on these issues. He even went out of his way to explain to the Stalinophobe editor of Labor Action that while "I favor an orientation toward the Stalinist movement in countries like France and Italy. . .

**We don't propose anything of the kind for the United States. . .**

Why did Cochran deliberately select the columns of the anti-Soviet Labor Action for his first public declaration? Why did he turn to this obscure league of abandoned hopes for sympathy? The reason for this political demonstration is apparent in Cochran's choice of issues to submit to the judgment of Shachtman and his sect of pro-imperialist Stalinophobes.

(1) Cochran raises his hands in pious horror at the "dictatorial methods" of James P. Cannon, the founder of American Trotskyism, and the SWP's insistence on discipline in action.

Opposition to the democratic centralism of the SWP, labelled as Cannon's "dictatorial methods," has been Shachtman's stock in trade for 13 years. The editor of Labor Action indicates that it is refreshing to see it repeated now in Cochran language.

(2) Cochran attacks the Trotskyist conception of the role of the party in winning a socialist victory: "According to their new revelation, the tiny, unknown SWP has the 'ordained leadership,' the essential cadres of the revolution, and if it only remains 'true to itself' and keeps blowing its own horn, its revolutionary triumph is guaranteed."

This is a vulgar burlesque of the idea formerly held by the Cochranites for many years in common with us that a revolutionary party must be built to assure the victory of socialism. It is not exactly a fresh contribution to the columns of Labor Action. Shachtman has been peddling it in one variation or another for 13 years. By offering his own version of this theme, Cochran performs a political service for the Shachtmanites and indicates the underlying identity of his views with theirs.

It was fitting and natural for Cochran to choose Labor Action for his first public declaration after splitting from the SWP. Shachtman was his predecessor in breaking from orthodox Trotskyism. Shachtman was his predecessor also in organizing a split from the SWP. Who in the radical movement would more likely feel a bond of sympathy?

How accurate Cochran's political instinct was can be judged from the expressions of sympathy

the editor of this Stalinophobe sheet decided to award his new contributor. True, he was much more careful about indicating his political differences with Cochran than Cochran was with him. Nevertheless, the feeling of camaraderie softens his most critical thrusts.

For instance, Cochran's complaint that his faction wasn't permitted in the SWP to express its minority views outside of internal party forums and bulletins to the extent it wished drew the following approving comment: "In other words the Cochran minority-bureaucrats demanded exact, the same right that the Shachtmanites demanded in 1940, the right to present their point of view in the magazine."

Labor Action's editor, of course, scored a point there. In all consistency, Cochran should have admitted that he was only making — 13 years later — the same anti-Leninist demand that Shachtman and his co-leader of the time, James Burnham, made in opposition to Leon Trotsky and the SWP in 1940.

But let the editor of Labor Action and his new contributor settle this point of honor and priority between themselves. We stand on the principles of democratic centralism that the majority of a revolutionary party has the right to decide what internal disputes should or should not be made public property.

**PROVES OUR CONTENTION**

Cochran's letter to Labor Action proves what we contended during the recently concluded faction struggle — that no deep gulf exists between the Shachtmanites and the Cochranites. Their positions on Stalinism are only in apparent opposition.

In reality they are symmetrical petty-bourgeois reactions to capitalist pressures. The Shachtmanite rushed away from Stalinism and eventually landed in the camp of imperialism. The Cochranites today are rushing toward Stalinism. But we doubt that the attractiveness to them of the Stalinist milieu will prove enduring. This is only the first form of their capitulation to the pressures emanating from American imperialism in its drive toward war. In England, the Haston group likewise demonstrated that pro-Stalinism can be a bridge to

surrender to a Stalinophobe labor bureaucracy.

At bottom, Cochran has much in common with Shachtman, particularly in the profound break he has made with orthodox Trotskyism, and in his revision of the basic program of Marxism as it touches the most burning questions of our time. His plaintive letter to Shachtman's house organ proves that.

## Seek to Legalize "Dirty Business" Of Wiretapping

(Continued from page 1)

One of the chief fears regarding wiretapping was the opportunity it afforded for extortion and blackmail. Even J. Edgar Hoover once opposed revision of the wiretap law on these grounds. In 1938, according to newspaper accounts, he blocked passage of a Treasury-sponsored bill to permit wiretapping, stating that "he had men who were expert in tapping wires, but if he let them practice it to any extent they would turn crooks in no time."

We can imagine the juicy pickings FBI agents could have if they were permitted to tap telephone wires legally. For purposes of extortion and blackmail, the telephone wires of the rich and publicly prominent hold out the best prospects. Thus the Wall Street Journal finds Brownell's proposition unattractive and wrote editorially:

"The trouble with this notion that you can safely whittle away at Constitutional safeguards is that you don't know where the process is going to stop. If espionage wiretap evidence is made admissible, why not other kinds. . . ? And if it is inconceivable that a given administration or a given head of the FBI would abuse or allow this authority to be abused, isn't that putting your faith in men, who die or may be replaced with worse men, and not laws?"

**CRIMES OF THE FBI**

The FBI, under the direct orders of J. Edgar Hoover and his superiors in the Department of Justice and at the explicit authorization of the White House, has been committing scores and hundreds of criminal acts of wiretapping daily since 1940. In a statement in January 1950 after the FBI's wholesale violation of the law had been exposed during the Copley case, Hoover confessed: "The policy we follow on wiretapping was set by the late President Roosevelt on May 21, 1940."

But these unlawful acts were carried out in such secrecy that it was not until Federal Judge Sylvester Ryan forced FBI agents, testifying in the Copley trial, to divulge their use of wiretapping that the existence on a wholesale scale of law-breaking by what was supposed to be the country's top law-enforcement agency was revealed.

At first, the FBI agents lied on the stand that such practices existed, then admitted them. Finally, forced to bring the recording of wiretaps into court, they produced records that proved to be unintelligible, although they claimed they got tip-offs on Judith Copley's "spying" from them. Would this also be the case with the wiretap evidence that Brownell and Hoover intimated is the basis of their unproved charges against Harry Dexter White?

Judge Ryan ruled in the Copley case that evidence from the "fainted source" of wiretapping was illegal and that wiretapping as such is against the law "whether or not there was a written authorization" from the then Attorney General Tom Clark, as Justice Dept. attorneys claimed.

It was Roosevelt's and Truman's attorneys general who first sought the legalization of the police-state method of wiretapping. Now the administration that is witch-hunting the previous administration's leaders is pushing for this same law that would give the FBI legal authority to listen in on the private conversations and personal affairs of the American people.

# French Trotskyists Hail SWP

(The following is a translation of an article that appeared in the Nov. 19 La Verite, organ of the International Communist Party, French Section of the Fourth International. — Ed.)

On Oct. 27, 1928, twenty-five years ago, the leadership of the American Communist Party expelled from the party on charges of Trotskyism, James P. Cannon, member of the Political Committee and one of the best known leaders of American communism, as well as two members of the Central Executive Committee.

Within scarcely a week appeared No. 1 of the Militant, organ of the Left Opposition, officially marking the beginning outside of Russia in the Communist International of a revolutionary Marxist current called "Trotskyist."

An internal struggle had taken place for years in the American CP between the faction of Lovestone (then leader, but likewise soon expelled on orders of Moscow along with the Right Opposition), the faction of William Z. Foster (the present leader of the American Stalinist party), and the faction of James P. Cannon. This struggle took place only over secondary questions concerning the orientation of the CP, remaining independent of the great ideological battle conducted in Russia between Trotskyism and Stalinism.

"We were still trying to solve things on an American scale: a common error. . . We looked to the Communist International to give us help with our national problems." ("History of American Trotskyism" by James P. Cannon, p. 42.)

Cannon, nevertheless, felt doubts about the correctness of Stalin's line and the expulsion of Trotsky, Zinoviev, etc. It was in this state of mind that he went to Moscow for the Sixth Congress of the Communist International (July-September 1928), the agenda of which was mainly concerned with the adoption of a draft program elaborated by Stalin-Bukharin.

From his exile in Alma-Ata, Leon Trotsky had written a pitiless criticism of this draft, a criticism that is today considered one of the classics of Marxism. This document, as well as Trotsky's appeal against his expulsion, were, naturally, kept from the Congress. . . but they had Soviet militants in the bureau of interpreters and stenographers to translate the work and pass it out among the delegates. This was the historic encounter between

James P. Cannon and the revolutionary thought of Trotsky.

The delegate of the American CP took the precious document with him from Russia and began the work of regroupment among the party ranks around the ideas of Trotsky.

This work did not pass unperceived by Foster-Lovestone, who called Cannon before one inquiry session after another. Cannon avoided immediate expulsion, evading direct questions until he had made the necessary contacts preparatory to his public announcement. Then on Oct. 27, 1928, in reply to his accusers, he read a long declaration in which he and his comrades declared themselves 100% Trotskyists.

He found himself immediately removed from his post, alone and without resources, boycotted by all his friends of the day before, without means of expression except the first number of the Militant had appeared (on credit).

But it is in such circumstances that a man shows his measure.

Cannon showed his: he organized lectures and discussions; he undertook intense correspondence. He knew how to shift from mass work to the work of individual propaganda. To the Communist cadres and militants he knew how to propose a policy.

Twenty-five years have passed. An entire epoch, extremely difficult for the Marxist cadres in the USA, since they have seen many reactionary waves submerge the country without the program of socialism yet winning the majority of the proletariat. But a preparatory epoch, a decisive epoch which has made a selection of men and of organizations.

The historic "success" on the soil of the United States among the leaders of the old American CP, was not on the side of Foster, who today still transmits to an organization in decomposition the orders of Moscow; it was not on the side of the swarm of renegades who now denounce before McCarthy's inquisitors their

comrades of twenty years ago; it is exclusively on the side of James P. Cannon, who knew how to break all the obstacles placed in his path and to forge the weapon of success — a genuine Bolshevik party of the vanguard.

To this party, the Socialist Workers Party, is assured beyond dispute the leading role in the great revolutionary struggles which the American proletariat will wage.

And the SWP has likewise another role, profoundly internationalist, to play. It is a question for it to aid by its example in the formation throughout the entire world of a generation of communist militants imbued with the spirit which gave birth to American Trotskyism: Unshakable attachment to principles, wideness of view and solidarity of international thought, firmness in the face of bureaucratic apparatuses and fabricated majorities, unity of thought and action, stubborn will to construct the revolutionary party.

CEYLON SOCIALISTS SEND GREETINGS TO SWP ON ITS 25th ANNIVERSARY

(Samasamajist, English weekly of the Lanka Samasamaja Party, Ceylonese Section of the Fourth International, published the following article on the 25-year record of the Socialist Workers Party in its issue of Nov. 5 under the title: "Hail SWP of America! Revolutionary Socialism's Vanguard in Imperialist Citadel." — Ed.)

A week before the 36th Anniversary of the October Revolution in Russia, our co-thinkers in the Socialist Workers Party, celebrated the Silver Jubilee of the struggle for formation of the party.

The struggle began on October 27, 1928. The date was a landmark separating two eras of struggle. The second has lasted a quarter of a century.

Readers can well imagine the difficulties of working within imperialism's citadel.

The American Trotskyists have consistently struggled on principled lines for the establishment of Socialist America.

The men who built that party had years of active service in the revolutionary ranks behind them.

**LOS ANGELES**  
**Friday Night Forum**  
presents  
Two lectures on the origin of the "race" concept and the program to abolish Jim Crow.  
By Richard Fraser  
Writer and fighter against discrimination  
(2) **Struggle for Equality**  
Friday, Dec. 4, 8 P.M.  
FORUM HALL  
1702 E. 4th St. Tel. AN 9-4953  
Questions — Discussion  
Refreshments  
Subscription 35 cents

