

T H E B U L L E T I N

OF THE WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

A STATEMENT ON OUR CHANGE OF NAME

DISCUSSION ON THE WORLD SITUATION

- 1. A thesis on the present status of the conflict between the Soviet Union and the Imperialists.**
- 2. Thesis on the International situation.**

THE WORK OF CANNON And SHACHTMAN IN THE TRADE UNIONS. Part IV.

THE TROTSKYITES IN THE U. A. W.

—ARTHUR BURKE

**"CRITICAL SUPPORT" TO REACTIONARIES:
A POLICY AND ITS MEANING**

—J. C. HUNTER

THE RED STAR PRESS

P. O. BOX 67

STATION D

NEW YORK

T H E B U L L E T I N

of the

WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

Vol. IX - No. 3. (Whole Number 46)

JUNE - JULY 1946.

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

	<u>PAGE</u>
A Statement on Our Change of Name	1
Discussion on the World Situation:	
1. A Thesis on the Present Status of the Conflict Between the Soviet Union and the Imperialists -- J.C. Hunter	3
2. Thesis on the International Situation -- George Marlen -- Arthur Burke	9
The Work of Cannon and Shachtman in the Trade Unions: PART IV. The Trotskyites in the U.A.W. -- A. Burke	25
"Critical Support" to Reactionaries: A policy and its meaning. -- J.C.H.	39

B A C K I S S U E S
of
T H E B U L L E T I N

are still available at FIVE CENTS a copy.

Address:

THE RED STAR PRESS
P.O. Box 67 Sta. D.,
New York

A STATEMENT
ON OUR CHANGE OF NAME

On May 8, 1946, the members of the Leninist League, U.S.A. adopted a resolution changing the name of the organization to the:-

WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

The reasons for the change are as follows. The name of an organization is most suitable when it is self-explanatory in stating the purpose of the organization. From this angle the name, Leninist League, is unsatisfactory since it does not convey the party-building purpose of our organization. The name, WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY, on the other hand, states directly and explicitly that the purpose of our organization is to serve as the nucleus for building a new revolutionary party of the working class.

A second and more important reason is that in adopting the name, Leninist League, the members of the organization unwittingly fell into the error of attaching their work to the name of an individual, an error which runs along the line of fetishizing the leaders of the proletariat. Since the rise of Stalinism, which thrives on such fetishism, this tendency has become particularly dangerous and must be fought against at every opportunity. The latter-day practice of the Socialist Workers Party in referring to itself as the Trotskyist Party is a good example of the increasing tendency to fetishize leaders.

Furthermore, the name Leninist League gives the impression that we automatically agree with everything Lenin ever said or did. In the work of all proletarian leaders, we accept only what is correct and in the revolutionary interests of the working masses. Upon arriving at a definite conclusion after adequate study, we have never hesitated to differentiate ourselves from those specific policies of Lenin which we consider incorrect, just as we have resolutely and unhesitatingly adhered to those which are genuinely revolutionary. Readers of our publications know that we have repudiated specifically Lenin's pre-1917 position against the principle of the permanent revolution, his position in support of the idea of a Constituent Assembly and his position in support of the British Labor Party.

* * * * *

THE BULLETIN and its PURPOSE

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

The immediate aim of the WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY is to arm the revolutionary workers with an understanding of the pseudo-revolutionary organizations now controlling the proletarian van-

guard and to organize these workers into a new party.

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

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

A NOTE ON A DISCUSSION -

ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE there begins the first of two theses representing a difference of opinion within the WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY concerning some phases of the international situation.

FOR SOME TIME a discussion has been in progress in our organization on these questions.

THE TWO THESES presented in this issue crystallize the main opposing lines of thought.

OTHER THESES, if they are presented, will be published in forthcoming issues.

A THESIS ON THE PRESENT STATUS
OF THE CONFLICT
BETWEEN THE SOVIET UNION AND THE IMPERIALISTS

* * * * *

1. Since the founding of the Soviet Republic in 1917, the chief contradiction in the international sphere has been that between the society based on the proletarian form of property in the means of production and the bourgeois world based on capitalist private property.

2. With the existence of a genuinely revolutionary Soviet regime, the fundamental factor determining the unfolding of this contradiction would have been the policy of promoting the world proletarian revolution, a policy which would have made the historical interests of the world proletariat merge in practice with the defense of the Soviet Republic against imperialist attacks. The growth of the bureaucratic degeneration of the Soviet regime, culminating in the dictatorship of Stalin, introduced entirely unforeseen features in the international contradiction without in the least eliminating it. The bureaucratic usurpers cast aside the policy of promoting the international proletarian revolution and placed their "defense" of the Soviet Republic on sheerly diplomatic and military grounds.

3. To date there have been two focal points in the general contradiction between world imperialism and the Soviet Republic:- (1) the first intervention, 1913-1921; and (2) the second intervention, 1941-1945. In both interventions, the military victory of the Soviet Republic occurred in the absence of success and spread of the international proletarian revolution. Consequently both interventions ended with a stalemate between the first workers state and capitalism in the rest of the world. The contradiction between the Soviet Union and the imperialist powers not only was not resolved in either case, but was heightened. The conditions of the conclusion of each intervention, however, differ from each other to such a degree that each set of conditions merits special examination. To repeat mechanically the evaluations of 1913-1921 in the present day can lead only to utter confusion.

4. At the end of the first intervention, the Soviet Republic was a weak, barely-breathing organism. Economically in collapse, the life of the Soviet Republic in that past period was a struggle for bare existence in the most literal sense of the term. The farthest view of the bureaucratized leadership at the end of the first intervention was the establishment of "friendly" diplomatic and trade relations with the various capitalist powers. An aggressive policy of expansion by the bureaucracy would not only have been a sheer fantasy, but would have led to the immediate destruction of the Soviet power.

5. The situation at the end of the second intervention is wholly different from that after 1921. In the two decades between the two interventions, the material structure of the Soviet Republic grew to huge proportions. The bureaucracy became regularized and efficient, and built a powerful nationalized industry and military machine. The proletariat of the Soviet Republic became enormous in numbers, technically far superior to the period of the first intervention, and while degenerated politically, a fighting military force such as could not even be imagined in 1918. In this condition, in 1941-1945, it was able to defeat the greatest military assault in history.

6. In the same two decades, while the Soviet Republic underwent a process of flourishing growth, the capitalist world passed through a period of intense crisis and decline. One of the chief symptoms, if not the most important and symptom, of the crisis and decline of the capitalist world is the difference in forces that the imperialists could muster in each intervention. In 1918-1921

when the Soviet Republic was tragically feeble, the imperialists of the United States, England, France and Japan, the chief victor powers of the World War, were able to participate directly in the intervention; they were unsuccessful because of the rising revolutionary tide which swept the world in that period. But in 1941-1945, when the Soviet Union had already grown to great power, only one major imperialist force could directly attack the Soviet Union, namely, Nazi Germany. This limitation of forces was the direct outcome of the crisis through which the capitalist world passed in the two decades after the first intervention, and not even the crushing of the masses in every revolutionary situation since 1921 could compensate for it. The specific circumstances which brought about this limitation are those which have been frequently outlined by our organization in the past; it is unnecessary to repeat them here. History has shown that the forces mobilized by the imperialists for the second intervention were disastrously insufficient for their task. At the same time these forces were prodigious, requiring an herculean strain and a tremendous expenditure on the part of the international imperialists. The military defeat inflicted on the imperialists in the second intervention is materially equal to dozens of defeats such as that of 1918-1921.

7. The specific outcome of the second intervention also differs significantly from that of the first. By 1921, the Soviet Republic just barely managed to maintain itself within the boundaries of the former Tsarist empire. Important territories such as Poland, Finland, the Baltic states, were lost during the first intervention. The second intervention had a totally different result. The Soviet Union has expanded to bounds never dreamed of before by the bureaucracy. It has emerged not a state just at the borderline of bare existence, but a world power in its own right. The crisis and decline of the capitalist nations, brought to an unprecedented stage by their defeat in the second intervention, have opened new vistas to the Soviet bureaucracy, namely, a policy of expansion. Germany and Japan lie prostrate; the empires which were given to them by the major imperialists to prime them for the 1941 attack on the Soviet Union, have had to be taken back. Economic collapse, social chaos and widespread famine stalk Germany and Japan. France and Italy are in a not much better condition. The British empire is now struggling for its very existence, the general crisis through which it was passing prior to 1941 being brought to a new and higher stage today. The United States alone has not only retained its power, but has even increased it. The power of the American imperialists, however, does not exist in a vacuum. It is organically conditioned on the situation in the rest of the capitalist world. The American imperialists are not free to confine themselves to strutting proudly in their magnificence, but face the grim task of pumping life-blood into the rest of the capitalist nations. While the Soviet Union has suffered frightful blood-letting and destruction, it has acquired vast compensating wealth in broad territories formerly in the hands of the capitalists, namely, in the eastern part of Europe and in Manchuria. The position of the Soviet Union at the end of the second intervention is that of a victor, not in the narrow sense of 1921, but in the far broader sense of having actually won material and positional gains, while the imperialists as a whole have met with serious reverses.

8. It is not sufficient to say that this is a period of preparation for a third intervention against the Soviet Union. While this idea expresses the correct fact that the basic contradiction between the imperialist world and the Soviet Union still exists and that the imperialists still have as their aim to destroy the Soviet Union and restore capitalism on a world scale, it leaves out the changed conditions from the picture; it does not go beyond what could have been said in 1921; it is a mechanical repetition of the ideas of the past. The emergence of the Soviet Union as a world power in its own right is omitted from this antiquated formulation. The bureaucracy has adapted its policies to the

new conditions and it is necessary for the workers to do likewise with their understanding. The bureaucracy has passed over to a policy of international adventures which may have territorial, military or economic aims, perhaps all three at once. There were foreshadowings of this as early as 1939. The case in point is the occupation of eastern Poland, the attack on Finland and the occupation of the Baltic states and Bessarabia. In the case of Poland, the Baltics and Bessarabia, the aim was chiefly military, from which, of course, territorial and economic aims cannot be excluded. The 1939 attack on Finland had purely military aims, the seizure of strategic areas around Leningrad for defensive purposes. The recent events in Iran are another example of the policy of international bureaucratic adventures; the aim may be any or all of those indicated, - territorial, military, economic. The stripping of industry in Germany, Roumania and Manchuria is a case of economic international adventures, which means also military aims. The period in which the bureaucracy sat passively on its borders is over. The bureaucracy now seeks to expand its borders to the extent that it is able, a policy which may be called predatory defense. The limits of this new policy are set by the danger of actually compelling the imperialists willingly to plunge into an attack on the Soviet Union. For the time being, the bureaucracy is able to jockey for territorial, military and economic advantages on the international scene in this new way. How long this period will continue cannot be foretold; it is at most a period of instability arising directly from the terrific defeat the imperialists suffered in the second intervention. It may be superseded by a period in which the Soviet bureaucracy, in an effort to lay the basis for a prolonged period of peace, will compromise and withdraw from certain of the territories it has occupied. At the request of the imperialists, the bureaucracy has already withdrawn its forces from Czechoslovakia, a vital territory in the heart of Europe, so that even Churchill has publicly declared that in Czechoslovakia there is (what he calls) a democratic regime. To what extent the bureaucracy may turn to such a policy of withdrawals depends on how it gauges the situation, the essential point to be measured being the extent to which such withdrawals are considered by the bureaucracy to be a guarantee of a period of peace. This in turn is linked with the factor of to what extent the bureaucracy wants a period of peace. It has seen that a war with the imperialists can result in a tremendous expansion of the Soviet borders. The adventurist international policy of the bureaucracy opens the Soviet Union to the menace of a new war. Witness Stalin's brazen machinations in Iran, which give the imperialists a powerful bargaining card with their masses for the purpose of turning them against the Soviet Union. If the bureaucracy loses its head and seeks a war with the imperialists, imagining that the outcome will be a repetition of that of the second intervention, it will find a war without any difficulty.

9. The fallacy of the concept of "intervention against" the Soviet Union is that it pictures the present-day role of the latter as a passive one. Not a period of preparation of "intervention against," but of war between is the correct concept of the present situation, war between a world power, the Soviet Union, and the imperialists. The formulation, "intervention against" the Soviet Union, omits the understanding that the Stalinist bureaucracy has embarked on a policy of adventures against the capitalist powers. Stalin's machinations in Iran, his seizure of machinery in Germany, Roumania and Manchuria, fall into the category of bureaucratic adventures against the imperialists. It is impossible to foresee to what extents the bureaucracy will go in this policy of international adventures. But whilst we are talking of "intervention against" the Soviet Union, the future war between it and the imperialists may be the outcome of the bureaucracy's adventures against the imperialists aimed at fighting the war on the soil of the capitalist countries. In 1918-1921 the intervention against - here correctly used - the Soviet Republic could be fought only on Soviet soil - (the brief campaign in Poland in 1920 is an exception which

has no bearing on the basic situation) - but who is to say where the war between the present-day Soviet Union and the imperialists will be fought. The mechanical repetition of antiquated formulas will leave us far behind the times, gasping with amazement at the unexpected turn of events in the future. Let it be clear that the distinction drawn here between the concept of "intervention against" and "war between" does not flow from any change in the basic contradiction between the Soviet Union and the imperialists, for this is a social-historical feature which transcends any momentary factors, but entirely from the changed strategical position of the Soviet bureaucracy.

10. The degree to which the imperialists on their part are driven toward war with the Soviet Union is determined by the depth of the international crisis in capitalism, a crisis enormously heightened by their recent defeat in the second intervention. To launch a new attack in such a period of instability and crisis in the capitalist world is extremely dangerous for the imperialists, but to allow the Soviet Union a chance to heal its wounds completely is equally, perhaps more, dangerous. The experience of 1921-1941 showed the capitalist world in a state of decline, with the Soviet Union a rising power. The prospect of such a relationship continuing into an extended future period cannot be faced by the imperialists with a calm mind. The future can hold only a still more powerful Soviet Union, even on a bureaucratized basis, and a capitalist world increasingly rent asunder with internal contradictions. The imperialists are torn between two choices:- (1) an attack in the near future, while capitalism still trembles with the effects of the recent defeat in the second intervention, but while the Soviet Union has not yet passed into the state of the really prodigious power available to it because of the nationalized economic basis; and (2) postponement of the attack to a considerably later date when the Soviet Union will be the most formidable power the bourgeoisie as a class ever faced, while the capitalist world, unable to escape its internal contradictions, can achieve at best no more than a depressed, transitory "stability," a state of "equilibrium" founded on ever-intensified crisis.

11. The analysis of the conflict between the Soviet Union and the imperialists must not be reduced to a guessing game whose purpose is to predict more or less precisely when the future war between them will break out. To determine with reasonable exactness when the war will explode may be useful and may do us credit, but it is not a question of principle, and therefore not a basic aspect of our work. The analysis of the Soviet Union-imperialist contradiction, on the other hand, is a question of principle because it involves basic factors in class relations, factors which stand far above the shifting and momentary tactical details which determine the exact time of the outbreak of the war. The international contradiction and the characterization of the present period of history flowing from it remain in existence regardless of any and all transitory and conjunctural factors. To attempt to set definite time limits within which the war must break out is, in the absence of a complete scientific analysis of the economic, political, diplomatic and military factors involved, sheer guess-work. Is it maintained that the war will occur in a year? Then it must be proved with a complete scientific analysis of the economic, political, diplomatic and military factors involved why it must be in a year, and not in a year and six months, or two years or five years. If the guess of a year should turn out to be correct, it is still only guess-work parading as Marxian science. In actuality, the information necessary for setting the time limit on the basis of a complete scientific analysis of the economic, political, diplomatic and military factors involved is not available, and such an analysis has never been made. Moreover, the unforeseen, unpredictable factors often play the most important role. A mass upheaval in Europe or Asia may make another war between the imperialists and the Soviet Union forever impossible for the reason that both the imperialists and Stalinism may be destroy-

ed in the final outcome. The outbreak of a civil war in Italy or France may postpone the war for a considerable time, ultimately perhaps forever. Even the threat of a mass upheaval or civil war can compel the imperialists to postpone their war plans. On the other hand, a relatively rapid plunge into a war against the Soviet Union may be the only possible outlet for the imperialists from the very features of crisis which hinder such an attack and warn against attempting it. Such self-contradictions are the very essence of capitalism. We leave the effort to guess the precise moment of the next war's outbreak to those who mistake guess-work for Marxian analysis. If the champions of the "one year" guess insist on bickering with the champions of the "two year" guess, they will only divert us from our work. And those who insist on making a difference of opinion as to the time limit of the outbreak of the next war the basis of a political platform and a prolonged discussion will also paralyze our work.

12. International adventures, the present-day policy of the Stalinist bureaucracy, has unfolded from 1939 to the present along several lines. In 1939, prior to the outbreak of the second intervention, the seizure of eastern Poland, the Baltics, Bessarabia, and areas in Finland were for the most part defensive measures against the intervention which was close ahead. The predatory appetites of the bureaucracy only began to form at that time, and grew out of a situation where for the moment the seizure of those territories could not be prevented by the imperialists. The occupation of eastern Europe by Stalin's Army starting in the Spring of 1944 was an adjunct of his military campaign against the Nazi Army. Here the first aim was purely military, with predatory territorial and economic aims emerging subsequently. The occupation of territories in the Orient falls into several categories. The imperialists, compelled by the defeat of the Nazi Army in the Soviet Union to bring the sham war among themselves to a close, were forced to engineer the "defeat" of Japan. In this context, they could on no pretext refuse to have returned to "ally" Stalin certain territories of the former Tsarist empire, such as southern Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands, which had come into Japanese possession. Stalin's occupation of Manchuria flowed from the obviously necessary tactic of bringing the "Second World War" to a plausible conclusion on a world-wide scale with the participation of all "allies," the specifically unilateral feature of Stalin's Manchurian adventure being determined by his easy and unpreventable access to that territory. The joint occupation of Korea, like the joint occupation of Germany, represents a compromise forced on the imperialists by Stalin's advantageous position resulting from his victory over the imperialist intervention. In all cases, the Stalinist bureaucracy and the imperialists were in complete agreement on a policy of effecting the liquidation of the German and Japanese fascist regimes with the masses held in subjection. The expansion of the Soviet Union was therefore accompanied by an increased political disorientation of the world masses. While this latter factor strengthens the Stalinist bureaucracy, it also strengthens the imperialists. The American and British imperialists could occupy Italy, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany and Japan and preserve the capitalist power which by the logic of all events flowing from the defeat of the Nazi Army in the Soviet Union was ripe for overthrow. Only the treachery of Stalinism, which bound the masses to the imperialists, made this imperialist coup possible. Stalinism therefore made possible the outbreak of a new war between the Soviet Union and the imperialists. Stalin's territorial adventures are a form of undermining the Soviet Union, this understanding being a question of principle because it involves basic class factors in the problem of the defense of the Soviet Union.

13. Before and during the second intervention, we shared the common error of believing that the rapid defeat of the Soviet Union by the Nazi Army

was a foregone conclusion. This error grew out of a woeful underestimation of the economic and military power of the bureaucratized Soviet Union coupled with a lack of appreciation of the significance of the extremely limited form in which the intervention occurred, namely, the direct participation of only a single major power, Nazi Germany. Nobody can foresee the form in which the future war between the Soviet Union and the imperialists will unfold. The imperialists may be faced again with limitations, this time arising out of different factors, i.e., the defeat of the Nazi Army and the intense world crisis of the capitalist system resulting therefrom. In the second intervention, such major powers as France, England, the United States and Japan could not participate directly for the reasons we have set forth many times in the past. In the future war between the Soviet Union and the imperialists, it cannot be foretold what major capitalist nations will be mobilized for direct participation. If these nations are limited to the United States alone, or to the United States plus a Britain in a severe crisis, the outcome remains to be seen in so far as "who will win" is concerned. It is high time we left behind us the shortsightedness of declaring in advance categorically that in this or that specific war, the victory of the imperialist powers over the Soviet Union is guaranteed. The defeat of the Soviet Union is one possible outcome of the next war with the imperialists. The defeat of the imperialists is another. But in the latter event, the course of history will not stop at that. The military occupation of all the major capitalist countries by the Stalinist bureaucracy is a sheer fantasy. The defeat of the capitalists in another war with the Soviet Union, in the absence of a victorious world proletarian revolution, will most likely mean a third outcome, that unbreakable impasse in the struggle between classes which results in the destruction of a whole society. If Stalinism retains its grip on the proletariat, resulting in an unbreakable impasse between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, both the Soviet Union and the capitalist world will go down in the general destruction of society. The two interventions already completed have brought the impasse closer to its final disastrous resolution. Society cannot pass through a whole series of such devastating shocks without arriving at either the socialist solution or destruction. This is the present historical either-or flowing from the basic international contradiction between the imperialists and the bureaucratized Soviet Union.

J. C. Hunter
March 23, 1946

* * * * *

The Failure of the Second Intervention in Russia

By manipulating the partition of Poland between Hitler and Stalin and by ordering Finland to resist Stalin's demands, the imperialists created a hostile atmosphere toward the Soviet Union. On the basis of that change of sentiment they scored a number of advantages, among them the handicapping of Stalin by withholding materials he needed in preparations to meet the Nazi attack. On the other hand, everything was done by them to insure the equipment of the Nazi army. On both sides all the economic forces were harnessed for the impending conflict.

Prepared and informed though he was, Stalin was unable to prevent the Nazi avalanche from rolling deep into the Soviet Union. With Stalin's army carrying out the scorched-earth policy, blowing up the great Dnieprostroy works and destroying other values, and with the Nazi army following a similar policy only with a thousand-fold greater fury, European Russia was being transformed into a staggering heap of wreckage.

However, the expectations of the imperialists that with one swift blow Stalin's army and all important defence barriers would be shattered did not materialize. Although a large portion of Stalin's army was overpowered and wiped out and many strong fortresses were conquered, for which achievements the Nazi army paid a heavy price in lives and in huge expenditure of materiel, new Soviet armies sprang up to meet the Nazis and more formidable obstacles impeded their progress.

The first campaign, which the imperialists erroneously expected to be also the final, lasted from June 22 to November 28, 1941, a few days after the Nazis breached the defences of Rostov. In the early days of the invasion the Nazis had made a sweep of 350 miles in less than three weeks, passing through the Stalin line on the Dnieper and beyond. Now, over a thousand miles inside Russia, much of their energy and resources had been spent and they met a steadied Russian resistance. Their advance halted.

A contributing factor in bringing the Nazi attempt to an enforced pause was the virtually complete chaos in the rear of their army, while in the back of Stalin's forces there was an undisturbed system of communications, a growing improvement in the organization and mobilization of what means were left to assemble for repelling the monstrous onslaught.

On December 6, 1941 Stalin's army assumed the offensive, capturing Kalinin on the 16, and in January it captured Mozhaisk and other lesser centers. It was during those winter months of 1941-42 that strong doubt arose among the leading strategists and helmsmen in the imperialist camp. However, the doubters were not in a majority and another trial was decided upon. After intense preparations a huge Nazi force was concentrated in the South, the imperialist plan being to cut the arteries connecting the Soviet armies with the oil fields, to carry the panzer divisions across the Volga and run a ring of steel and fire around Moscow from the rear.

The Nazis opened a terrific drive and Stalin's army again gave way. Early in July 1942 the Nazis reached the Don River on a broad front, and piercing the Soviet lines struck South and East, toward the oil fields in the Caucasus and the Volga, while Stalin's forces sought to relieve the heavy pressure by a series of counter-attacks in the North

and in the Don area. On August 25 the Nazi army fought its way into the environs of Stalingrad and on the 3rd of September they broke through into the city proper.

The titanic Battle of Stalingrad lasted almost a half year (August 22, 1942-February 2, 1943), with both armies locked in the deadliest, most stubborn combat in history. Almost every building in the city was transformed into a pile of blazing ruins which were alternately conquered and lost by the attackers and defenders. Gradually the Nazi army was surrounded and cut off from the main forces. On February 2, 1943 the Nazis in Stalingrad surrendered.

Even before the battle entered the last stages, the imperialists, who watched the struggle keenly, knew that Stalingrad was the final test to settle the question among themselves as to the inability of the Nazi war machine to accomplish the assigned task. The foremost leaders of the imperialist camp held interminable secret consultations to decide on a new policy in accord with the changed circumstances regarding their life-and-death problem of stabilizing the capitalist system through the elimination of the anti-Capitalist form of property in the Soviet Union.

THE UNDERGROUND

The violent impact of the Nazi entry into France, the Balkans and other territories stunned the European masses. The proletarian vanguard was blasted to rubble, thousands of workers were wiped out, other thousands sent to a slow death in concentration camps. Two and a half million French workers were kept in Germany as prisoners of war and also forced laborers (Anthony Eden, in House of Commons, Nov. 1944). Despair mingling with bewilderment lasted for months. And the crashing effect of the Nazi sweep into Russia, with the Red Army, whose impressive dress parades past the Lenin mausoleum caused many people to believe that its strength was unsurpassed, unable in the first weeks to hold back the Nazi war engine, only added to the discouragement.

However, already in 1940 some individuals, workers and intellectuals, in various occupied territories carried out isolated terrorist acts against the Nazis and their local collaborators. In 1941 their method of resistance, coupled with sabotage in shops and factories, became widespread. The attempt to disrupt some railway lines in France, the stabbing of a Nazi officer in a Paris subway, the shooting of a Gestapo agent near the Nazi headquarters by youths on bicycles (August 1941), the killing of guerrillas of over a hundred soldiers and officers of the pro-Nazi government of Yugoslavia (Sept. 1941), a threatening mass revolt in Czechoslovakia (Oct. 1941), the assassination of Holtz, the Commander of the Nazi garrison in Nantes, France, the killing of a Nazi military official in Bordeaux, the assassination of Heydrich, Deputy-protector of Bohemia (May 1942) these and numerous other tangible expressions of sporadic and unorganized expanding rebellion against Nazi tyranny spoke of a rumbling volcano the eruption of which the imperialists had to prevent. Otherwise the Nazi war machine, ramming the defenses of the Soviet Union, would have been struck a damaging blow in the back.

The most logical solution of the problem for the imperialists was to capture the European Underground and tie it securely to the "democratic" war machine.

De Gaullist, British and American officers were sent into France to establish connections with Underground groups and individuals, mostly Stalinist and Socialist workers, also some patriotic Republicans and Monarchists. With technical proficiency and skill, and safety, they gradually brought the vast movement, with the aid of the opportunists, under a centralized bureaucratic control with threads leading to the "Allied" Command. That accomplished, the Allied Command began a campaign of arming the Underground from without. Weapons were parachuted in various appointed places, and the workers were kept in a state of military preparation.

To shift confidence of the Underground from its own forces to the "democratic" war machine as the chief source of hope for delivery from Hitler, stirring "Commando" landings were carried out on the French coast. The largest of them, causing a great excitement among the masses was the Dieppe Raid, August 19, 1942. Many French workers in the false belief that the "Allied" invasion had begun came out against the Nazis and were mercilessly slaughtered. The lesson learned, the masses now waited for the "Allied" chiefs to give the signal before acting against the Nazis.

The amazing tenacity, courage and toughness the Soviet soldiers displayed in the incredible inferno of Stalingrad, and finally — the victory, could not but find electrifying repercussions among the masses in the occupied countries, particularly in France. But the imperialist officers with the Stalinist and Socialist leaders collaborating, pursued the line of telling the inspired workers to be patient, not to endanger the movement, to await the D-day when in cooperation with the "Allies" the Underground would rise like one man and destroy the hated Nazis and collaborationists.

But if it was necessary for the imperialists to shackle the Underground in order to prevent the spontaneous release of the immense revolutionary energy and to secure the Nazi rear prior and while the Wehrmacht was straining every nerve in the smoke-filled Stalingrad, how much greater became that necessity when the imperialists began to dismantle and liquidate the sham war, which involved the withdrawal of the Nazi forces from the occupied territories, the removal of the Nazi regime itself!

The difficulty of controlling the Underground could only gradually be surmounted. Meanwhile the main reliance was placed upon the Gestapo. With the first step in the direction of liquidating the sham war, the elimination of the Vichy-Nazi forces from French North Africa, a wave of enthusiasm swept over the masses, particularly in the Unoccupied France among workers, and soldiers and sailors of the Vichy regime. Hitler moved swiftly to clamp down on the danger, seized Toulon, scuttled the fleet and crushed the sailor resistance. Next he demobilized the Vichy French army and extended the Nazi occupation to the entire country. The effectiveness of the move impressed the underground and strengthened the feeling of dependability on the "Allies."

TWO-AND-A-HALF YEARS OF NAZI RETREAT AFTER STALINGRAD

To grasp the new development it is necessary to pose, among others, the question: What was the task the Nazi army was charged with now? Its previous undertaking was definite and precise. But that undertaking had been completely abandoned. The Soviet forces went through a transformation. Resoluteness and confidence and strength coursed

now though the ranks of the Red Army and the whole toiling population of the Soviet Union. New industry was rapidly rising in the Urals and beyond, producing chiefly for the front. Meantime, back of the Nazi lines, around the Nazi garrisons was swirling a daring guerilla movement, equipped by Stalin who could spare arms owing to the Lend-Lease. The movement necessitated a greater detailing of Nazi troops for police duty. At the same time the morale of the Nazi soldiers flagged.

What mission was the Nazi war machine performing for the imperialists in the two-and-a-half years of withdrawal to Berlin?

There were several problems connected with the new assignment to Hitler. Taught by the terrifying experiences of 1917, 1918 and 1919, the imperialists knew that in the devil's cauldron which was Europe, one of the danger features, a menace which for many years presented a specially vexing problem to them was the German working class. There could be no doubt that with the Nazi regime removed, the moment's madness of the German proletariat would give way to a "madness" of a different sort, and with a proper leadership, even if not of so high a standard as Lenin's in 1917, would imperil the capitalist domination of Europe. This menace could not be disposed of in the same manner as the menace of the French working class. The flower of the German proletariat was in the Nazi army which in its major portion was in Russia, and in lesser parts distributed in the occupied territories from Norway to Crete.

For the German workers there was reserved a special treatment to render them completely harmless for a long time again. Hitler was ordered to scrape the bottom of the mobilization barrel and force the remainder of the German proletariat into the army. The able-bodied German workers were replaced with twelve million foreign slaves who were bitterly reluctant and generally unskilled, and whose labor in the munition industry was naturally far below the productivity and efficiency level of the German worker. However, since the Nazi task was different from the one prior to Stalingrad, neither the quality nor the quantity of munitions was of any moment.

The ordeal inflicted on the German proletariat was somewhat similar in certain aspects to the one to which the Loyalist Government subjected the workers during the Spanish Civil War. The first method consisted in the weird aerial annihilation of whole working class districts of Berlin, Hamburg, Bremen, Munich, Leipzig, Cologne, the Ruhr, and other large and small proletarian centers. The capitalist industry was left intact, but the working class families — wives, children and parents of the mobilized workers — were stifled in the flame and smoke caused by the terrific air bombings. In Hamburg, for instance, due to the consumption of oxygen by the solid sea of fire rising from burning blocks of buildings, over a hundred thousand lives were destroyed through suffocation. This crippling of the German proletariat did interfere with production, but the imperialists were motivated by a different policy from the one they staged in the Dunkerque dumping of war materials to the Nazis.

The second method was mass destruction on the Russian front, in which situation both the Soviet and the German masses continued to bleed profusely — which was to the future advantage of the imperialists, and a measure to weaken the Russian masses.

The third, less gruesome method, applied primarily in the lat-

her phase, consisted in turning over of large and lesser bodies of the un-
informed German workers to Stalin and the "democratic" imperialists. Thus,
considerable "pockets" were left behind the Russian lines in the Caucasus,
in the Crimea. In Latvia the whole Kurland Peninsula contained an aban-
doned section of the Nazi army. A great many of the soldiers were killed,
the rest surrendered. "Islands of Resistance" were left by Hitler in East
Prussia, in Poland and in Austria and Czechoslovakia. They really offered
no effective resistance and were wiped out by Stalin.

To balance these "pockets" in the East there were "pockets" in the
West, helping to break into fragments the huge and dangerous mass of the
German proletariat. There were 25 divisions in Italy, 15 divisions in
Norway and Denmark, about 15 in the Balkans (New York Times, Feb. 7, 1945).
About a hundred thousand Nazi soldiers were kept in the French "pockets"
on the Atlantic coast, some 60 thousand were interned in Spain, some div-
isions were scattered in the Dodecanese, Aegean Islands, Rhodes, Crete
the Channel Islands. The great armed bulk of the German proletariat was
successfully carved up and then disarmed piecemeal by the imperialists
and Stalin.

Thus the requirements which the protracted withdrawal of the
Nazi army, of necessity involving numerous delaying counter-offensives
of a rear-guard nature, were several. The need to pulverize the German
proletariat — that was achieved to the extent of killing 7,000,000
soldiers and civilians according to Nazi figures. Next, to achieve a
more thorough massacre of the Russian masses. And, no doubt of special
importance, to shackle the French workers and rivet them, especially
the most advanced sections controlled by the opportunists, to the French
Committee of National Liberation, a new imperialist trap formed in Africa
in 1944 for that specific aim, and attached to De Gaulle's Free French
National Council, an arm of the "democratic" imperialist war machine.

THE DISMANTLING OF THE SHAM WAR

When the "Allied" soldiers set foot on the European continent, in
Italy, on September 3, 1943, there was a wave of tense expectation among
the masses of the occupied countries, particularly in France. Italy,
to prevent an explosion, was quickly put under the Nazi control, and the
drawn-out farce to "push the Nazis out of Italy" commenced. The object
of the dilatory game was to gain the necessary time for completing the
urgent tasks in France and Russia.

After creeping for nine months up the Italian Peninsula the "demo-
cratic" armies reached Rome. Three days later, on June 6, 1944, the "demo-
cratic" imperialists' army landed on the Normandy coast.

The Underground was by now well chained to the "Allied" imperial-
ists under the command of Gen. Pierre Koenig, officer on General Eisenhow-
er's staff. It was attached to the "democratic" sham operations "against"
the Nazis. But the pent-up feelings of the French masses had to be vented.
So several weeks after the "Allies" began to race through France their
direct agents in the Underground, assisted by the Stalinist and Socialist
bureaucrats, staged a few minor battles between the workers and the Nazis.
Things went off smoothly for the imperialists and the sham war was ^{thus} success-
fully dismantled.

PREPARING THE WHEREWITHAL

Already at the end of 1942, during the Nazi defeat at Stalingrad, the production of arms in the United States alone surpassed that of Germany, Japan and Italy combined. The British munition production more than trebled as compared with former years, and was expanding uninterruptedly.

But the most amazing growth in the production of war goods took place after the decision to remove the Nazi regime, in 1943, 1944 and 1945. The two greatest imperialist powers accumulated mountains of planes, tanks, self-propelled artillery, anti-aircraft guns, and millions of tons of merchant shipping - as well as enormous stores of food.

Brand new navies consisting of thousands of vessels of all types were launched and seventeen million men went through the most strenuous training. Above all the United States imperialists developed an infernal weapon, the atomic bomb, whose strength in recent months, according to reports, has been greatly increased. Militarily and economically the imperialists emerged from the attempt to destroy the Soviet Union many times stronger than the Soviet Union. In that respect THE BULLETIN of May-June 1945 was correct when it said: the "imperialists are favorably situated to attack Stalin's army because of their huge military machine and vast untouched reserves."

The blood-letting and devastation left by the imperialists in the Soviet Union defies description. According to the official organ of the Red Army, it would require more than a hundred billion dollars for the restoration of the Ukraine (Red Star, May 1945). In his Feb. 9, 1946 speech Stalin said that the fundamental task of the new Five-Year-Plan consists in "restoring the pre-war level in industry and agriculture." Stalin hopes to achieve the production of 60,000,000 tons of steel a year. But the imperialists long ago surpassed this future goal of Stalin's. Omitting the British Empire and Western Europe, American industry as far back as 1943 reached the figure of 88,000,000 tons of steel. The full capacity today is much vaster.

But if the imperialists have no problem in so far as material means is concerned, then what is their problem? The ideology of the masses without whose support a war in general and a war against the Soviet Union is extremely risky, perhaps impossible. Last year THE BULLETIN stated: "There is a strong pro-Soviet Union sentiment among the masses within the 'democracies' forming an obstacle in the path of the imperialists which they will seek to overcome before attacking." (May-June 1945)

OR what basis can the imperialists overcome that all-important obstacle?

SETTING UP THE NEW CONTRIVANCE FOR SPRINGING THE THIRD ATTACK

Since the October Revolution the imperialists, economically always more powerful than the Soviet Union, have been impeded by the difficulty of setting up appropriate ideological grounds for arousing the masses against the Soviet Union to a point of agreeing to a war for its extirpation. The first intervention in 1918 was carried out under the deceitful slogan of restoring the Eastern Front against Germany. The slogan collapsed when Germany surrendered in November 1918. The second intervention (1941-1942) required a special setting of a sham war among the imperialists, of filling the mind of the German proletariat with the

poison of racial superiority, of rendering that poison effective through the policy of actually lifting the German working class above the miserable status of millions of foreign slaves. Before the eyes of the German workers was rising as if by magic a German World Empire, astride the European Continent. Hitler achieved something no conqueror was able to accomplish -- the occupation of France, the Low Countries, Denmark, Norway, the Balkans, all in one swoop!

And even then, the German masses marched not under the pure idea Against Communism but under the complex slogan: Against Jewish bankers and democratic capitalists and their ally Bolshevism led by Jews.

The second intervention failed primarily because the imperialists were prevented by the special circumstances from pooling their man power and their material strength in a united military action. And this experience has shown them that only a combined strength of all imperialist powers can secure for them the long-sought triumph over the state form of economy established in October 1917. But the imperialists can never reveal to the masses the real reason for their need to wipe out that economy. If they were to say to the masses that a war must be waged against Russia because it is a "Communist State," they would find support only among the sections of the ultra-reactionary petty-bourgeoisie. And to sit with folded arms and wish for a miracle would be tantamount to self-destruction. On the other hand, there is a very effective pretext, as the imperialists verified in their successful placing of the whole world on the war footing in their pretended struggle against Nazi Germany.

It is the pretext of stopping a brutal international aggressor and robber who threatens the security of nations and the fate of humanity that has served imperialism as a powerful rivet to fasten the mind of the masses to its policy. This pretext is very much alive today because the imperialists do not let it cool off for an instant. Such a paralyzing pretext the workers can hardly resist.

The new policy of the imperialists with respect to Stalin followed the familiar pattern of "appeasement" to be succeeded by a reversal and accusation of aggression. Naturally the "appeasement" was carried out in "friendly" talks with the Stalin gang which was not averse to accepting "concessions," "gifts" and "grants" from its "Allies."

Among the first "grants," very obviously, was the change in the imperialist policy on Lend-lease. Since, technically, it was not an outright, unreserved voluntary contribution to an Ally fighting in the same cause but a "lend" and a "lease," Stalin, as indicated recently in the press, is obligated to repay the Lend-Lease after the lapse of a certain specified time. Stalin's refusal to meet the obligation, it is not difficult to see, can but incense the "taxpayer" in America and the backward masses who see the matter in the light that Stalin succeeded because of the Lend-Lease.

One of the signs that the imperialists have now reversed their original explanation for Lend-Lease to Stalin is the fact that before VE-Day they actually spread the impression that Lend-Lease to Stalin was a contribution to an Ally: "The Russian army in Berlin is the main benefit we derived from Lend-Lease. It is adequate." (Editorial, New York Times, April 24, 1945).

But when they opened their campaign of garnering the fruit of "appeasement" the policy strikingly changed. Discussing the conditions for a

"loan" to the Stalinist Polish government, the New York Times (April 26, 1946) remarked that Lend-Lease to the Soviet Union "obligated that country in return for aid furnished" to fulfill certain commitments of economic nature.

The long chain of "appeasement" acts was surrounded with an impenetrable veil of secret discussions with Stalin. On the surface it seemed just as in the game with Hitler before September 1939, that the imperialists sought to put up resistance to Stalin's pressure on the question of Poland, of Yugoslavia, of Stalin's numerical representation in the UNO and other "issues." But they invariably "retreated," as they had done with Hitler when they were grooming him for the role of the insatiable aggressor.

The Yugoslav question was "solved" in Stalin's favor when Churchill officially repudiated Michailovich in Parliament and switched the British policy of support to Tito. Stalin's path into Yugoslavia was cleared in various ways. When the Allies occupied the Southern part of Italy, "The Soviet Air Force received a base in Italy to supply its mission with Marshall Tito's Partisan forces in Yugoslavia." (New York Times, August 14, 1945).

In February 1945 Churchill repudiated the London Polish government. The Stalin Polish puppet government was not only recognized but was elevated to the membership of the UNO.

But the meat of the "appeasement" was not the "trifles" like "Lend-Lease" but the various territories which the imperialists agreed that Stalin occupy not only for the "duration" but for a considerable period after the elimination of the Nazis. Stalin was let in on the "unconditional surrender" proposition so he could without any diplomatic obstructions occupy half of Germany. They also included him into the Far Eastern "war," definitely as part of their new policy. For no visible reason on earth they invited him in their Yalta "chats" to "help" them to secure the "victory" over Japan and saw to it that "the huge, undefeated Japanese Army" as the New York Times described it on August 16 1945, offered no resistance to Stalin's entry into Manchuria and Korea.

Stalin in Manchuria is resorting to the indirect tactic of using his "Communist" forces to establish a Chinese Stalinist puppet state. While withdrawing his soldiers in Russian uniforms, he is replacing them with his soldiers in Chinese "Communist" uniforms, thus retaining Manchuria within his orbit of power.

Over a year earlier before Stalin issued forth "to aid" the imperialists "defeat" Japan, conditions had been secretly worked out and according to reports signed in the Spring of 1944 for Stalin's occupation of the Balkans. A line of demarkation, however, was drawn between the Stalin-controlled Yugoslavia and British-controlled Greece. When Stalin evinced a design on Greece and through the medium of his Greek bureaucrats stretched his hand to that country, the British rapped him on the fingers.

Naturally, the "appeasement" features were recorded in documents drawn up and discussed and signed in secret in Moscow, Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam. The specific clauses and conditions are still largely withheld from public eye but the essence is clear. Stalin obligated himself to respect the integrity of all the countries he entered, to guarantee a "free" government, respect the property, much of which was British, American and French capital invested in mining machinery and

industry. The final point, unquestionably, Stalin placed his signature under the condition that at a certain specified date he would withdraw from all those territories which were not, by the consent of the imperialists, to be included in the U.S.S.R. A special pact for his withdrawal from Manchuria was signed by Stalin with the imperialist puppet Chiang Kai-shek.

Those who know imperialism as it was in 1914-1918, those who did not grasp the nature of Hitler's "seizures" of territories before and after 1939 are bewildered by the Kaleidoscopic passing of countries from one power to another. The idea that present-day imperialism, far more powerful militarily than the imperialism of decades ago, operates in its strategy to wipe out the proletarian form of economy through the unique tactic of "handing over" territories now to Hitler, now to Hitler and Stalin, now to Stalin alone, seems to be a product of wild and unrestrained fancy. However, this idea, both in the case of the sham war and in the case of the post-Stalingrad policy designed to transform the Soviet Union in the eyes of the masses from a victim into a monster of aggression, is a reflection of sharply visible authentic acts of the imperialists themselves, acts which integrate and add up to a unified whole.

While imperialism was bringing the military end of this process to a conclusion it looked as if it lived through an anxious moment. For some reason Stalin stalled in his advance into Germany. Imperialism was pressed for time. Whereas after Stalingrad imperialism required ample time to take hold of the Underground, now, after it had made an amazingly rapid sweep across France, it had to conclude the liquidation of the sham war. But for some ^{amazing} reason Stalin's army did not budge.

Six months went by since the landing in Normandy. The "Democratic" armies were virtually stamping in one spot, moving by yards toward Cologne which lay only a few miles away. What went on behind the scenes between them and Stalin is not clear but Stalin would not order the march on Berlin, and conducted operations only in the flanking areas.

People were wondering why Eisenhower was not moving ahead. It was being recalled that only a few months earlier the Nazi garrisons in the most powerful fortresses in France were toppled like so many houses of cards, but now all progress stopped. The mystery was deepening.

The imperialists seemed worried. "Is Stalin on a sit-down strike?" was the cry of the capitalist newspapers, radio speakers, even of meteorologists who explained, from their field of observation, that the weather in the region from East Prussia down to the Carpathians was perfectly fit for a Russian offensive. Stalin's delay caused the imperialists to stretch their schedule and fill in the pause with a military side-show, while matters could be adjusted with Stalin. On the 17 of December 1944 the Nazi "blitzkrieg" artists supposedly took the "Allied" commanders by surprise and "broke" through the lines on a fifty mile front at the Belgian-Luxemburg border. Now the "Allied" Command was involved in a task of first eliminating the "Bulge" and only then take up the question of crossing the Rhine. The operation to eliminate the Bulge took some time, meanwhile things were straightened out behind the scenes with Stalin and both sides moved swiftly into the heart of Germany.

The war between Stalin and imperialism -- the most devastating and costly war in all history -- was over. In its long trek over the ravaged expanse of the Ukraine and through the Baltic states, the Balkans

and Eastern Germany, the Red Army left an appalling wake of many millions of corpses, not only of the Nazi army but also of its own men. Tens of millions of workers families remained homeless, resources were depleted, the whole Soviet population almost to the point of nervous exhaustion, for no people on earth had gone through such a fiery ordeal as the toiling masses of the Soviet Union.

On the other hand the "democratic" imperialist war machine reached the peak of strength and fitness. Its immense industrial fabric was rolling out military equipment at record pace and in record quantities. Moreover, imperialism now possessed a weapon of infernal power -- the atomic bomb, upon the development of which the American imperialists spent 2 billion dollars. The force of that new weapon was demonstrated in the wiping out of the Japanese city of Hiroshima of 343,000 population with one single bomb on August 6, 1945, horrifying the masses of the whole world.

And at this very moment the policy of imperialism revealed itself with extraordinary clearness. The imperialists turned over to Stalin what can be described as the prize in the long list of "appeasement" pieces.

Manchuria is one of the richest territories on the globe. It is the wealthiest, most industrialized part of China, as a matter of fact of the Far East as a whole. Its population exceeds that of France. In size it is nearly equal to the combined area of Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia and Poland. Stalin's "war" to enter that land (August 8, 1945) lasted a few days, after which the Japanese officially called off the entire affair, (August 16, 1945). Stalin came into possession of industrial plants, ware houses, railroad equipment and war materials turned over to him by the "defeated" Japanese army.

But even more vivid became the "give-and-take" game the imperialists and Stalin were playing when it was seen that the stories about Roosevelt agreeing to give Stalin the thirty six highly strategic Kurile Islands were no fabrications. Stalin actually moved into the Kuriles and, according to reports, promptly proceeded to fortify them to seal the entrance to the Sea of Okhotsk. With Stalin's occupation of the Island of Sakhalin and Northern Korea the circle of territorial "appeasement" as far as the eye can see at this writing, was brought to completion.

Stalin obviously had no knowledge of the extent of the program of "appeasement." He welcomed any spot where the imperialists would let him boss around, even for a short while, in places he could never hope to hold, such as the Danish Island of Bornholm. He sounded the ground about the possibility of his military control of the Dardanelles, his trusteeship of Tripolitania, on establishing bases in the Dodecanese and in Formosa, but the imperialists did not respond. Seeing that the American and British imperialists went to the extent of what seemed as unrestrained, reckless extravagance in "lending" values to the amount of almost twelve billion dollars, Stalin put in a request for a billion dollar loan to be used in the new Five Year Plan. But his request was "lost" in the State Department of Washington. He also tried to be let in on the secret of the atomic bomb, but his "advantage" had no weight with them whatsoever. From these indications, the "appeasement" program, at least for the moment, has been terminated.

With regard to Stalin's occupation of Balkan States the line of the imperialists is of special meaning. The Balkan peninsula was for decades a semi-colony of the British, French and American imperialists. Yet,

when Stalin was still a great distance away from the Balkans, with his army heavily engaged in the battle against an immense Nazi force from the Arctic to the Black Sea, the British and American imperialists not only did not put up a diplomatic campaign against Stalin's occupation of Balkan territories, not only made no effort whatsoever to prevent that occupation, but did not even arrange for a joint occupation.

This policy of agreeing that Stalin occupy the Balkan states without sharing the occupation with the imperialists is highly indicative. The withdrawal of the British military mission from the imperialist Yugoslav stooge, Mikhailovitch, accomplished in the Spring of 1944, only throws additional light upon the imperialist policy of involving Stalin in the Balkan occupation. The withdrawal of the mission from Mikhailovitch was in effect a de facto recognition of Stalin's stooge Tito. At that time Stalin's army was still far away from Yugoslavia. It reached the old borders of the Soviet Union only by July 1944, according to a map published by the Intelligence Division of the U.S. War Department.

Soon, curiously enough, the imperialists gave the "Communist" Tito, who did not hide his connections with Stalin, an official standing. Under the personal supervision of Churchill, conferences were held with Tito resulting in strengthening his hand against all the internal opposition to his drawing Yugoslavia into Stalin's puppet-states system.

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

Some people imagine that Stalin emerged from the war so mighty as to be in a position to wring concessions from the imperialists. This illusion is dispelled by the case of Greece. Here the imperialists resolved to keep Stalin's army out -- and it did stay out, although he had a huge supporting force inside Greece, while his Russian troops were on the borders of that country.

In Greece the British did not give support to the Greek Titos, because that country is a vital foothold for military operations in the Balkans, once the war against the Soviet Union commences.

Had it been a question of Stalin's advantage over the imperialists, he could have easily pushed into Greece and face them with a fait accompli. Stalin tried to secure a hold on Greece only through his internal Greek forces, and he failed. The answer to the question why Stalin did not march into Greece and why the imperialists opposed the Greek Stalinists is outlined in the New York Times of December 10, 1944:

"Russian troops could have been in Athens just as easily as the British, perhaps more easily. And one is justified in asking why it is that British Tommies are upholding Premier Georges Papandreu instead of the Red Army supporting the resistance movement in what Mr. Churchill said was a Red plot to seize power by force of arms.

"The answer is that there was a deal made somewhere by which Europe was divided into spheres of influence."

It is plain that at the time the "deal" was made Stalin's Army was deeply involved against the Nazis, and the imperialists were not in any

way forced by Stalin to agree to his occupation of the Balkans. It was their policy, the understanding being that eventually the Balkans would be restored with complete freedom for the imperialists to enter them on a capitalist basis. The "deal" meant that the Balkans were a "No Man's Land" yet under Stalin's control -- for a certain period. "Greece, it seems, had been given to the British, but all the rest of the Balkans and Yugoslavia is a kind of diplomatic No Man's Land now under Russian influence." (Ibid.)

Thus, instead of a "diplomatic deadlock" on the issue of the Balkans, which would signify a policy of not agreeing to an occupation by Stalin's forces alone, there was an opposite policy. The imperialists facilitated the entrenchment of Tito's "Communist" rule making it easier for Stalin's army to carry out the occupation of the Balkans as a whole -- except for Greece.

Even more striking is the imperialist policy in the Far East, specifically in the case of Manchuria. The territory is indisputably Chinese. Since, as is widely known, the early Soviet regime had officially and irrevocably renounced all the Tsarist territorial intrigues and encroachments in China and elsewhere, Stalin could not on any pretext ask that the Tsarist "rights" in Manchuria be restored for the Soviet Union. Yet there is no manifestation of a "deadlock" between Stalin and the imperialists on the issue of Manchuria. Quite the contrary: there is a definite information in the press, reiterated by Churchill, that there was an understanding at Yalta for Stalin to establish himself in Manchuria on the basis of restoration of Tsarist privileges.

The most logical agreement among the "freedom-loving" "allies" would have been to have the Japanese army surrender to the official Chinese government, as was the case in other Japanese-occupied parts of China. A still more plausible agreement would have been to set up a joint occupation of Manchuria by the imperialists, Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek. But evidently the imperialist line at Yalta was altogether different; neither they nor their puppet Chiang Kai-shek raised the question of joint occupation, or occupation by Chinese forces only. Chiang Kai-shek, naturally by instruction from his masters, made a treaty with Stalin granting the old Tsarist privileges in Manchuria to the Soviet dictator. Stalin accepted. No doubt both sides understood that once Stalin occupied the territory he would by hook or crook seek to hold on to it. Stalin promised in the treaty to aid Chiang Kai-shek to establish the Kuomintang power in Manchuria. In reality Stalin worked to aid his own Chinese forces to make Manchuria another Stalinist puppet state.

To make this Manchuria case against Stalin doubly strong, the imperialists had Chiang Kai-shek sign a treaty also with the Chinese Stalinists, knowing full-well that both Stalin and his Chinese stooges never meant to allow Chiang-Kai-shek become master of Manchuria. In drawing up the treaties "binding" the Stalin gang to certain obligations to Chiang Kai-shek, the imperialists pretended they forgot how Stalin had broken his non-aggression pact with Poland, his pact with France. They knew that the very entry of Stalin into the Far East was predicated on his breaking the non-aggression agreement with Japan. Quite realistic about Stalin's opportunist line of aggrandisement, they had expected him to violate or go around his pledges to Chiang Kai-shek; and he did. They needed this violation by Stalin and his Chinese stooges to launch their preparatory campaign in building up a war psychology against the Soviet Union. Signs are multiplying leaving no doubt that the recent actions by Stalin and the Chinese Stalinists are being already used by the bourgeoisie to that

end. In an editorial, the New York Times of April 17, 1946 said regarding the flare-up of fighting between the Stalinist Chinese forces and Chiang Kai-shek in Manchuria:

"The new hostilities are especially dangerous because the Communists move in the wake of the Russian armies. The Russians themselves have at last agreed to leave Manchuria, two months late, but Chinese Communists reinforced by 'Union' Communists from Russia and 'White Russians' become Soviet citizens, are now ready to take over as their successors. It is difficult to square this development with either the letter or the spirit of the Russo-Chinese treaty, to which both the United States and Great Britain are indirect parties through the Yalta agreement."

CAN STALIN RELINQUISH THE FRUITS OF "APPEASEMENT"?

An honest leadership, as was Lenin's in the Brest-Litovsk negotiations crisis, would not hesitate, for the sake of saving the conquests of October, to give up to the imperialists large areas even of Russia proper. No crooked deals with the imperialists were involved, no need existed to deceive the masses, no personal aggrandizement of a conscious renegade and tyrannous dictator was the central feature in the policy of the proletarian State.

Unlike Napoleon, who built his power chiefly by means of territorial conquest, Stalin lifted himself within the old borders of the Soviet State, on the basis of a rising pyramid of bureaucratic centralization. After the bloody purges of 1936-38, Stalin reached the pinnacle of his personal power on the internal basis. His 1939 march beyond the borders, however, the acquisition of half of Poland, which followed with the absorption of the Baltic States and Bessarabia, precipitously widened the circle of his power and authority. To the limited upward line now was added the "theoretically" unlimited horizontal, or "Napoleonic," line of extension of Stalin's dictatorial power.

In 1941, when the Nazi war machine went through the Soviet defenses like a fire through a parched meadow, encircled Leningrad and reached within a striking distance from Moscow and the Caucasus, Stalin's "prestige" was shaken as it had never been in fourteen years, since he maneuvered the Shanghai workers into a massacre by "comrade" Chiang Kai-shek. Stalin's "brilliant" "non-aggression" diplomacy with Hitler appeared to be a botchery if there ever was one, a deadly trap. And only owing to the terrific effort on the part of the Russian masses, not due to Stalin's "brilliant" generalship, that the tide was turned.

Stalin's entering into Berlin was described to the Russian masses as a solely military achievement, and so was painted his "smashing" drive against the large Japanese army in Manchuria. His occupation of the Kuriles and Sakhalin were understood to be very adroit diplomatic triumphs.

It goes without saying that Stalin had his own calculations in accepting the "appeasement gifts" of the imperialists. He has learned a thing or two since he made a mess of his seemingly grand diplomatic structure which was cracked open by imperialism in June 1941. Stalin must have envisioned the termination of his dictatorship when the Nazi army crashed toward Leningrad and Moscow. It may be taken for granted that in his deals with the imperialists Stalin has proceeded carefully, calculating each step with utmost caution and building up a protective ideological shield against their future propaganda spearhead thrusts. Stalin's

ultimate aim, of course, is to include those states into the USSR. But he never entertained the silly notion that the moment he entered the Balkans or Poland or Manchuria he would automatically and immediately transform them into component segments of the Soviet Union. A realistic policy compels him to go through a masquerade of recognizing his own stooge governments in those states, at first establishing a system of puppet states militarily forming one huge network of fortifications with Moscow as the center. The dependence of those border states upon Stalin is being achieved through certain economic changes, distribution of land to the peasants, formation of an industrial bureaucracy through a partial nationalization of industry, the construction of the Stalinist Party not only as a political but also as an economic and military lever of control.

Stalin's system of blockhouses on the periphery of the old borders of the Soviet Union does not at all require that every one of the forts be manned with Russian troops.

In Yugoslavia, for instance, while "peace" lasts, he may have no need to garrison the country with divisions of the Red Army. Czechoslovakia is drawn into his orbit of blockhouses through the nationalization program and political-police control of the State. Stalin's Czech stooge, Prime Minister Fierlinger, recently declared: "We look to Russia for our security, admittedly. I don't think the United States or Britain is ready to offer us a treaty of alliance. But Russia has done so and it will remain the basis of our foreign policy. That foreign policy will remain unchanged, whatever the outcome of our elections." (New York Times, March 11, 1946).

With the Comintern's present developing Left policy tied firmly and exclusively to his foreign policy, Stalin's bureaucrats work everywhere with feverish energy to extend and strengthen his blockhouse system and draw as many important and feasible territorial elements into Stalin's orbit before the storm breaks. Thus, the Yugoslav Stalinist section demands Trieste; the Italian Stalin bureaucrats are in favor of ceding Trieste to Yugoslavia. In Iran local "uprisings" are staged to attach certain provinces to Stalin's puppet system. The same is being organized in Kurdistan. In Germany Stalin is seeking to eliminate the Social Democracy, a tool of imperialism, and "merge" it with his own German Comintern section. Wilhelm Pieck is reported to have said:

"The new party desires to create such conditions that the occupation will not be necessary."

"This sentiment dovetails with the promise Marshal Georgi K. Zhukov, Soviet commander in Germany, is reported to have made to Social Democratic leaders who support the fusion. It was to the effect that if the merger succeeded conditions would be favorable for a withdrawal of all but a handful of Russian troops." (New York Times, March 20, 1946)

A naive person who has no stable grasp of the flexibility of power politics, who fails to observe that the world is changing after a certain definite fashion is always apt to evince excessive zeal in rejecting an idea which on the surface appears as a product of fancy and in strengthening this surface impression by squeezing that idea into an unrealistic, rigid and ludicrously narrow frame. As he "grasps" the idea, it means that Stalin must hold on to every inch of ground of occupied territories whether this or that village or section can be of value to him in his system of border states-forts or not. Such a person does not penetrate to the substance of the idea, that the question involves the basic

territories of positive military importance.

If under the pressure of a mere verbal drive Stalin turned over all the highly strategic puppet territories back to the imperialists -- the list is long; among those territories must be counted also Poland and the Baltic States which have not been recognized by the imperialists in a final form as component parts of the USSR -- his power would automatically shrink not only horizontally, but what would be infinitely worse for him, also vertically. His "prestige," which, as has been pointed out, was badly shaken when Hitler was overrunning the Soviet Union, and all the bureaucratic talk about the invincible Red Army and the impregnable defenses was revealed to be worse than empty bombast, proved to be chloroform for the Russian masses, would begin to totter. The Russian masses would realize that Stalin's new "diplomatic achievements" were hollow bluff, similar in their counterfeit nature to all his previous "diplomatic victories" beginning with the widely-acclaimed "friendship" with Turkey and ending with the no-less acclaimed "non-aggression pact" with Hitler.

Stalin's security of power is attached now, to a large extent, and has been so since he moved across the border in 1939 and later attacked Finland, to the horizontal plane.

For him there is only one course -- to push skilfully ahead. If one wished to understand what would happen if Stalin abandoned the whole system of puppet-border-forts, let one visualize Napoleon voluntarily relinquishing all his territorial seizures and retiring within the shell of France.

There are certain fundamental differences between the "conquests" of Stalin and the actual conquests of Napoleon. The French Dictator stood as supreme master over his puppet states because he conquered them in a struggle against their former rulers and against the chief world power, England. Stalin, on the other hand, came into possession of the territories through the unique method of agreement with the very imperialists seeking to destroy the Soviet Union. He gathered imperialist-owned territories with the consent of their powerful owners, and the consent was given him when he was locked in with a huge Nazi army still on the Soviet soil.

Two "minor" points of difference. Napoleon was blockaded by the British imperialists who gave every encouragement to the continental peoples to break his military grip. Stalin was not only not blockaded, as he actually had been before June 1941, but was given mountains of supplies, and the puppet states were ordered to join his military forces, while in the Far East a huge Japanese imperialist army did nothing to resist him. The Russian masses do not know the true character of Stalin's "conquests," but that character would become revealed at once if he withdrew at the mere sound of the "anti-aggression" speeches of Churchill.

There is one more important difference. Although Napoleon's fortune rested on territorial expansion, a strong prop to his power inside France was the transformation of the internal conditions ^{under} his regime. The peasantry prospered, the bourgeoisie grew rich and the proletariat obtained higher wages in a country never touched by invasion as long as his star was in the zenith. Stalin, on the other hand, brought right into the territory of the Soviet Union the most terrible war in history. The decline of his "prestige" would be tantamount to the decline of his power.

The question of his personal power is paramount with Stalin. He has

no choice but to follow the opposite road from the one an honest leadership would take. His line could have been no other than to take advantage of the "goodness" of the imperialists, who not only did not object but who freely opened the gates for him even to such rich imperialist possessions as Manchuria, a territory completely out of the sphere of the Soviet-Nazi war.

As experience has shown, Stalin bases his defense on the blood and muscle of the masses and material resources. He is carting away machinery and equipment into the interior to protect them from the coming air raids. He is organizing support for himself in the Balkans and even in Germany. He knows it will take the imperialists some time to develop their ideological campaign which they are revolving around his occupations.

Knowing full-well why the imperialists were falling all over themselves to "please" him, Stalin has no illusions about the inevitability of a new attack. In connection with his experience in 1941, when he chloroformed the Soviet masses and his army into a sense of false security by lying that Hitler's bayonets were turned to the West, Stalin now seeks to prevent the paralysis of the army by indicating openly that a war with imperialism is impending.

Stalin knows that military action will be preceded by a diplomatic war around the "interpretations" of Teheran, Moscow, Yalta, and Potsdam, the Sino-Soviet Pact and other documents. He knows the aim is to envelop the British and American population with an atmosphere which will induce the masses to pass from mere prognostication "We are going to have a war with Russia," to a positive and direct "We must fight Russia." Stalin has prepared a million "interpretations," "explanations" and "exposures" up his sleeve, and he will play them in accordance with the movement of the diplomatic pieces on the international chess-board.

STALIN'S COMINTERN POLICY

With the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941 Stalin attached the Comintern line fully and exclusively to his foreign policy. The line of the Comintern during the war years was of the ultra-Rightist character. But already at the end of 1943 Stalin realized that the Nazi force would be eliminated and he would confront the "democratic" imperialists as the potential military adversaries. Since it would be impossible for the Comintern to carry on a Rightist line in the event of war with "democratic" imperialists, Stalin's forthcoming change in his foreign policy necessitated a corresponding alteration in the line of the Comintern. In consequence, Stalin early in 1944 secretly laid down the basis for the eventual shift of the Comintern line to the Left (the Foster letter).

The first sign of the change became visible in 1945 in the Duclos article which was a maneuver for the removal of Browder and the reestablishment of the "Communist Party" in the United States. The further unfolding of the left zigzag will be closely connected with the unfolding of the diplomatic war between Stalin and the "democratic" imperialists.

George Marlen
Arthur Burke

THE WORK OF CANNON AND SHACHTMAN
IN THE TRADE UNIONS

PART IV - THE TROTSKYITES IN THE U.A.W.

HOMER MARTIN'S ROLE IN THE U.A.W.

For years the auto workers suffered under the most brutal speed-up system in American capitalism. The intense exploitation of the workers and the high concentration and integration of the industry created a natural field for union organization.

Because the unions were under the control of the labor fakers, the auto field was infested with all sorts of opportunist swindlers seeking to capitalize on the militant aspirations of the auto workers. Besides the A. F. of L. gang there were the Stalinist bureaucrats and a host of "independent" careerists of the type of Homer Martin and Richard Frankenstein, all sniffing around for some trade union offices.

Through the notorious Auto Board Settlement in 1934, the A.F. of L. gang prevented a nation-wide auto struggle. At the same time this betrayal marked the swan song of the A.F. of L. in the auto field. At the Second Convention of the U.A. W. in May 1936 the openly pro-Green leadership was thrown out. The new leadership, representing the anti-Green forces, was manipulated by a Stalinist-Socialist pro-C.I.O. bloc which utilized the anti-Green sentiments of the auto workers for their own opportunist purposes. The candidate of the Stalinist-Socialist bloc was a former priest, Homer Martin, who very practically riveted his sights on a real piecard in the U.A.W. and left the imaginary pie in the sky to his duped followers. The Stalinist stooges, Wells, Mortimer, and Hall were given vice-presidencies and Ades handed the post of secretary-treasurer. The whole concern of these careerists was the business of grabbing up the big jobs. After the posts had been neatly distributed to the satisfaction of the Stalinist bureaucrats, they pushed through their program. To the Stalinist resolutions, Martin added an amendment calling for support to Roosevelt. On this openly class-collaborationist note the Second Convention adjourned.

The line of the Trotskyites toward this Second Convention of the U.A.W. was one of "critical support" to the sham progressives. The Stalinist-Socialist-Homer Martin bloc was labelled by the Trotskyites "this essentially progressive bloc." (New Militant, May 9, 1936) The program of the Stalinist-led "progressives," it was said, "lacks much in content in so far as accurate analysis is concerned." (Ibid.) That the main concern of the progressives was the seizing of the big jobs in the union was clearly understood by the Trotskyites:

"So strong was the desire of many delegates including the progressives to obtain offices that instead of fighting out differences on basic issues and then electing men on their stand, it was decided by the steering committee that election of officers should come first." (Ibid.)

The Trotskyites' "advice" to the workers was that only the test of the class struggle could prove the calibre of the new leadership: "Only the test of a class struggle will show clearly where each stands." (Ibid.) This latter "advice" was a line of paralyzing

the workers in the U.A.W. with false hopes. Marxism evaluates any leadership in terms of its political line. It does not have to wait for the class struggle to present the workers with a finished betrayal in order to make possible the evaluation of an opportunist leadership. The task of Marxists is to fight against and prevent such betrayals. The line of the Stalinist-led bloc in the U.A.W. was quite well known to the Trotskyite leaders whose "advice" to the workers to watch for the results of some future test left the workers disarmed victims of the "progressives."

Up to the end of 1937, the Trotskyites were roosting inside the Socialist Party. Toward the latter part of the "French Turn" period in the Socialist Party, the Trotskyites, preparing to split out, published their own organ, the Socialist Appeal. In the issue of October 2, 1937, they gave an account of the Third Convention (August 1937) of the U.A.W. and showed what the class struggle test had revealed about Homer Martin in the period since the Second Convention. While the Trotskyites were buried in the Socialist Party, Martin and the Stalinists had a falling out, as thieves inevitably will in the labor movement. On the policy of sell-outs Martin did not at all differ with the Stalinists. The cleavage was on the important matter of control of the union. Using the power of appointment for his own conniving purposes, Martin gathered up all the discontented careerist job-hunters opposed to the Stalinists and built up a powerful bureaucratic machine of his own:

"Martin set to work. Using the power of appointment, he gathered all the job hunters, all the opportunists in the union. With ample resources in the treasury, he sent his organizers up and down the countryside in a vicious red-baiting campaign to throw fear and confusion into the hearts of the union membership.

"Industrialists and the capitalist press were informed that henceforth 'Communists' would be expelled, unauthorized strikes would be tolerated no longer." (Socialist Appeal, October 2, 1937)

The sell-outs now put over by the Martin crew were accompanied by a campaign of unremitting red-baiting. As usual in such campaigns the most deadly poison was the fiction which identified counter-revolutionary Stalinism with revolutionary Marxism. Martin's red-baiting gave the Stalinists a revolutionary appearance and only added to their prestige as seeming opponents of Martin's sell-out policies. Drawing a balance sheet of eighteen months of Martin's rule, the Trotsky clique was compelled to acknowledge that the Martin leadership which it had painted as progressive really had behaved in a most reactionary fashion:

"In eighteen brief months, this truly progressive leadership has become a furiously reactionary, red-baiting clique, whose only thought is the perpetuation of its own existence and position." (Ibid.)

The conclusion was quite logically pointed out:

"The leadership has become a hindrance and an obstacle to the further progress of the organization." (Ibid.)

Of course, the truth was that the Martin gang was never, at any time, by any stretch of the imagination, a "truly progressive leadership." The talk about the Martin gang being at one time a truly progressive leadership was just an attempt to explain away the original Trotskyite support to him. Martin was simply another "labor" sky-pilot gathering easy pickings in the union movement which he found to be a profitable business. By the end of 1937, the Cannon-Shachtman leadership was cursing Martin as a rotten strikebreaker. (Socialist Appeal, December 18, 1937)

In January 1938 when the Trotsky leaders formed their Socialist Workers Party they continued to lambast Martin. Also among the targets of Trotskyite criticism were the nefarious Lovestoneites, now defunct, but then one of the groups of fortune-seekers in the U.A.W. The Lovestone gang, formerly the leadership of the American C.P., received the boot from Stalin in 1929 during one of the phases of Stalinist centralization. Remaining merchants of Stalinism, the Lovestone crew copyrighted a trade mark of its own and continued to do business in the same Stalinist manner as before, although it now sweetened its Stalinist merchandise with an "anti-Stalinist" coating. Smelling a fair bargain in the U.A.W. the Lovestoneites eagerly peddled their political wares to Homer Martin, the top dog of the union. Martin spotted a good bargain and snapped up the Lovestoneites' proposition, trading them some advisory duties in exchange for their support. In his clique war against the Stalinists Martin needed some competent advisers to handle the more complex political problems for him. The Lovestoneites now ventured forth as salesmen for Martin, ballyhooing their new product before the auto workers as a "progressive" who should be supported against his Stalinist rivals. The Trotsky leaders attacked this idea:

"Actually, Homer Martin's program in its trade union aspect differs not in the least from that of the unprincipled Stalinist clique opposing him." (Socialist Appeal, February 5, 1938, p. 1)

Cannon and Shachtman took particular pride in their seeming struggle against both the Martin and Stalinist gangs and made sure that their followers had an adequate appreciation of their rigid adherence to principles:

"We hold no brief for Homer Martin, or his water-boys, the Lovestoneites, or his reactionary allies. We have been his most vigorous opponents and the most consistent champions of the rights of the rank-and-file. We have conducted this struggle while the opportunists were trying to patch up any kind of peace with him." (Socialist Appeal, April 2, 1938.)

The pages of the Trotskyite press were full of stories about the extraordinary opportunity to conduct wide revolutionary mass work. The mutual attacks of the Stalinist and Martin gangs, the dirt spilled on both sides did indeed provide an excellent springboard for the common exposure of both sides. Had there been a Marxist force in the U.A.W. the unprincipled clique war between Martin and the Stalinists would have been utilized as a striking lesson in the contrast between opportunist trade union policies and revolutionary unionism. Both the Martin and Stalinist camps of reaction would have been rejected and uncompromisingly exposed as labor swindlers. The proper political lessons would have been drawn and the auto workers educated into the meaning of revolutionary Marxism.

THE TROTSKYITES JUMP ON MARTIN'S BANDWAGON

Outwardly it seemed for the moment that the Trotskyites were redeeming their promise to pursue the path of revolutionary mass work in so far as the auto union was concerned. But suddenly the Martin-Stalinist war broke out in renewed and intensified fury. Now principles were put to the test as they always are in sharp crises. There was no room or time for equivocations and fraudulent disguises. Everyone had to come out in the open and take his stand.

Cannon-Shachtman's stand consisted of laying aside their paper resolutions, throwing themselves with unreserved abandon into the reactionary clique warfare and **PLEDGING FULL SUPPORT OF HOMER MARTIN!**

"Support Martin

"The policy here recommended does not imply extensive negotiations over questions of program, etc. It does not necessitate formal agreements of any kind. The most important facts are already known, and the duty of responsible militants is clear. In the crisis provoked by the Stalinite bid for power, the militants have no choice but to support the Martin administration as against the Stalinite-Frankensteen combination. And this support should be given openly, frankly and aggressively." (J. P. Cannon, Socialist Appeal, May 14, 1938, p. 4. Emphasis in original)

This piece of treachery proved how "seriously" Cannon and Shachtman took their own words against the reactionary Martin and his putrid regime. Jay Lovestone and Co., formerly the target of Trotskyite gibes about their poisonous peddling of Martin, now had a hearty belly laugh as Cannon and Shachtman hastily clambered about the Martin bandwagon. When the Trotsky leaders, with a perfectly straight face "proved" that support to the Martin leadership was in the interests of the working-class, they perpetrated another in a long series of betrayals.

To show how rotten opportunists are compelled to reverse themselves when it suits their factional purposes: - for a long time, the Cannon-Shachtman gang had been applying bitterly critical phrases to Martin, such as the following which we quoted above: "...he gathered all the job hunters, all the opportunists in the union"; "vicious red-baiting campaign"; "a furiously reactionary, red-baiting clique, whose only thought is the perpetuation of its own existence and position"; "the leadership has become a hindrance and an obstacle to the further progress of the organization." But now, that Cannon-Shachtman had jumped onto Martin's bandwagon, here is how they painted his leadership in their call for support to him:

"The U.A.W., under the Martin leadership remains, by comparison, the most progressive of the C.I.O. unions and by far the most democratic." (Ibid. My emphasis - A.B.)

Note that in Cannon's exhortation for support to Martin, the policy advocated was not made contingent upon "extensive negotiations over program" and did not "necessitate formal agreements of any kind." In other words, unlike Lovestone, Cannon-Shachtman were not even using the cover of a program as a disguise for their shameless perfidy. Martin, on his part, naturally accepted every particle of support from all quarters in his unprincipled clique fight with the equally unprincipled

Stalinists. Particularly welcome to Martin was support from people who vociferously gave every outward appearance of principled opposition to Stalinism. Experienced clique fighters desiring to pull the wool over the eyes of the trusting rank-and-file do not present their line as motivated by the mundane concern for jobs; rather it is always "principles" and "policies" that are pushed forward as the alleged issues in factional clique fights. Therefore support from "anti-Stalinist" political tendencies, such as the Lovestoneites and Trotskyites, strengthened Martin's hand and gave his camp a principled appearance.

MARTIN'S PROGRAM OF STRIKEBREAKING

As a cover for his bureaucratic machinations, Martin submitted a comprehensive program to bamboozle the rank-and-file auto workers. This was known as the twenty point program. Strikingly enough, it was supported by the Stalinists who were at war with Martin supposedly on questions of principle. Each camp calculated cunningly in its own factional interests in presenting a front of unanimity on this twenty point program. Martin and his Lovestoneite lickspittles so framed the program that the Stalinists did not oppose it for it fitted in perfectly with their ultra-Rightist line. On the other hand the Stalinists figured that concentration of their fire on Martin's bureaucratism, rather than on program, would lead inevitably to certain victory for them if this legitimate point was made the outstanding issue of their clique warfare. Thus each camp for its own factional reasons united in supporting the "twenty point program." It was a revealing illustration that principles were not involved at all in this clique fight in which the auto workers were used as so many pawns in the bureaucratic struggle for control.

What was the political essence of this Martin-Stalinist program concealed behind a mass of reformist demagogy? Every worker even remotely familiar with Marxism knows that war is inherent in the capitalist system, that war is but a military continuation of capitalist political policy and that a revolutionary struggle against war cannot be waged separate and apart from a revolutionary struggle to overthrow capitalism. The program covered up the hypocritical national defense slogan under which the capitalists always disguise their military continuation of counter-revolutionary political policy!

"Constant resistance to war propaganda, and cooperation with all sincere efforts to keep America out of war. Support of La Follette-Ludlow Amendment as a guarantee of Labor's democratic right to determine whether or not it will wage a war of aggression abroad." (Quoted in Socialist Appeal, May 21, 1938)

The Martin-Stalinist program also embodied an old trick of the reactionaries whose aim is to prevent strikes against the rotten agreements they sign with the bosses. The indignation and dissatisfaction of the workers showing itself in strike action is slandered as "wild-cat strikes." Thus, the Martin-Stalinist program promised the bosses:

"Cooperation of all officers and members of the Union in the prevention and elimination of wild-cat stoppages and strikes." (Ibid.)

From every possible angle, then, the Martin-Stalinist program was pro-

capitalist, class-collaborationist and a strikebreaking program. What was the Trotsky line on the subject of this crookedly motivated program?

Generally, whenever Cannon and Shachtman urged support to labor fakers, they pleaded non-responsibility for the labor fakers' specific program, for obvious self-protective reasons. In jumping onto Martin's bandwagon, however, Cannon and Shachtman didn't even bother to feign a disguise. They took exception only to Point 16 of Martin's program which called for support to the Lewis-Stalinist Non-Partisan League and which urged the re-election of Governor Murphy in Michigan. But to all the other 19 points in the Martin-Stalinist program, Cannon and Shachtman gave an unreserved endorsement. Here is the Trotskyite endorsement black on white:

"The twenty-point program (printed elsewhere in this issue) is a comprehensive plan of action and with one important exception (point 16 - A.B.) it by and large fills the bill." (Ibid.)

More, the program as a whole was given a clean bill of health by the Trotsky opportunists and pictured as progressive:

"Basically, however, in its significant and important features the program is progressive and probably the most thoroughgoing in the C.I.O." (Ibid. My emphasis - A.B.)

The Cannon-Shachtman approval of this program of reformist, pacifist fakery and strikebreaking shows how staunch they were in their support to Martin and how insincere had been their previous "criticism" of him. About three months after Cannon demanded support to Martin "openly, frankly and aggressively" the Trotskyites got themselves so entangled in their support to Martin that they even dropped their reservation on Point 16 of the strikebreaking program and hailed the program in its entirety in fervent words of praise:

"The 20 point program was and remains the weapon against the depression attacks of the employers and is the road for union builders." (Socialist Appeal, August 6, 1938, p. 3)

Such was the Trotskyite "revolutionary" mass work in the U.A.W.!

Interestingly, in the recent 113 day General Motors strike, the issue of "company security" (the bosses' terminology for protection against "wildcat" strikes) was made a key point by the bosses and pushed by all the top fakers in the U.A.W. The Trotsky writers correctly showed that this was the rotten fruit of Homer Martin's campaign against "wildcat" strikes. But one "little" point was conveniently "forgotten" by the Trotsky historians, namely, that the Cannon-Shachtman leadership had rendered support to Martin's strikebreaking line on "wildcat" strikes during the crucial period of the factional struggle in the U.A.W. back in 1938.

BACKING MARTIN'S MANEUVERS

In the unprincipled clique fight between Martin and the Stalinists, thug methods were the chief course open to both camps of unscrupulous power seekers. Martin's racketeering methods were more prominent precisely because he was then in the driver's seat in the U.A.W. In raising the cry against the bureaucratic method of control, the Stalin-

ists had an irrefutable point against Martin. A little more than a month before they lined up with Martin, the Trotsky leaders had examined the basic charges of bureaucracy raised by the Stalinists and found them to be authentic. The three central acts of Martin's bureaucratism were enumerated in the Trotsky press:

"1. The abolition of local union papers at the Executive Board meeting after the Milwaukee convention.

"Was this bureaucratic? Most certainly."

"2. The gag resolution prohibiting Board members from discussing decisions of the board outside of board meetings.

"No doubt this, too, was bureaucratic."

"3. The signing of the present supplementary agreement with General Motors without consulting the workers by calling a General Motors conference.

"This was the most bureaucratic action of all."

(Socialist Appeal, April 2, 1938, p. 2. My emphasis - A.B.)

The officials on the Executive Board who were playing ball with the Stalinists were the millstone around Martin's neck preventing him from completely taking over the union. It was necessary for Martin to eliminate this insistent threat to his domination. In May 1938 he arbitrarily abolished Frankenstein's position thus cutting the ground from under him. This bureaucratic manipulation only added to the Stalinist arsenal. Martin's bureaucratism was plainly revealed.

When the Trotskyites hopped over to the Martin camp, however, they evaluated his rotten policies as being for the cause of progressive unionism!

"Homer Martin's defense of the union from outside clique control was a real advance for the cause of progressive unionism in America and must be supported." (Socialist Appeal, May 14, 1938.)

As Cannon stated, there were no "formal agreements" concluded with Martin, but that did not deter the Trotsky leaders from giving him a complete democratic color. Cannon and Shachtman were a little tardy in switching over to Martin but they clearly outdid Lovestone when they started to spread brazen fabrications about the role of Homer Martin.

THE CONTINUATION OF THE U.A.W. FACTIONAL CRISIS

The crisis of May 1938 in the U.A.W. became intensified in the succeeding months as Martin desperately resorted to every bureaucratic maneuver possible to rid himself of the Stalinist pack yapping at his heels. It was obvious that in their factional war against Martin the Stalinists were aided enormously by the fact that Martin himself was a hardened bureaucrat, an expert sell-out artist, a persecutor of all militants who were waging "wildcat" strikes in protest against his alliance with the auto exploiters.

In June 1938, Martin bureaucratically suspended the five leading pro-Stalinist officials; Frankenstein, Mortimer, Hall, Wells and Addes. Martin's bureaucratic actions against the Stalinists created such a stench, that the Trotskyites, despite their support, were con-

strained to chide Martin and lecture him on the need to go to the rank-and-file so as to assure them that he had no intentions of violating union democracy:

"To overcome at least in part the bad effects of this move, the Martin leadership ^{explain what policies it wishes to carry through} must go to the membership at once, explain the role of the Stalinists, and why disciplinary action was taken, and assure the membership that no campaign of red-baiting or violations of democracy is under way." (Socialist Appeal, June 18, 1938, p. 2)

This was the 1938 version of the Trotsky line in the Stalinist dual unions in the 1928-32 period. Recall how in a convention of the Stalinist National Miners Union in 1929, the Trotsky representatives rounded up the militant delegates repelled by Stalinist bureaucratism, herded them into a hotel room and invited William Z. Foster down to "streighten them out." Stalin's flunkey, Foster, was thus given an opportunity to use some soft soap and calm down the more advanced militants with more ingratiating language. (See the exposure of this episode in the first installment of this series.) Now the same fundamental Trotsky line was applied to Martin. Martin, the conscienceless bureaucrat, was lectured by the Trotskyites to become mindful of the rank-and-file whom he despised and feared, and endeavor to square himself with them. The Trotskyites now asked Martin to paint himself a champion of the rank-and-file as they had asked Foster to do in the above-mentioned episode back in 1929.

Martin, not being as politically astute as the shrewd Foster, ignored the friendly "advice" proffered by the Trotskyites. Meanwhile, after the suspension of the pro-Stalinist officers in June 1938 the factional pot in the U.A.W. really began to boil. The Stalinists had a perfect issue made to order. Every time the Stalinist crowd howled for "democracy" against the Martin gang, they harped on Martin's bureaucratic suspensions. Using the reinstatement of the five suspended officers as a driving wedge the Stalinists brought the faction fight to a crisis in late June 1938. Again faced with a crisis, Cannon-Shachtman showed their true colors once more and again exhorted the auto workers to side with Martin:

"There can be no neutrality in this battle. Non-intervention means support to the Stalinists. They thrive on the position of the fence-sitters. We are not advocating support of everything the Martin administration has done in the past and will do in the future. We have ourselves made the most unsparing criticisms in the past when we disagreed with the administration. But all of these bureaucratic missteps fade into insignificance compared to the danger presented by the Stalinist campaign." (Socialist Appeal, June 25, 1938, pp. 2-3. Emphasis in original.)

For a while Martin was able to beat off the Stalinist threat. In August 1938 he went the whole hog and behind closed doors expelled Mortimer, Frankenstein and Hall. This was one of the more outstanding bureaucratic acts in the entire clique war and played right into the hands of the treacherous Stalinists. It is well known that reactionary persecution of opportunists only strengthens opportunism. Reactionary persecution of opportunism only builds up the opportunists in the minds of the workers as bona-fide opponents of capitalism. The

precise object of the opportunists is to drug the workers with exactly this illusion and build themselves up as defenders of the oppressed masses. It is only when the opportunist scoundrels are combatted and defeated by revolutionary Marxism backed up by a correct understanding of the role and character of the opportunists on the part of the workers that a genuine victory is registered in the interests of the toilers: Martin's bureaucratic suppression campaign which only built up the Stalinists in the U.A.W. as true fighters against bureaucracy was a clear illustration of the principle that reaction works to prop up opportunism. Even this elementary principle was completely distorted by the Trotsky leaders in their recruiting drive for Martin. Martin's strong-arm methods received implicit approval from Cannon-Shachtman who even called Martin's moves an occasion for rejoicing:

"A fresh wind is blowing through the American Labor Movement.

"Within the past week, its invigorating force has been felt in three major trade union centers and the results should be an occasion for rejoicing among militant and progressive workers the country over." (Socialist Appeal, August 13, 1938, p.1)

The first two centers mentioned in order were Los Angeles and New York where the Stalinists lost some forces and reportedly lost a union election. The third center was Detroit where Martin's bureaucratic expulsion order was taken as the third reason for rejoicing:

"In Detroit, three of the suspended officers—stooges of the Communist Party — of the United Automobile Workers were expelled from the union."

"With these actions, the labor movement is beginning the long delayed but much needed job of cleansing its system of the Stalinist virus that was poisoning its entire body and driving it to certain doom." (Ibid.)

With this dose of chloroform, the Trotsky leaders were preventing the workers from realizing that Martin's bureaucratic, red-baiting witch-hunt was not really damaging Stalinism, but was strengthening it in the eyes of the workers and preparing the grounds for his own elimination and the victory of the Stalinist bureaucrats in the U.A.W.

THE TEMPORARY INTERRUPTION IN THE FACTIONAL WAR

Workers who dared to open their mouths against the rotten betrayals of the Martin leadership were classified as "Red," and promptly given the boot. As a result of the heavy bureaucratic hand of Martin, dissatisfaction boiled over among the oppressed rank-and-file. Cannon and Shachtman could not ignore these sentiments and had to take official cognizance of it. On August 20, 1938 the Socialist Appeal wrote:

"It is time to say a word about the chair-warming reactionaries and opportunists camped in Martin's own backyard. It was their stupid, bone-head policies which built up the inordinate strength behind the Stalinists. Now they imagine that they have a field day to clean the militants — all militants — out of the union. What is this but the reverse side of the Stalinist medal which aims to clean out the militants via its traditional methods."

It would appear from the above that the line of supporting Martin had been played out. One would think that Cannon and Co. would not be able to find any more "reasons" why support to Martin was in the interests of the working class. After the expulsion of the three pro-Stalinist officials in August 1938, however, the Stalinists threatened to call a new convention to oust Martin. This proposal met with wide support and once more a crisis was created for the ruling Martin clique. What line did Cannon-Shachtman advocate now? In this crisis, did they finally adopt the Marxist policy of exposure of both bureaucratic camps and urge the workers to reject and cast out both gangs of crooks? Did they point out that any other line meant attaching the workers to one or the other, in reality to both gangs of swindlers? By no means!

"Differences with Homer Martin or other members of the Board— however serious or justified — are not at issue now. Progressives must realize that every ounce of support must be thrown in the scales of the Martin forces against the Lewis-Stalinist complot. Any other course is treachery to the auto workers and their union." (Socialist Appeal, September 3, 1938)

Unfortunately for the Trotskyites, John L. Lewis, then working with the Stalinists, manipulated a compromise which secured a firm foothold for the Stalinists in the auto union, a foothold they retained for many years. Martin was completely washed out. For the Trotskyites to call for support to Martin as "against" the Stalinists was patently absurd since the breathing space in the faction fight had unified both reactionary camps into one solid lump. Left without a horse to back, Cannon-Shachtman sagely noted that Martin's policies could never have defeated the Stalinists anyhow:

"The temporary conclusion of the present factional fight has demonstrated with unmistakable clearness that the Martin supporters on the International Executive Board were incapable of leading a fight against the Stalinist menace, of providing leadership for progressive, militant unionism, of building the union and conducting an effective campaign against the automobile manufacturers." (Socialist Appeal, October 8, 1938, p.2)

One would think from the above that the Trotsky leaders learned of this fact only in October 1938 and were never aware of it before! Or at least this is what the Trotsky leaders wanted their supporters to believe. The truth is that from the formation of the Cannon-Shachtman Trotsky organization in 1928 the elementary fact that Stalinism is only aided and abetted by other forms of opportunism was pointed out in their press time and again. In the auto union specifically, they knew that there were no principled differences between Martin and the Stalinists. The Trotskyites themselves point this out when they were lambasting Lovestone for supporting Martin. When Cannon-Shachtman swung into the Martin orbit, they went with their eyes wide open and with their hands outstretched for a crumb from the two-bit potentate then heading the U.A.W. They were left holding the bag and accordingly expressed their keep disappointment on the lack of returns from their investment by re-introducing their previous criticism of Martin. In January 1939 the Trotsky press admitted what had been openly rumoured all along; that Martin was in cahoots with the Fascist Father Coughlin and with Bennet of the Ford secret police. (Socialist Appeal, January 28, 1939) This was the real evolution of Homer Martin; the road he travelled was paved by all of his supporters.

HOW THE TROTSKY LEADERS WRITE HISTORY

While the Homer Martin issue was still hot among the ranks of the Trotsky workers, Cannon and Shachtman had to work like beavers to explain away their support to him. It was not easy for the revolutionary-minded Trotskyite workers to swallow the idea of supporting such an outright labor faker as Martin. The alibi then spread by Cannon-Shachtman was the "lesser evil" theory, the petrified argument which holds that support to an agent of the capitalists is to be preferred to support to agents of Stalin. In such a policy an independent proletarian line is ruled out and the workers are deceived into supporting one or another sell-out artist. The excuse given by Cannon-Shachtman was that this was the only way of preserving the union:

"We are interested in preserving the unions from destruction and that is the basis for the 'lesser evil' tactic in the unions." (Socialist Appeal, November 26, 1938, p. 5)

Drawing the analogy to their line in the auto union, Cannon-Shachtman explained:

"Our action, for example, in supporting the Martin administration as against the Stalinists, in the auto workers union was based on these considerations. It was correct to seek to preserve that union from the Stalinist disrupters." (Ibid.)

Such were the specious arguments used by Cannon-Shachtman in 1938 to justify their support to Martin in the faction fight in the U.A.W. However, many years later, when these events had become a dim memory, the Cannon writers engaged in a typical piece of Trotskyite finagling. In 1944 a faction fight broke out in the New York American Labor Party between the Stalinists on one hand and the Rose-Dubinsky gang on the other. This unprincipled clique fight occurred some four years after Shachtman had organizationally separated from Cannon. In this clique fight Shachtman applied the 1938 line of the Trotsky organization and lined up with the Dubinsky-Rose clique. The arguments used by Shachtman and the line applied was identical in every respect to the Trotsky line in the auto union from May to September 1938.

Shachtman's organizational severance from Cannon in 1940 had taken away a good proportion of Cannon's following. Cannon was quite embittered at his former comrade-in-arms and was scouting around for points to show up Shachtman's opportunism in order to cover up his own. Shachtman's open support to the social-democratic labor misleaders in the A.L.P. provided a perfect case in point. Cannon and Co. thus took their ex-colleague to task and read him a severe lecture on the evils of supporting every labor faker who happens to be wrangling with the Stalinists for one reason or another. Paying homage for the moment to a correct view, Cannon and Co. stated that a bloc with reactionaries is an unprincipled combination and actually works for the strengthening of Stalinism. As a most striking example of this unprincipled combinationism The Militant harked back precisely to the 1938 clique struggle in the U.A.W. and drew the following analogy for its uninformed readers:

"We witnessed this phenomenon in 1938 in the faction fight of the auto union. Homer Martin, then President of the UAW, by his red baiting, his bureaucratic high-handedness only built up Stalinist strength. At that time, a group of petty

bourgeois opportunists, the late unlamented Lovestoneites, cliqued up with Homer Martin and excused everything on the grounds of the 'Stalinist menace.' They accomplished little more than to disgrace themselves. We witnessed an equally disgraceful performance today on the part of a group of petty bourgeois opportunists — ex-Trotskyites, who alibied their support of the Dubinsky-Social Democratic clique on the grounds of the 'lesser evil!'" (The Militant, April 8, 1944, p. 6)

For obvious diplomatic reasons, the Cannonites left out the all-essential truth that the opportunist policy of supporting Homer Martin during the faction fight in the U.A.W. in 1938 was precisely the line of Cannon and Shachtman on the grounds of the fraudulent 'lesser evil.' How typical of Cannon to attack the criminal policies of the Lovestoneites, which he himself held in common with them and what a convenient method of diverting the workers' attention from Cannon's own opportunism

The contempt which the Cannon editors have for their readers shows itself most clearly in the foregoing citation. They plainly calculate that their readers have such faith in them that they will never even think of questioning the truth of those hypocritical statements.

Thus the stigma of support to Martin is pinned to the now-extinct Lovestone crew who actually supported Martin as did Cannon and Shachtman. The brazen lies of the Stalinist leaders are premised on the blind faith of their followers. It is obvious that Cannon presupposes the same attitude on the part of his followers; his outright falsification of the Martin affair is explainable only in this light.

The very example which the Cannonites cite in their supposed criticism of Shachtman's line is a most damning indictment of the Cannonites themselves. The whole incident here is another illustration of how opportunism works to prop up opportunism. Shachtman's line in the A.L.P. in 1944 was clearly opportunist, as the Cannonites indicate. On the other hand, Shachtman in his reply seized upon Cannon's hushing up of Trotskyite support to Martin in 1938. (Max Shachtman, The New International, April 1944) Along these lines, Shachtman naturally had to defend the line he had pursued in common with Cannon in 1938 as perfectly correct.

THE END OF HOMER MARTIN IN THE U.A.W. AND THE NEW TROTSKYITE ZIGZAG

The back-door peace engineered by Lewis and the Stalinists was not fated to last long. In January 1939 the U.A.W. factional kettle boiled over again. The Stalinist caucus called for a convention in Cleveland in March, whereas the Martin gang decided for a convention of their own in Detroit. By this time the Stalinists had captured the majority of the forces in the union. Martin's strikebreaking, his bureaucratism, plus the revelations of his secret meetings with Coughlin and Bennet repelled most healthy-minded auto workers and drove them into the Stalinist trap.

At first Cannon and Shachtman gave the impression of playing "independent" of both the Stalinists and of Martin:

"The rank and file must act at once if the union is to be saved from the wreckers and the wreckage. While preparing its forces for the Detroit convention and rejecting the Stalinist stooge gathering in Cleveland, it must act independently, and not as a mere servant of Martin." (Socialist Appeal, Jan. 28, 1939)

In any case one point was made quite clear by the Trotsky leaders. That point was the proposed Stalinist stooze gathering in Cleveland which Cannon-Shachtman distinctly branded as a plot to knife the U.A.W. workers:

"Exposure of the projected Addes-Mortimer-Thomas convention at Cleveland as a Stalinist scheme to smash the union and certain to be run as a standard Stalinist stooze assembly directed from beginning to end by Browder and his gang of union-wreckers." (Ibid.)

Blinded in the faction fight by their previous partnership with Martin, the Trotsky leaders miscalculated on the relation of forces. No sooner was the ink dry on the above-cited issue of the Trotsky paper when a heavy body blow was dealt to the Martin Convention by the top C.I.O. gang. The C.I.O. leadership gave official blessing to the Stalinist gathering in Cleveland:

"The split that has been developing in the powerful Auto Workers Union took a new turn last week when Sidney Hillman and Philip Murray, representing the leadership of the C.I.O., decisively rejected the claims of the Martin group and recognized the authority of the Thomas-Addes-Frankensteen group." (Socialist Appeal, February 4, 1939, p. 1)

Martin was cut off from the C.I.O. The flight of all the job-hunters formerly supporting Martin reached landslide proportions in the Stalinist direction.

In this precipitate rush to the Stalinist gathering were to be found none other than the Trotsky leaders themselves. On February 14, two weeks after pretending independence, the Trotsky organ quoted a leading Trotskyite, V. R. Dunne, as stating that: "We will support the March 27 Cleveland convention." This Stalinist convention thus became the new focus of Trotskyite affection. It was now incumbent upon Cannon-Shachtman to color up the Stalinist Cleveland convention to explain away their sudden switch. Whereas previously the Trotsky leaders had claimed that the Cleveland convention was a "Stalinist stooze gathering," now they miraculously transformed it into a convention allegedly dominated by the rank-and-file. Eye-witness reporters in the Trotsky press painted over the Stalinist-led convention in the appropriate "democratic" hue:

"If it is possible to say that a rank and file is running a convention, then certainly it is master of this one." (Socialist Appeal, April 7, 1939)

Just a couple of months before, Cannon-Shachtman were shouting that the Cleveland convention was a Stalinist plot to smash the union. Of course, this was in the period when the Trotskyites had the Martin convention in mind. Now that the Trotskyites had switched to the Stalinist convention, they boosted it as lustily as they had cursed it before:

"Its decisions are by far the most progressive of any organization in recent times. Its deliberations are carried out in a democratic manner that should be a model for all other unions to follow." (Ibid.)

Naturally, contrary to the Trotsky distortions, it was the Stal-

inist bureaucratic machine and not the rank-and-file which was the master of the Cleveland convention. Indeed, just a couple of weeks later, without a word of acknowledgement of what they had reported before, the Cannon-Shachtman writers themselves estimated the results of the convention and showed it was Stalinism that ran and dominated the Cleveland gathering:

"The Cleveland convention was an anti-Martin convention and it is therefore no surprise that the force which provided the leadership in the fight against Martin dominated the convention. THAT FORCE AND LEADERSHIP WAS THE STALINIST MACHINE." (Socialist Appeal, April 25, 1939, p. 1. My capitals - A.B.)

Such was the "rank-and-file" running the Cleveland convention!

This was the Trotskyite "model" which they held up for "all other unions to follow"! Whereas before, they supported the rotten Martin gang on the excuse that anyone was to be preferred to the union-busting Stalinists, now they palmed off a Stalinist-led convention as a sterling example for workers to follow.

Since the Stalinists made a pretense of defending the rank-and-file against Martin, they released a flood of demagogy designed to give the impression that their convention, in contrast to Martin's, was a rank-and-file convention. Thus when Cannon-Shachtman dived off Martin's sinking ship and clambered aboard the Stalinist boat, they echoed Stalinist demagogy. It is clear that when factional expediency is at stake, Cannon and Co. will go to any lengths in their deceptions.

TO BE CONTINUED

**"CRITICAL SUPPORT" TO REACTIONARIES:
A POLICY AND ITS MEANING**

In so-called Labor circles for many years there has been a policy prevalent which goes under the name of "Critical Support" to reactionaries. This policy has been in use in a wide variety of political spheres ranging from the Social Democrats of the Alex Rose stamp to the Shachtmanite Workers Party. The Social Democrats supported Roosevelt with "criticism" which was at times bitter to the extreme. The New Leader contains some exceedingly powerful material, for example, on the aid given by the Roosevelt Administration to the various fascist powers in the past several years. The Stalinists followed the same line. The Trotskyites, including both wings, have supported the Stalinists in elections with ferocious "criticism." The remarkable medley of a whole series of seemingly opposed political organizations throwing support to one another to the accompaniment of strenuous verbal denunciations is a phenomenon meriting close attention. What does it all mean, in so far as the real interests of the working class are concerned?

We have stated our position on this matter clearly for many years. Support is support — no matter how much it is clothed with verbal criticism. Any organization which urges workers to support another organization in an election shares responsibility for the deeds of that organization if its candidates are elected. The "criticism" does not absolve one from political responsibility for the results of the voting one helped to bring about.

Thus, the Stalinists, who urged the workers in New York City to vote for O' Dwyer, share responsibility for his reactionary policies as Mayor. The fact that during and after the elections the Stalinist leaders criticized O'Dwyer's policies does not release the Stalinists from this responsibility. In the evaluation of the November 1945 elections given in Political Affairs, the organ of the Stalinist Party, there is a summary of the criticisms they levelled against O'Dwyer during the Mayoralty campaign:

"Serious difficulties were caused by concessions made by O'Dwyer to reactionary pressures during the campaign. For one thing, he was instrumental in forcing the Manhattan Democrats to withdraw the Democratic designation from Councilman Davis after they had given it to him as a result of pressure from Harlem and from labor. Second, he Red-baited twice in the course of the campaign. Third, he failed to dissociate himself from the reactionary foreign policies embarked on by the Truman Administration." (December 1945, p. 1084)

This hue and cry was only a cover of the Stalinists' line of tying the workers in New York to a Tammany stooge and an agent of Wall Street. If the Stalinist bureaucrats did not indulge in this "criticism" they would have no self-protective cover and their line of attaching the workers to reactionaries would stand exposed. Self-protection — that is the essential function of the "criticism" in the line of critical support to reactionaries.

It is interesting that each organization understands clearly the evil nature of the line of "critical support" to reactionaries pursued by other organizations. Thus, the Trotskyites are completely clear

that the Stalinists who on a line of critical support urged the workers of New York City to vote for O'Dwyer are fully responsible for his reactionary policies. An editorial in The Militant of March 2, 1946, after listing O'Dwyer's misdeeds, exclaims quite correctly:

"And this is but one small portion of the pay-off hundreds of thousands of New York workers are now receiving for following the treacherous advice of the Communist (Stalinist) Party and the Stalinist-dominated American Labor Party to vote last November for O'Dwyer as the 'labor-progressive coalition' candidate." (P. 4)

Yes, this is true. The Stalinist followers may thank the Fosters and Cacchiones for the blows O'Dwyer is now dealing the working class. An editorial in Labor Action of March 4, 1946 also heaps condemnation on the Stalinists for their support to O'Dwyer:

"And it is one of the main crimes of people like Quill and the other Stalinists and Stalinist stooges that they tied the unions they control to the tail of Tammany Hall in New York. ...That's the price you pay, Mr. Quill, for your rotten policy. You, and your Stalinist friends with your stranglehold on the American Labor Party, put O'Dwyer in office. Now you're getting back what can be expected from his type."

Notice — the responsibility of the Stalinists for the election of O'Dwyer is not just some passing error, but "one of the main crimes" of the Stalinist bureaucrats.

* * *

But what kind of "blessings" have some of those whom the Trotskyites urged the workers to vote for showered down from their elected posts? Take the case of the British "Labor" Government now in office. Here is a point which far transcends in importance the election for Mayor of New York City, however vital such an urban center may be. The British "Labor" Government dominates not only the millions of workers in the British Isles, but also the hundreds of millions of colonial slaves of British imperialism.

In the July 1945 General Election, the Trotskyites urged the workers to vote for the British Labor Party. "Attlee or Churchill" — such was the electoral slogan of the Trotskyites, and Attlee was represented by them as a political alternative to Churchill.

When the Laborites were elected, the Trotskyite leaders piled on their most enthusiastic praises. According to Cannon's paper, "The middle classes of town and country have joined with the workers to deliver the first telling blow against capitalism." (The Militant, August 4, 1945, "British Workers Vote Labor Party to Power.") According to Shachtman's paper, the electoral victory of the British Labor Party "is a victory that should command the support and admiration of the workers of the world." (Labor Action, August 6, 1945)

Were the Trotskyites really serving the interests of the workers in urging them to vote for the Labor Party? Were the "rave notices" with which the Trotskyites greeted the electoral victory of the Labor

Party based on fact, or were they the grossest deception of the workers?

Let us give the judgement of the Trotskyites themselves on the British "Labor" Government. In the same issue of The Militant in which they declare that the Stalinists must be held responsible for the misdeeds of O'Dwyer whom the Stalinists supported in the election, the Trotskyites present this scathing denunciation of the "Labor" Government under the title: "Labor Traitors Pursue Tory Policy On India":

"When the history of perfidy is written, the name of Clement Attlee and Ernest Bevin will appear high on the list of traitors to the working class. Attlee was made Prime Minister of England, and Bevin Foreign Minister when the British workers voted the Labor Party to power last July." (P. 3)

The article goes on to recount the crimes of the "Labor" Government against the millions of Indian colonial victims of British imperialist brutality. And the same issue of Labor Action which curses the Stalinists for urging the workers to vote for O'Dwyer, rails against the Attlee gang in the "Labor" Government for its bloody assault on the masses of India:

"And so, while British troops were shooting down the Indian sailors and the people of Bombay and Calcutta who had demonstrated in support of the sailors, Attlee issued a statement which slandered the masses of India, which ignored the real political issue: the desire of the Indian people for national independence. . . . As in every other phase of British political life, he and his Labor Party pursue their policy of perpetuating capitalist rule, of bolstering the British Empire." (Editorial, March 4, 1946)

If the Stalinists, because they urged the workers to vote for O'Dwyer, bear part of the responsibility for his misdeeds, then by the same logic the Trotskyites, who to the extent of their influence egged on the British workers to vote for Attlee-Bevin, have on their hands some of the blood shed by those opportunists who stand so high on the list of traitors to the working class. Just as the Stalinists knew all along that O'Dwyer is but an agent of Wall Street, so the Trotskyites were completely aware that Attlee-Bevin are agents of British imperialism. In fact, during the General Election last July, the Trotskyites stated that Attlee-Bevin and the whole Labor Party gang are case-hardened betrayers. Nevertheless, the Trotskyites urged the workers to vote for Attlee-Bevin. Should people who live in glass houses throw stones? Are those who play the same tricks with the workers as the Stalinists qualified to condemn the Stalinists? Is it wrong for the Stalinists to bamboozle the workers into voting for known reactionaries, but right for the Trotskyites to do the same thing?

When O'Dwyer merely stood behind the efforts of the New York capitalists to prevent the transit workers from getting a two-dollar a day increase in pay, the Shachtmanites screamed that the Stalinists' electoral support to O'Dwyer was "one of their main crimes." O'Dwyer's crimes are virtue itself compared with the crimes of the "Labor" Government of England against the millions of colonial slaves. If the Stalinists' electoral support to the peanut politician, O'Dwyer, is "one of their main crimes," then what abomination was the support the Trotskyites gave to such murderous scoundrels as the British Laborites on whose villainies "the sun never sets."

* * *

What the Stalinists, who have enormous influence, do in broad sweeps, the Trotskyites, who are smaller organizationally, do in lesser measures. The political tactic of both organizations is the same. Through the line of "critical support" both deceive the workers into clinging to their known enemies.

The Trotskyites know thoroughly that the line of "critical support" is a treacherous one, that it is a matter of attaching the workers to their enemies and at the same time trickily avoiding responsibility. This is clear from their attacks on the Stalinists for supporting O'Dwyer. But their anti-Stalinist noise is sheer hypocrisy, for the Trotskyites are painted with the same brush as the Stalinists.

In our article entitled, "The Third British 'Labor' Government," (THE BULLETIN, November-December 1945) we put the matter clearly:

"As the criminal policies of the British 'Labor' Government unfold and bring increased misery and hardship upon the toilers, every class-conscious worker should ask himself: Who was it that put me up to supporting the 'Labor' bandits in July 1945 and tricked me into giving them a free hand to bring ruin upon the working class? The answer will lead to only one conclusion for every class-conscious, revolutionary-minded worker: Repudiate the Stalinist and Trotskyite misleaders who preached support to the imperialist British Labor Party."

Interestingly enough, the Stalinists, who also told the workers to vote for the British Labor Party, are also now attacking the British "Labor" Government. Not only in their tactics, but also in their hypocrisy, are the Stalinists and Trotskyites brothers under the skin, for both these opportunist organizations were instrumental in foisting the British Labor Party Government on the more advanced, vanguard workers. And now these Judases have the brazenness to point an accusing finger at the Laborites!

The tactic of "critical support" is a regular merry-go-round in which the advanced workers are being whirled back into the reactionary camps they once left. The workers breaking with the bourgeois politicians and becoming Stalinists are thrown right back into the clutches of the same bourgeois politicians through the "critical support" fakery of the Stalinist bureaucrats. The workers who break with the Stalinists and become Trotskyites are flung back into the old trap by the Trotskyite bureaucrats who are perennially urging "critical support" to this or that Stalinist candidate. The Stalinist outfit ties the workers to the bourgeoisie; the Trotskyite outfit ties the workers to the Stalinist bureaucrats and through them to the bourgeoisie. Because the proletarian vanguard is centered around this Stalinist System (the basic Stalin movement plus the Trotsky wing), the bourgeoisie remain in power at a time when the grass should already have grown high over the grave of the capitalist system.

* * *

But here is the real pay-off. The same issue of The Militant which talks against the Stalinists for supporting known reactionaries, i. e., for doing the same thing the Trotskyites do, carried an article urging the workers of Seattle to vote for some Stalinist stooge, the Reverend F. Benjamin Davis, for a post in the City Council!

The Trotskyite rank-and-file knows that the Stalinist agents are against the interests of the working class, and so Cannon and Co. are compelled to make some concession to that knowledge, The Militant, therefore, is constrained to say of this Rev. Davis:

"His program is that of the Communist (Stalinist) Party which proposes in the local elections to confine the Negro struggle to the single issue of passage of a local FEPC ordinance of extremely limited effectiveness."

Furthermore, "His record indicates that he follows the bankrupt policy of depending on favors from the capitalist government as a means of solving the problem of discrimination, rather than on the militant mass struggle of the Negro people in unity with the organized working class."

Now, let every Trotskyite worker ask himself: For what purpose are these Stalinist stooges put up in elections by the higher bureaucrats? There is only one answer. To increase the power of the Stalinist System for the purpose of serving Stalin and betraying the toilers more effectively. But here is the electoral purpose ascribed by The Militant to stooge Davis in the Seattle campaign:

"He (Rev. Davis) is an independent Negro candidate running in order to provide representation on the Council for the Negro people and other persecuted minorities." (My emphasis - J.C.H.)

In this statement there are two distinct lies. Davis is not an independent candidate, but a stooge of the Stalinist bureaucracy, completely and totally dependent on their criminal politics and party machine. Secondly, he is not running "in order to" represent the Negro people and other victims of oppression, but to misrepresent them, to sell them out to the capitalists in the interests of the Stalinist bureaucracy which depends for its continuation in power upon the continued enslavement of the workers outside the Soviet Union to the bourgeois ruling class.

What idea does the candidacy of a Stalinist flunkey embody in the minds of the workers who vote for him? The fatal illusion that a Stalinist agent in some manner serves the interests of the workers, white and black. It is this disastrous notion which has resulted in the shedding of oceans of working class blood. But here is how The Militant puts this matter in the case of Davis:

"His candidacy embodies the idea that the Negro people must organize itself politically in opposition to the capitalist parties and political machines in order to fight against discrimination and persecution."

This statement is an atrocious fraud. In voting for a Stalinist, the workers are voting for Stalinism, and for nothing else. They are not aware of this and it is the duty of Marxists to enlighten them. The Trotskyites play exactly the opposite role; they obscure the fact that a vote for a Stalinist is another brick in the already huge Stalinist structure of international crime against the toilers.

The "critical support" tactic contains two parts. The "criticism" is the Trotskyite leaders' cover-up before their own followers who would be rebellious against unvarnished support to Stalinist agents

or other reactionaries. But if they did nothing but criticize the Stalinists, naturally the Trotskyite leaders would never get either their own followers or any other workers to support the Stalinist flunkys. The Trotskyite leaders have to make their bitter pill a little attractive. Hence, they spread the fakery that supporting Stalinist bureaucrats is in some way progressive and in the interests of the proletariat. The Trotskyites' "anti-Stalinist" phrases are a disguise of a fundamental line in support of Stalinism and other forms of reaction.

* * *

The treacherous line of the Trotskyite leaders of support to Stalinist bureaucrats or other reactionaries is the essence of the political role of the Cannon and Shachtman organizations. All their other actions and phrases are a cover-up of this essential role. The issue of The Militant, for example, from which we cited their support of Stalinist Davis in Seattle, their hypocritical outcries against the Stalinists for supporting O'Dwyer and the Trotskyites' equally hypocritical noise against the British "Labor" Government which they themselves helped to put into power, is quite a typical issue. The variety of fakery we have outlined above is the heart and soul of that issue of The Militant. The rest is cut a camouflage of this essential opportunism. Splashed over the rest of the issue are all sorts of "militant" headlines. "FREEDOM REVOLT FLARES IN INDIA," shouts the lead headline on page one. "ALL-OUT AID TO GM STRIKE!" "GRAND JURY WHITE WASHES KILLER OF FERGUSON BOYS" "WESTINGHOUSE STRIKERS DEFY BAN ON MASS PICKET LINES" And so forth and so on. It is this noise by which the Cannons and Shachtmans (Labor Action is simply the cousin of The Militant) give themselves the air of being fighters in the interests of the working class. Their "pro-Labor" rumpus is sheer demagogy. The Stalinist Daily Worker is full of the same stuff. Unfortunately, the workers fall for all these demagogues in great numbers. The workers who follow Cannon, for example, imagine that a lot of "militant" talk about India makes Cannon a Marxist. Cannon and his colleagues are a wing of the Stalinist System. They support Stalinist directly and indirectly and therefore are a hindrance in the fight against Stalinism. During the last two decades in this country alone, tens of thousands of revolutionary-minded workers have broken with Stalinism, recognizing it to be a force operating against the interests of the working class. A considerable number of these workers who remained alive politically have fallen into the clutches of Cannon and Shachtman who chained them right back into the Stalinist System. It is for this reason that the influence of Stalinism in this country is unbroken. The international pro-Stalinist role of the Trotsky tendency, from its origin, has been the chief cause for the failure of the revolutionary, anti-Stalinist workers to overthrow the power of Stalinism on a world scale.

J. C. Hunter
April 1946