

TEN CENTS

JAN. - FEB. 1947

# THE BULLETIN

OF THE WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

## **GERMANY: THE IMPERIALIST— STALIN TUG OF WAR**

—THOMAS F. HARDEN

## **A Lesson in the American Class Struggle (The Coal Strike: IT'S OUTCOME AND SIGNIFICANCE)**

—ARTHUR BURKE

## **An Achievement of the British Trotskyites**

AN EXCERPT FROM THE POLITICAL BIOGRAPHY  
OF LOUIS BUDENZ

Documents From The Archives Of Trotskyism

Trotsky's Statement on Lenin's Testament

THE RED STAR PRESS

P. O. BOX 67 STATION D

NEW YORK

THE BULLETIN  
of the  
WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

HXI  
W6B8  
v. 10-13

Vol. X - No. 1. (Whole Number 49)

Jan. - Feb. 1947.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Germany: The Imperialist - Stalin Tug of War --- Thomas A. Harden	<u>1</u>
A Lesson in the American Class Struggle (The Coal Strike -- Its Outcome and Significance) --- Arthur Burke	13
An Achievement of the British Trotskyites --- A.B.	19
A Fraudulent Labor Portrait --- A.B.	22
*****	
THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION: An Excerpt from the Political Biography Of Louis Budenz	25
*****	
DOCUMENTS FROM THE ARCHIVES OF TROTSKYISM: Trotsky's Statment on Lenin's Testament	29

Address Communications To:

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

## THE BULLETIN and its PURPOSE

THE BULLETIN is devoted to crystallizing the programmatic foundation for a new proletarian party in America and a Marxist International. On the basis of the lessons of the October Revolution, of the struggle against the betrayals resulting from the Stalinist 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 BULLETIN is to arm the revolutionary workers with an understanding of the pseudo-Marxist organizations now controlling the proletarian vanguard and to organize these workers into a Marxist 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 Marxist 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 of Marxism 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.

\* \* \* \* \*

GERMANY  
The Imperialist-Stalin Tug Of War

Since the ending of the war situation there has been a tense diplomatic struggle over the German-treaty question between the forces of world capitalism on the one hand and the Stalinist bureaucracy on the other. Germany has been a key point in world economic and political relations ever since the October Revolution, and particularly since the advent of Hitler in 1933. Before taking up the attitude of the various political forces on this question, it is necessary to give a brief review of the whole subject.

The October Revolution occurred in the midst of the Imperialist War and was followed a year later by the defeat of the Central Powers. Prior to the realization by the bourgeoisie of the need of submerging their inter-imperialist antagonisms before the more fundamental antagonism between the new form of socialized economy to the imperialist system as a whole, there was a policy of plundering Germany. This policy continued for some time until it resulted in an unexampled inflation and a sharpening revolutionary crisis which showed that Germany was a decided storm center for world capitalism. Having stayed off a successful revolution, thanks to the opportunist forces within the working class, the international finance capitalists saw the necessity of restoring Germany as a strong bastion of capitalism. With the advent of Hitler, international imperialism pursued a consistent policy of building up that country with the dual purpose of stabilizing it and of using it to solve the major problem for the bourgeoisie, as the spearhead to defeat the Soviet Union. A practically disarmed and helpless Germany was assisted to the fullest extent to rearm, to gain tremendously strategic territories and to become a first rate economic and military power. Borkin and Walsh of the Anti-Trust Division of the United States Department of Justice, in their book "Germany's Secret Weapon", have given scores of instances of American Trusts, such as the oil, aluminum, beryllium, synthetic chemistry, and other industries furnishing direct economic aid to the weak, and in some instances, bankrupt German concerns. One instance is set forth of an outright gift of \$50,000,000 by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey to a then collapsing German competitor.

Incidentally, we may note that the whole history of Germany from 1923 to 1939, and particularly from 1933 to 1939, refutes the Stalin-Trotsky theory of the primacy of the Great Britain-USA antagonism. If the main antagonism was between the USA and Great Britain, then it becomes utterly incomprehensible that in unison the finance capitalists of these two countries not only poured millions of dollars into Germany to build up, or rather to create an imperialist "rival," but also turned over to that presumed rival half of Europe. The real explanation of course is as we have indicated ever since the beginning of our tendency, that the English, American and French imperialists were not making serious "errors" over a period of years, but were definitely preparing Germany as the spearhead for the onslaught on the Soviet Union.

The columns of the Bulletin have shown , with documentary evidence, that from 1939 to 1945 there was no break in that policy; that in order to carry out the real war on the Soviet Union the imperialists organized a sham war among themselves.

With the Nazi failure to defeat the Soviet Union, the imperialists were forced to alter their strategy. The basic intent to destroy the socialized property remained the crux of the imperialist policy but the means to accomplish that had to be changed. The German force had to be replaced with the untapped military power of Anglo-American imperialism. The territories temporarily handed to the Nazis were reoccupied and divided between the imperialists and Stalin. These two forces have been brought face to face in Europe and Asia- the task for imperialism now is to build up a war sentiment against the Soviet Union.

Whereas in the previous war situation Germany served as the military spearhead for world imperialism, today it has been converted into a bone of contention to intensify the diplomatic cleavage between imperialism and Stalin. An authoritative organ of capitalist opinion, "World Report" in its issue of September 17, 1946, has the provocative heading "U.S. Challenges Soviet Union to Showdown Over Germany." This same issue significantly enough contains on pages 42 to 45 the full text of an address made by U.S. Secretary of State Byrnes at Stuttgart on September 6th, 1946, and is commented on by this bourgeois magazine in the following sentence:

"The issue has to be faced, Even if it means a showdown with Russia over the control of both Germany and Europe."

The speech of Byrnes was a carefully calculated reply to the speech by Molotov in July. A comparison of the two speeches will show that both the imperialists and the Stalinists were maneuvering to get the support of a unified Germany in preparation for armed struggle. This is a far cry from 1945 when Stalin was represented in the capitalist press as a "glorious ally", and a co-victor over fascism. How did it come about that now there is the sharpest tension between Stalin and the imperialists over Germany whereas before there was an amicable division of territory between them. Why is it that the policy of Anglo-American imperialism was first to share occupation of Germany with Stalin and now to set in motion a huge propaganda campaign against this very occupation by Stalin? Wasn't it paradoxical for the imperialists to first carve up Germany into zones and now to quarrel with Stalin about the necessity for German unification?

The clue to all these questions is the examination of how the imperialists and Stalin manipulated in entering Germany during the recent war situation. The policy followed in that period by each of the contending camps laid the groundwork for the present diplomatic tug of war. What were these manipulations?

Shortly before August 1, 1944, Stalin's army reached the bank of the Vistula river before Warsaw and the border of East Prussia in the north. The army before Warsaw was operating on what was called the central front. On this front the Nazis directly guarded the path into Germany. Here

the Russian army closest to Germany stood some 325 miles away from Berlin. On August 1, the Warsaw uprising occurred, and lasted until October 3, a period of sixty-three days. Stalin's army withdrew from the outskirts of the city, remained stationary, and even ceased bombardment. The Nazi army was fully occupied in the battle within Warsaw. From the purely military standpoint here was a marvelous opportunity to smash the Nazi army. But that did not suit Stalin's plans. The Nazi army was given a free hand to slaughter the participants in the uprising.

Meanwhile, on the "Western Front", the Allied armies finished their race through France and halted at the German border on September 1, 1944. Whereas the imperialist armies even crossed the border in certain minor sectors, Stalin's army on the other hand was in the middle of Poland and touched only the border of East Prussia in the North. Geographically, the imperialist forces were in an extremely favorable position to dash into Germany ahead of Stalin. According to imperialist sources themselves, was this possible from a purely military standpoint?

In the first week of September, 1944, the entire imperialist press was howling about the Battle of Germany. The race to the Vistula by Stalin's army from June 22 to August 1, 1944; the way the imperialist forces knifed through France; the picture of the fortresses falling like ten pins; the stories of the complete collapse of the Nazi army, all gave the world the picture of complete Nazi downfall. On September 3, 1944, the New York Times wrote:

"The end seemed near. In the last three months, the Battle of France had been won in a complete route of the Germans, with two of their armies smashed, two more in flight." (My emphasis-TFH.)

On page 3-E of the same issue of the Times there is a headline "WEHRACHT IS SHATTERED BY BLOWS OF ALLIES."

Soon after, the imperialist press announced the launching of the invasion of Germany from the west. There were big headlines about a breakthrough in the Siegfried line. Nothing it seemed could prevent the allied occupation of Germany. On September 17, 1944, on page 1-E, the New York Times reported:

"Last week the invasion of Germany began. American troops crossed the border into the dark land from which war and destruction had spread over the world. The BLITZ had come home."

The same issue of the New York Times contained the following:

"American units smashed a ten-mile wide hole through the main defenses of the Reich's famed west wall and drove to within 26 miles of the Rhine. From Switzerland to the sea, six great Allied armies were driving forward. A seventh special air-borne army was poised for a vertical attack."

During this period, Finland, Bulgaria, Greece and Romania added to the picture of Nazi collapse by switching over and declaring war on

Germany. The apparent debacle of the Nazi forces seemed to presage an allied race through Germany, but somehow, despite the great noise about the big advance and breakthrough, it soon became apparent that the imperialist invasion of Germany was not taking place.

Although the bourgeois press informed the world in blazing headlines that the final push into Germany had begun, Stalin did not move a finger on the central front. The imperialist leaders were given a clear field by Stalin but mysteriously the invasion noise died down. The direct connection between the halt of the imperialist "invasion" of Germany and the continued inactivity of Stalin's forces on the Central front becomes quite apparent.

The capitalist newspapers at the time appeared flabbergasted at the bogging down of the invasion of Germany. To explain it, all the hedges that were used through the sham war now began to be introduced; adverse weather conditions, lack of supplies, etc. Before this, as we have seen, the mighty Siegfried line was reported to have been breached. Now, all of a sudden it was sealed up and stories were spread (stories which later proved false) of the great natural defenses which the Nazis commanded,

All of these frauds were designed to build up a new picture in the mind of the masses. The bourgeoisie put on a new phonograph record attempting to prove that the allies could not invade Germany at that time as had been expected. It is obvious that the Allies did not want to go into Germany at that time, and that is why their propaganda line changed. They had to cover up their halt and make it seem plausible to the masses. What was not only plausible in the light of the total situation, but what seemed to be dictated by every surface military and political consideration, had now to be made implausible to the masses.

The comments of the imperialist press on the situation on the Central Eastern front gives the clue to the motivation of their not going into Germany. Attention was glued to this "all important" Vistula front and the strange continuing silence there:

"But along the vital Vistula River sector, there was an enigmatic silence." (New York Times, October 8, 1944, p.1-E)

With ill-concealed irritation and anticipation, this same organ of finance capital speculated on the halt of Stalin's army:

"The Russians have had nine weeks to realign their armies, bring up reinforcements, and solve the various logistical problems created by their rapid advance of June and July." (Ibid.)

As previously pointed out, on October 1, 1944, the allied imperialists had a toe inside Germany and stood some 317 miles away from Berlin while Stalin remained behind the Vistula. On the Hungarian front and the Baltic front Stalin showed activity, but the central front remained inactive and continued so for five and a half months, until January 12, 1945, (long after the Nazis had crushed the Warsaw uprising, eliminating this as a causative factor in the delay). Week after week, the imperialist writers called attention to this delaying

tactic of Stalin's. On October 15, 1944, Hanson Baldwin wrote in The NY Times:

"The Russian victory on the southern and northern flanks of the Eastern front, though important, cannot be decisive; they are conquests of what are essentially outpost positions.

"The main fronts are the western front from Holland to the Belfort Gap and in the east, the Warsaw-Vistula front which is still static after 2½ months." (My emphasis-TFH.)

While waiting for Stalin to move on the Vistula front, the imperialists developed a new sitzkrieg in the west, with excuses for it continually mounting. It will be remembered that the sitzkrieg of 1939-40 had led to a general use of the term "phony war", and it was necessary for the official imperialist propagandists to see to it that in the new and heightened situation the term should not pop up again. The "break-through" was now replaced with "quadrilles" around Aachen. The whole maneuver was portrayed as a costly siege, and the final taking of the town was not allowed to arouse any enthusiasm by the imperialist spokesmen.

Again all the old excuses about the weather, and the great obstacles offered by the formerly routed and smashed armies, now suddenly unrouted and unsmashed, were brought into play. And still Stalin did not move. An offensive by the Red Army was momentarily expected on the central front, according to the imperialist analysts:

"November is the month when the Red Army traditionally has begun its winter offensive." (New York Times, November 12, 1944.)

The New York Times was reflecting the general urgent desire by the bourgeoisie for Stalin's anticipated move into Germany. Once more the picture completely changed in the capitalist press as the imperialists acted upon their expectations. Once more colorful stories were released telling about a new massive drive in the west to coordinate with Stalin's anticipated move:

"Last week the western allies hurled their mass strength against Germany in what appeared to be a bid for a victory in 1944. Six great armies drove hard into the Nazi line; two more were available. Planes, guns and tanks by the thousands, tough infantrymen in the millions poured into the attack. It was an assault on a scale never before seen on the western front—more men than the allies had ever had in action at one time and along a battle line. This assault was the opening of the third phase of the war in the west—perhaps the greatest phase." (The New York Times, November 19, 1944. My emphasis, TFH.)

From the above, we can see that the foremost organ of American finance capital was speaking of immediate victory and was stating that the assault was on a scale exceeding all that had gone before. Now



all the stories about bad weather, weak supply lines, etc. were no longer needed and again put back into moth-balls. Plausibly the allies could have and should have turned this colossal drive into a parade through Germany at double quick step. But Stalin still did not budge on the Vistula and so this "gigantic offensive" too turned out to be purely verbal. The imperialist propagandists once again focused attention on the silent central front and now introduced a subtle line, basing the success of the allied movement in the west directly on the Eastern front situation. Every argument was wheeled out to show that Stalin could forthwith open an offensive. The imperialist hullabaloo on the western front was an obvious pressure move to get Stalin to start his long awaited drive.

Having been disappointed in November, the undaunted New York Times predicted that Stalin would certainly move in December. On November 26, 1944, The Times said:

"First, the winter freeze is on its way, and by mid-December the terrain will be fitting for the kind of warfare in which the Russians excel."

But December came and the Eastern front remained stationary. The pressure for a Russian campaign on this front was intensified. The subtle hints were discarded and the bourgeois writers categorically insisted on action.

Meanwhile, the ludicrous stop-and-go offensives of the imperialists could not be left hanging in mid-air. The imperialists needed time to settle with Stalin the question of his moving forward into Germany. To give them this time there occurred one of the most fantastic episodes in the entire situation.

On December 17, 1944, the masses of the world were literally shocked by the news that on the previous day the Nazi army, which they had been told was on its last legs, had launched a huge counter-attack in Belgium.

At the time of this Nazi movement, the bourgeois press itself showed that the allied imperialists had a ten to one air superiority over the Nazis. The Allied military forces were shown to be superior in their equipment, morale, manpower and in every other possible source of comparison. Thus, even as the Nazi forces created a "bulge", the imperialist writers had to completely invert the picture they had been painting and present a plausible sounding explanation to the masses. The story handed out was that fog had enveloped the front and aided the Nazis while somehow this very same fog hindered the allies. This fairy tale, along with several stories inadvertently contradictory, was peddled for days in the most solemn fashion by the bourgeois press, as was the tale that snow was aiding the Nazi movements and simultaneously hampering allied operations. A sufficient commentary was made on this on December 28 by General March, a retired Chief of Staff of the United States Army, in the pithy sentence: "I never saw it snow on one side and not on the other." (New York Times, December 28, 1944)

The imperialist press also pulled out of its storeroom the old alibi of surprise. On December 20, 1944, the New York Times wrote:

"The initial successes of the enemy in this battle, which may stop or considerably delay the Allied winter offensive and may lengthen the war, have been directly the product of surprise." (My emphasis, TFH.)

This was one of the officially released stories. The lying nature of this "explanation" is shown from an inadvertent admission in the columns of the same paper. On the previous day, December 19, The Times gave the direct contradiction to this story of surprise:

"On the other hand, the German movement into the area where the counter-offensive is now taking place had been observed in the past two weeks."

The newspaper PM, on December 22 stated categorically that the assembling of the Nazi force had been observed by the British and American aerial reconnaissance. It also reported that:

"Three weeks ago the commanding officers of the U.S. 1st Army now bearing the brunt of the Nazi offensive, told C.B.S. correspondent William S. Shirer that they were fully aware of the possibility of a German attack and guessed correctly where it might come." (Original emphasis.)

This was no new situation in the "Second World War." On many other occasions such as Pearl Harbor, and the bombing of Clark Field in the Philippines, minor officers revealed their understanding and knowledge of impending attacks but strangely enough their warnings were rejected by their superiors. It is notable that on virtually every occasion of such nature, these superiors received their reward from the imperialists in the way of promotions, etc. In the case of "the Bulge", Drew Pearson revealed a similar situation. In his radio broadcast on September 29, 1946, Pearson made the following disclosure:

"The Battle of the Belgian Bulge was one of the most tragic in American history. It cost thousands of American lives and delayed the defeat of Germany for three months. Before the battle started, several junior officers and men warned that the Germans were preparing to attack. Among them Colonel B. Abbott Dickson of Philadelphia warned his superiors December 10, six days in advance. His warning, however, was overruled by General Edwin Seibert, who wrote a report December 12 that the Germans could not possibly attack. But they did attack on December 16 with tragic results. Now here's the payoff. Colonel Dickson, the man who was right, is now out of the Army. General Seibert, the man who was wrong, has now been elevated to be the number two man of combined American Intelligence." (Transcript of Broadcast)

The Belgian Bulge gave the imperialists more time to maneuver with Stalin to get him to enter Germany quickly. Pearson, in the above

quotation, estimates that three months were gained, or as he would put it, "lost". Once again the bourgeois press went all out in demands for a Stalin drive. The whole outcome of the war was made to depend on an offensive by the Red Army. Speculations were bruited as to possible negotiations between Stalin and Hitler for a separate peace. Stalin was accused by some of a sit down strike on the Vistula.

Meanwhile, negotiations appear to have been feverishly proceeding behind the scenes between Stalin and the Allied imperialists. Suddenly Churchill came out openly in support of Stalin's line in Poland. The London gang of Poles was repudiated. These were only some of the visible signs of secret agreements which had obviously been concluded. With matters apparently finally "straightened out" between Stalin and the imperialists, the Bulge began to be liquidated and at the same time, the Red Army finally, on January 12, 1945, began the drive on the central front.

Stalin's army reached the Oder River, 27 miles from Berlin on February 18, 1945. On March 4, the Allied imperialists started their move into Germany and a little over a month later (April 14) they reached the Elbe River. During this entire advance Stalin did not move past the Oder. But on April 15, the day after the imperialist armies reached the Elbe, as if on cue, a new Stalin advance began, ending with the capture of Berlin. After having reached the Elbe on April 14, the Allied armies remained motionless at this river, just 45 miles away from Berlin, while the Red Army stopped marking time and drove into the city.

At first it appeared utterly incredible to many that the bourgeoisie was going to stand idly by while Stalin snatched the plum of Berlin from under their nose. But it soon became apparent that this was exactly what was happening. At this time, there was no attempt to explain away the halting of the imperialist armies with all sorts of lame excuses. This time, it was openly declared to be bourgeois policy and this policy was made clear in an order to the armies by Eisenhower:

"General Eisenhower's order said the Ninth would halt on the Elbe and await the arrival of Russian forces from the east, thereby leaving the capture of the capital to the Red Army. It also was understood that the American First and Third and British and Canadian armies received similar orders to halt at the Elbe.

"It was felt by high staff officers in the field, however, that the Ninth and other American forces could push on to the capital without great difficulty while the order disappointed some staff officers, it was not altogether unexpected. It was known that the Ninth Army had pushed past the eventual British-American occupation area when it crossed the Weser River." (New York Times, May 2, 1945)

The imperialists are not suicides and a class conscious worker knows that the aim of the bourgeoisie is to break up the socialized property form in Russia, not to strengthen it. Yet here surface appearances give the impression that the imperialists wanted to see Stalin extend his territory and power.

Why was the policy of imperialism to have Stalin enter Berlin and other parts of Germany? Stalingrad had convinced the whole imperialist leadership that the second intervention had failed. And it had failed in the context of a war in which Stalin was accepted by the masses as the saviour of the world from fascism. Militarily and economically the imperialist forces, the practically untouched British and American armies could have launched an immediate attack on the Russian forces which, after the terrible war with the Nazis were bled white physically and economically. But this would have been incomprehensible to the masses in the imperialist countries and the masses in the imperialist armies. Furthermore, the imperialists had seen that the full resources of the capitalist world were necessary for the next attack. An ideological basis had to be set up for the third intervention sufficient to set the masses of the world against Stalin.

The imperialists were well aware with whom they were dealing and knew from the Stalin-Hitler partitions in 1939-1940 in Eastern Poland and the Baltic States of Stalin's policy of ruthless bureaucratization and terror. They knew that a similar Stalin policy in the new territories opened to him by the secret deals from Teheran to Yalta would give them a substantial basis to transform the sentiment of the workers against the Soviet Union. Thus a new "Hitler" could be built up in the eyes of the masses.

It can be seen that if this analysis is correct there would be two necessary stages in the process, one following closely on the heels of the other. The first stage, the "appeasement" of Stalin by material and territorial concessions; the second, the drive to build up a new monster before the world to the point where there would be sufficient ideological grounds for the third intervention. Let us look at Germany in the light of this analysis. Do the facts correspond to this interpretation or not?

We have already seen that the first stage was present in the actual manner of entry of the imperialists and Stalin into Germany. What about the second stage? From the time of the speech by Byrnes at Stuttgart up to the present there is little doubt about the second stage. So much is this the case, so widely is this recognized that it is not necessary to examine this aspect of the matter. And we can definitely say in advance that one of the main points of incitement to war will be on this very point of Germany.

What is really a most important question is why did Stalin swallow the bait? If he had refused to accept the material and particularly the territorial "proffers" he would have eliminated the possibility of imperialism making use of the ideological basis. The particular question cannot be explained by abstract general references to opportunism. The answer must be sought in the specific nature of Stalinism as a system of bureaucratic usurpation on the basis of a workers state. The prestige of Stalinism, reeling at the time of the Nazi advance, as the runaway Stalinist Kravchenko has pointed out, could not recover on the basis of defeat or even a stalemate. His prestige could recover and grow only on the basis of utter defeat of the Nazis and so Stalin had to grab while the grabbing was good. Since his acquisitions of territory were viewed at the time as a direct product of his war against the Nazis, his moves in this

period even increased his prestige with the misguided masses. In this connection, also, two factors should be emphasized. One is that the imperialists helped, even pressed Stalin to take over enough of Germany to constitute one of the future causes of war in the manner outlined above, but that the important most highly industrialized part of Germany, the seat of heavy industry, they reserved for themselves. The second is that although there is not an economic pressure driving Stalinism to expansion as imperialist powers are driven, there is nevertheless, as we can see as far back as Poland in 1939, tremendous inducement to the bureaucracy for the acquisition of new territory and augmentation of Stalin's power.

As a result of such acquisition there is new scope for power and privilege for the Stalinist bureaucrats. But still more important is the building up of greater material resources for the protection of the bureaucracy in the forthcoming imperialist onslaught. Finally there is the extension of its counter-revolutionary power through direct military suppression of the main enemy of the bureaucracy, the proletariat.

In the face of the above situation, in the face of the oncoming war between imperialism and the Stalinized Soviet Union, what are the duties of Marxists? Certainly to present to the advanced workers the facts in the imperialist machinations, to point out the special role of Stalinism in bringing on the coming blood bath, to point out that only struggle against and overthrow of both imperialism and the Stalinist bureaucracy can save humanity from the most catastrophic war ever seen.

To our knowledge we are the only tendency in the world today that has fulfilled these tasks. From 1939 to the present time both the Cannon and Shachtman varieties of Trotskyism have aided both imperialism and Stalinism by concealing the existence of a sham war. The Trotskyists have been content to tail the imperialists and Stalinists and peddle the theory of an imperialist war. They are still tail ending one or the other of these tendencies throughout the world in the present day situations.

In connection with the Stalin-imperialist situation in Germany it is important to note the crystallization of political forces in pulling the German proletariat towards either imperialism or Stalinism. On the one hand, the Stalin political machine is operating full blast to recruit, by means of fraud and intimidation, large sections of the anti-imperialist minded German working class. On the other hand there is the old tried and true agency of imperialism, German Social Democracy, which is recruiting workers directly into the imperialist camp. The history of the last few months is filled with the maneuvers of Stalinism and the imperialists against each other. The task of Marxists is to expose both forces and its supporters. We have already had occasion to comment in previous issues of our publication on the direct support to Stalinist candidates by the Cannon Trotsky outfit. Support to opportunism is by no means limited to the Cannon branch of the Trotsky tree, however, as we have also pointed out concretely. In the November 4, 1946 issue of LABOR ACTION, organ of the Shachtman Trotskyite Workers' Party, we find, on page four, support to the imperialist camp. Writing on the elections in Berlin and the victory for the Social Democratic Party, the traditional agent of imperialism, LABOR ACTION says:

"In a sense it is an indication of the political disintegration of Europe that today in 1946 revolutionary socialists find comfort in the fact that the workers of Berlin are voting for the Social Democrats, while 20 years ago we were lending every effort to break the workers away from the reformist Social Democracy. But facts are stubborn- and the fact is that in the specific situation the vote of the German workers should be hailed." (My emphasis, TFH)

What does Labor Action mean by such a statement? Are the Schachtman leaders ignorant of August 4, 1914, when the German Social Democracy supported the imperialist war and was stripped of every pretence of being anything other than an agent of finance capital in the workers' ranks? Do the editors of Labor Action know about Ebert and Scheidemann? Have they heard of Noske? Don't they know about the murder of Liebknecht and Luxemburg? Coming down to the present, don't they know that international and German Social Democracy is one of the principal imperialist instruments?

The answer is given in the very same article:

"Traditionally they (the Social Democrats-TFH) have played the role of subservient agent of their native capitalist class. And that is the role they will continue to play in relation to Anglo-American imperialism."

To "hail", as does this article, the vote of the German workers for an admitted agency of German capitalism, which will continue to play the same role in relation to Anglo-American imperialism, is nothing but conscious treachery.

Objectively, the masses of the world have been polarized into ~~two separate~~ ~~reactionary camps-~~ the imperialist and Stalinist. This is true even of the many workers who may be subjectively against both. Those revolutionary-minded workers affiliated with the various branches of the Trotsky and Left Trotsky movement are tied by their leadership to either one or the other reaction-or both. The above example of the Workers' Party is one instance of these workers being tied, through the Shachtmanite leadership, to Social Democracy, which means to imperialism. The first step for these subjectively revolutionary workers in order to build a Marxist movement independent of and opposed to Stalinism and Social Democracy ( and thereby to imperialism) is to break with the Cannons and Shachtmans and all other covert supporters to reaction. In that way and in that way only will they be free to begin to establish a revolutionary movement which will expose the machinations of imperialism and Stalinism.

Thomas F. Harden  
December 10, 1946

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* A LESSON IN THE AMERICAN CLASS STRUGGLE \*  
 \* (The Coal Strike -- It's Outcome and Significance)\*  
 \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

After V-J Day terminated the war situation, one of the basic contradictions faced by the American imperialists was the disparity between the preparations for the impending war against the Soviet Union and the mass sentiment for a relaxation of all military controls. Specifically in the unions, the bourgeoisie and its labor machinery were able to foist the no-strike pledge on the workers from 1941 through 1945 with the excuse that there was a war on. But with V-J Day this fraud could no longer be used to police the workers.

The problem of the bourgeoisie in the present period is to tighten the repressive apparatus against the unions as a necessary preliminary for a new war. Since V-J Day, it has gone about this problem in a systematic manner, raised an organized hue and cry about strikes which labor leaders helped to betray, and demanded stronger anti-strike laws. Using the Railroad strike in May 1946, the capitalists created and whipped up hysteria and laid the ideological basis for tighter anti-labor laws. Later, the Wage Stabilization Board refused to allow previously agreed upon increases to the maritime workers thus provoking the Maritime strike around which another huge campaign of incitement was launched by the bosses and their agents. The deliberate, planned campaign of the bankers and industrialists became so evident to the rank-and-file trade unionists that their misleaders had to put up an air of opposition to the bourgeoisie on that issue. Thus Philip Murray, in a statement on December 6, 1946 summarized the development since V-J Day by declaring:

"It has become self-evident that there is a deliberate and monstrous movement underway to cripple, if not destroy, the labor movement of this country." (The New York Times, December 7, 1946.)

Murray, of course, took precautions to conceal the particular motive of the capitalist campaign. And, of course, Murray could not reveal that it is precisely because of the American labor bureaucracy, aided and abetted by other opportunist forces, that the bosses' drive has thus far proceeded with success and promises to pick up momentum in the immediate future.

In this context let us view the recent developments in the coal fields. Last spring Lewis signed a contract with the government which he boasted of as a great victory for the miners. (The Lewis-Krug Agreement.) But due to the sentiment among the miners, Lewis showed on October 21, 1946, that the government stooges of Wall Street operating the mines had sabotaged some of the provisions of the contract. Furthermore, Lewis suddenly discovered that the miners were tied to a brutal back-breaking fifty-four hour week in the most dangerous of industries and were doomed by their pitifully inadequate wages to grinding poverty and slow starvation. This, incidentally, is the admitted result of more than a quarter-century of Lewis' leadership of the United Mine Workers Union and the upshot of all of his great "victories" for the miners!

Lewis' line in the recent "negotiations" was to involve the issues in a maze of subtle contract legalisms which confused the miners. Finally, on November 20, 1946, Lewis issued what amounted to a strike call although he didn't call it such. After the miners walked out, the conspiracy of the owners, their government, and their disguised agent, Lewis, emerged into view.

The official government agencies schemed to starve out the miners and maneuvered to deny them any unemployment insurance:

"The chances that any will draw State unemployment insurance benefits are nil." ( The New York Times, Dec. 1, 1946.)

The owners ganged up on the miners and decided to withhold credit from the strikers in the mine towns. A Lewis subordinate commented on this:

"William Blizzard, president of District 17 of the United Mine Workers, described the decision to withhold credit from the strikers as 'rotten', but added: 'They are always rotten down here.'" ( The New York Times, Nov. 27, 1946 )

The owners and their agents in the government thus worked together to put the pressure on the hard pressed miners. In this situation, when the mine-owners and their government agents were squeezing the miners financially, what did the UMW officials do to relieve the miners from the rapacious class enemy? In this connection, it should be borne in mind that the Lewis leadership draws fantastic salaries from the union treasury. Despite this organized looting of the Lewis gang, however, the union treasury amounted to over 13 million dollars when the miners walked out. This money, of course, was drained from the ill-paid miners over the years by the Lewis leadership. But when this money was desperately needed by the miners due to the strike situation, the Lewis mobsters lined up with the bosses and withheld any strike benefits from the miners as the bosses withheld credits in the company stores and the government refused insurance benefits:

"Miners in the coal towns near Charleston expressed the hope that the union would help them get funds if their store credit ran out but Mr. Blizzard made it clear that they would have to get along on their own. He said most miners helped one another out in strike periods and thus were able to spread their slender resources over the whole community." (Ibid.)

When Blizzard characterized the action of the mine-owners in withholding credit as rotten, he was quite correct. But the action of the UMW leadership in withholding strike benefits was even more putrid because it came from people who claimed to "represent" the miners.

In this way the Lewis pick-pockets colluded with the bosses to break the spirit of the miners who had sacrificed to build the union with its well-stocked treasury for "emergencies." Of course, Lewis, in addition to his banker's salary, never hesitated to draw on his fat expense account to loot the union treasury while concocting ways of selling out the miners. In "negotiations" where Lewis makes talks for public consumption, he gives facts and figures about and pretends to be moved by



the terrible plight of the miners. Actually this staunch supporter of capitalist slavery enforces the continuation of the exploitation of the miners and is not one whit interested in alleviating their rotten conditions.

It is clear that the only "strike benefits" in existence are those grabbed by Lewis and his time-servers. The coordination of effort of the owners, their government lackeys, and the Lewis band to blackmail the miners into a blind alley becomes manifestly clear.

The noise in the capitalist press against Lewis was purported to give the misleading impression that Lewis was really conducting some sort of battle for the miners. This is what the bosses want the coal miners and the workers in general to believe since the bourgeoisie know that as long as pro-capitalist labor leaders like Lewis retain control in the unions, the capitalists have nothing to fear from the workers.

Since the bosses' government by a contract legality was in temporary "charge" of the mines, the bourgeoisie made a big howl to put over the idea that workers are not allowed to strike against the government. This is one of the main class collaborationist poisons which the capitalists and their agents unceasingly din into the ears of the workers. An injunction was trotted out and fines levied. Then, with the outcry at its peak and the stage properly set, Lewis completed his assignment and treacherously issued a fiat on December 7, 1946 commanding the miners to return to work empty-handed. The miners were ready for a militant strike struggle and most of them were thus completely stunned and embittered by this Lewis stab in the back. Forgotten were the hypocritical Lewis pretenses about the terrible fifty-four hour week and the starvation wages of the oppressed miners. Instead, Lewis echoed the rotten capitalist lie about the impartiality of the bosses Supreme Court and preached faith in this instrument of capitalist rule. The text of the Lewis order stated:

"The Supreme Court of the United States is a Constitutional Court. Its powers are derived from the Federal Constitution. The Supreme Court is, and we believe will ever be, the protector of American liberties and the rightful privileges of its citizens. The issues before the Court are fateful for our Republic. It may be presumed that the verdict of the Court, when rendered, will affect the life of every citizen. These weighty considerations and the fitting respect due the dignity of this high tribunal imperatively require that, during the period of its deliberation, the Court be free from public pressure superinduced by the hysteria and frenzy of an economic crisis." (The New York Times, Dec. 8, 1946.)

Lewis, painting himself and his bureaucratically entrenched clique as the authentic representatives of the miners, then assured the betrayed rank-and-file that their interests would be protected by him and his henchmen in the negotiations with the bosses:

"If, as and when such negotiations ensue, your representatives will act in full protection of your interests, within the limitations of the findings of the Supreme Court of the United States." (Ibid.)

The "limitations" of the findings of the Supreme Court already pre-condition that Lewis, as before, will sell out the miners whom he pretends to represent.

Finally, Lewis chloroformed the miners with the advice to "await the

rendition of legal and economic justice." (Ibid.)

This blow against the miners was naturally a blow against the entire American working class. The open class enemy, such as the mine owners, or the directly political spokesmen of the imperialists, Truman, etc., could not get the miners back to work on the same conditions as before; it took the machinations of the disguised enemy within, Lewis, to set up the miners for the killing. Thanks to this new betrayal by Lewis, the American imperialists have scored a very important victory and have their hands free to continue full speed ahead with the plot to tighten the repressive measures against the unions.

#### Who Helps Tie the Miners to Lewis?

Reality in the coal fields is distorted both by the bosses and the Lewis bureaucracy along two lines: (1) That Lewis is a courageous and aggressive union leader and (2) that the sentiments of Lewis and the militant miners are one and the same.

The dissemination of this perversion of facts to the miners is essential to the continued rule and influence of the Lewis clique. The tragic fact at present is that even a goodly number of workers who have already arrived at the understanding that Lewis is a reactionary bureaucrat, remain ideologically chained to the Lewis policies. How is it possible that these workers follow an objective line which is not in harmony with their subjectively revolutionary sentiments? The answer is to be found in the political work of the official and unofficial wings of the Trotsky movement, the Cannonite Socialist Workers Party and the Shechtmanite Workers Party.

On the one hand, the S.W.P. leaders admit the following which is in harmony with the healthy sentiments of the Trotskyite workers:

"It is a patent fact that the capitalist-minded leadership of the American labor movement constitutes the most important bulwark of capitalist class rule." (Fourth International, Sept. 1946 p. 259)

Does John L. Lewis fit into the category of the capitalist-minded American labor leadership? It does not take too much perspicacity to grasp the answer since Lewis himself freely admits his capitalist ideology. The Trotsky leaders learned this a long time ago. To take but one citation from many of similar statements on this point we read:

"Lewis is a labor lieutenant of the capitalist class. His labor bureaucracy rests upon American capitalism." (Socialist Appeal, March 30, 1940 p.3)

The Trotsky leaders know that by word and deed Lewis is unequivocally in the camp of the class enemy. But their correct statements on Lewis' position are timed for peaceful moments and designed as a cover for the true Trotsky policy in the critical situations. During the whipped-up hysteria in the bourgeois press in the recent coal strike, Cannon applied his understanding that "the capitalist-minded leadership" of the unions constitutes the most important club of the imperialists in his traditional way of hurriedly repainting Lewis as a champion of the miners:

"The federal government, climaxing its unprecedented strike-breaking campaign, is threatening savage reprisals against AFL United Mine

orkers President John L. Lewis for refusing to surrender the rights of the toiling miners." (The Militant, Nov. 30, 1946 p.1)

Shachtman boldly echoed Lewis and Cannon and called the UMW pte-card artist a "representative" of the miners:

"Union leaders, known for their strong opposition to Lewis, have been compelled by the necessity of defending unionism to announce their support of Lewis as the representative of the mine workers in his fight against the government." (Labor Action, Dec. 2, 1946 p. 1)

To such an extent did the W.P. leaders go in their distortions that they actually assured the workers that the UMW leadership would not capitulate to the bosses:

"There is no comment by union officials available at the moment of writing, but the long tradition of the mine workers in building their union and resisting all attacks on it, is reason to believe that the UMW will not back down under this bald species of anti-union intimidation." (Labor Action, Nov. 25, 1946 p.1)

Cannon and Shachtman prevented the truth about Lewis' role from appearing although they know that truth well. Their line was to instill confidence in Lewis' crooked leadership and to echo the Lewis demagogy. The debacle of the miners was prepared directly by Lewis. However, Lewis was aided by Cannon and Shachtman through the medium of misleading the revolutionary-minded miners and other workers on the anti-working class nature of Lewis' policies.

When Cannon stated that the capitalist-minded labor bureaucrats were responsible for perpetuation of the bosses rule, he only stated a half truth. To complete the picture, one must add that the continuation of this capitalist-minded leadership is made possible by the support rendered by the Cannons and Shachtmans and other pseudo-Marxist forces.

After the Lewis sell-out, the S.M.P. and W.P. were on hand with their usual recipes for the miners and other workers. In this instance, Cannon saw as a "lesson", the necessity for a National Conference of Labor leaders, who should act in unison:

"Now, more than ever, the immediate need of the hour is the convening of a National Conference of Labor, with broadest representation from the union ranks of every affiliation. Labor must be mobilized and unified behind a program of fighting actions." (The Militant, Dec. 14, 1946 p. 2)

Under the present leadership of the unions, or some fraudulent "rank-and-file" outfit as appeared on the scene before, such a unity can only be based on a class collaborationist program and not on a Marxist struggle against the capitalists. Cannon's scheme would only mean that the labor fakers or their stooges would openly collectivize their efforts to keep the workers ground down under capitalist oppression.

We might add that Cannon's plan does not even have the virtues of originality. Murray came out similarly for the unity of the AFL, CIO,

and Railroad Brotherhoods to present a joint front "for" the workers. Since Murray is currently the fair-haired boy of the Stalin gang, as Lewis is of the Trotsky leaders at present, the Stalin bureaucrats hailed this unity scheme of Murray's:

"Philip Murray voice/the real interest of the workers throughout the country when he addressed a letter to the AFL and the Railroad Brotherhoods, calling upon them to take joint action with the CIO in support of the miners strike and in support of the economic and legislative interests of the entire labor movement." (The Worker, Dec. 8, 1946 )

Clearly, the Cannon proposition is no more than a tailoring of the current Stalinist line.

Shachtman's solution is that Lewis and the other bureaucrats should dress themselves in political clothes with a sandwich sign called Labor Party:

"Experience of Coal Strike Shows Labor Needs Own Party." ( Labor Action, Dec. 16, 1946 p. 1 )

What is this "own" party of labor that the W.P. is talking about ? They showed what they mean by this expression when they supported the Dubinsky gang in the A.L.P. in 1944, the labor bureaucrats heading the Michigan Commonwealth Federation, not to speak of the Labor fakers heading the British Labor Party. This shows that the W.P. leaders identify what they call "independent" labor politics with the reactionary labor bureaucrats. All that the Lewises, Murrays, Greens, Dubinskys, etc., can do when decked out in political clothes is more effectively stifle the forward movement of the American workers.

Even after the Lewis sell-out the W.P. leadership still found kind words to describe strikebreaker Lewis. Max Shachtman declared:

"John L. Lewis is a labor leader of exceptional talents. In the field of tactics, in will power, in fearless aggressiveness, he towers above the average labor leader." ( Ibid. p. 4)

Truly there is no end to the wonders of John L. Lewis in the pages of Labor Action. Another writer for the same paper, in the same issue, makes a remarkable discovery:

"What we say applies particularly well to Lewis, however. It is he who leads his union into the most resolute labor struggles; even in wartime." ( Ibid. )

The Shachtmanites go even further than Lewis himself does in this sphere. As a matter of fact, some time ago Lewis made a speech in which he specifically denied that he led any strikes during the period of the war situation.

"Asserting that the union had called no strikes during the war, he (Lewis-A.B.) stated that the industry had not only supplied the needed tonnage for this country but had sent much coal abroad." ( The New York Times, March 13, 1946 )

Why should Lewis have to lie about these facts when he has the Shachtmanite W.P. doing it for him?

On our part we made our evaluation of Lewis as a bribed flunkey of the bosses many years ago, and we never deviated from that estimation as Lewis never deviated in his established role. Time and again life has confirmed this analysis and will continue to vindicate it in the future. We warned the workers before and we take the opportunity to do so again; a precondition for any real fight against the mine owners and their gov't is the ousting of the Lewis mob and their replacement by workers dedicated to revolutionary class struggle policies and to workers democracy. Control from above must be replaced by control from below and class collaboration replaced by revolutionary class struggle. To those workers who have already come to this understanding and who want to help spread it the first step is a break with the Cannons and Shachtmans who by their double-dealing policy do not allow this understanding to reach the miners. When the policy we advocate becomes incorporated into the ideology of the miners and other workers, the path will finally be opened to a real struggle against the bosses.

As matters stand today, the miners have been deceived into believing that their interests will be secured in the forthcoming negotiations between Lewis and the bosses. We deem it our duty to warn the workers once more to expect nothing but betrayal in one form or another from the Lewis gang. And we draw the attention of the revolutionary minded workers to the fact that neither Cannon nor Shachtman repudiated their whitewashing frauds about Lewis, that they gave a misleading analysis of the situation, and that they will again spread deception in the forthcoming crisis in the mine fields.

Arthur Burke  
December 1946

NOTICE TO OUR READERS: \*

We regret that in this issue of THE BULLETIN, we are unable to publish Part VII of the Trade Union series, "The Work of Cannon and Shachtman in the Trade Unions," entitled "Treachery in the Coal Fields." This article will be published in the next issue of THE BULLETIN.

Earlier installments of this series are still available:

- Part I -- The Period of Dual Unionism (1928-1932)
- Part II-- The Minneapolis Teamsters Strikes of 1934
- Part III- The Period of the Formation of the CIO.
- Part IV-- The Trotskyites in the UAW
- Part V -- The Sell-Out of the Food Workers
- Part VI-- A Horse-Deal With John L. Lewis

Five Cents per Copy

\*\*\*\* \*\* AN ACHIEVEMENT OF THE BRITISH TROTSKYITES \*\*\*\*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

During the period of the war situation in Britain, the British Trotskyites (Revolutionary Communist Party), campaigned for the slogan "Labor To Power." In the general election of 1945 this slogan was concretized by active support to the British Labor Party. The Trotsky workers are fully aware of the fact that the Attlees and Bevins are firmly riveted to the interests of British imperialism. How then, were these revolutionary minded workers gotten to throw their weight behind people whom they knew to be enemies of the British proletariat? The Trotsky leadership accomplished this by explaining that the Laborites held the misplaced confidence of the majority of the workers. Because of this, they said, it was necessary to push these labor traitors to power where they would expose themselves in deeds before the masses. The result would be a gain for proletarian revolution, argued the Trotsky leaders:

"To those millions of workers who have illusions in the reformist leadership we say: 'The Labour leaders are the lackeys of the capitalist class. They will betray you. But you do not believe us. Very well, put them in power. We will help you. We will promise them our unqualified support in any struggle, any independent step forward they take against the policies of capitalism.' In this way, through their own experiences, the masses will be won to the banner of Communism. Labour to Power! That is the battle-cry of the Trotskyists, the Revolutionary Communists. That is the real Marxist-Leninist 'answer' to the immediate questions posed before the working class." (Workers International News, July-August 1945, p.8)

In promising "unqualified support" to any independent action of the Laborites the Trotsky leaders implied that the Attlees and Bevins actually had the possibility of pursuing class struggle policies. However, the Trotsky workers were caught by the revolutionary sounding argument about exposing the Laborites and thus diligently went to work electioneering for the victory of the Labor Party. The Trotsky workers were taught that this was a necessary step forward for the British working class and that it would lead toward the building of a revolutionary party.

The general elections returned the Labor Party to power with a resounding majority and Attlee and Bevin formed "His Majesty's Labour Government." The British Trotsky leaders were jubilant over the Labor Party victory and dinned into the ear of the workers that this represented a gain for proletarian revolution:

"The period of triumphant reaction has drawn to a close, a new revolutionary epoch opens in Britain." (Workers International News, Sept. 1945, p.23. Emphasis in Original)

Indeed it seemed that there was no end to the possibilities opened up for the revolutionary workers by the victory of the Labor Party. Wherever the Trotsky leaders looked they saw only a gain for revolution:

"The class issues are posed in a sharp and unambiguous fashion, which represents a tremendous gain for the revolution." (Ibid. p.20. Emphasis in Original.)

What has happened since the Attlee-Bevin-Morrison crowd took over the government machine? On the domestic front the Labor Party bureaucrats have been functioning to break strikes, to dupe the workers with fake

nationalization measures (such as the Bank of England which assured the British rulers guaranteed profits and continued control.) The sick coal industry was given a shot in the arm by the Labor Fakers who secured the interests of the black-hearted coal owners and intensified the exploitation of the miners. Internationally, "His Majesty's Labor Government" continues to shoot down the rebellious masses and protects the imperialist interests of the bankers and capitalists with an iron hand.

How has the Trotsky analysis fared in the light of events since the institution of the labor servants of the British imperialists into government office? What happened to the story about the forthcoming exposure which the Trotsky leaders promised would occur once the Labor Party got into power? Without a word of repudiation for their previous promises and for what was supposed to be a fundamental Marxian analysis, the British Trotsky leaders now note that the Labor Party is not exposing itself to the masses despite all the counter-revolutionary deeds:

"The fact that the illusion of 'full employment' can be maintained in the present period of boom; that, apart from the nationalization measures and other reforms and semi-reforms have been introduced by the Labour Government- National Health Bill, Old Age Pensions, the Housing Plan, abolition of the Trade Disputes Act- these have served to assure the masses that the Government is making a serious effort to do the job for which it was elected." ( Socialist Appeal, Mid-Sept. 1946 )

So little of this promised "exposure" has occurred that the Trotsky leaders now state that "it is quite likely that not only will the Labour Government see through its term of office, but that we may see a second Labour Government." ( Ibid. )

Thus the "reason" which the British Trotsky leaders gave as the motive for supporting the labor fakery to power turns out to have been a distortion of reality.

In this connection what have the lessons of history to show to the workers? Does the elevation of opportunists into government power in and of itself operate to expose opportunism? The bourgeoisie entrusted their labor gendarmes with heading the British government in 1924 and 1929. In each of these governments they worked hand in glove with the British bosses to check any revolutionary developments among the masses. Both in and out of power the Laborites stabbed the workers in the back. Yet despite all the betrayals the British Labor Party leaders had the support of more workers in the general elections of 1945 than at any other period in its history. Therefore, the previous accession of the British Laborites to posts of power did not mean their exposure before the workers. History is rich in experience with similar lessons in regard to Stalinist bureaucrats and Social Democratic bureaucrats in Germany, France, Spain, Italy and elsewhere. Opportunism is not exposed before the proletariat by its wielding of state power for the class enemy. Opportunism can be exposed only by a Marxist policy. This means no catering to the illusions of the misguided workers and no moratoriums at any time in the struggle to break the direct and indirect attachment of the workers to the opportunist traitors.

The Trotsky policy of electioneering for the British Laborites could not be the product of a misunderstanding of the role of the Attlees and Bevins. The dark and bloody past and the betraying present of the Laborites is well known to the Trotsky leaders as their press indicates. Since the

policy of supporting the Laborites could not be premised on ignorance of the facts of history nor on illusions about the role of these labor misleaders, what then was the true meaning behind the Trotsky policy? This meaning has been inadvertently revealed by the Trotskyites themselves. There are workers who grow disillusioned with the British Laborites and subjectively break from them; this is a continuous process whether the Labor Party is in power or not. But in the present specific situation what will be the direction of these workers? The Trotsky leaders know only too well:

"But as Pelitt points out, the honeymoon period of the Labour Government will end with the termination of the cyclical trade boom. And when the masses turn from the Labour leadership the C.P. WILL LARGELY BENEFIT." (Workers International News, June-July 1946 p. 202 My emphasis and capitals -A.B. )

As was easily foreseen by the Marxists and pointed out in our publication, the Trotsky "strategy" works for the British imperialists and for the Stalinist counter-revolution! That is the sinister meaning of the line of placing the Labor Party bureaucrats in power. All the rosy promises that the masses, after seeing the Laborites in power, would turn toward a revolutionary policy proved so much dust in the eyes of the Trotskyite workers. By their own words the British Trotsky leaders stand indicted as aids to the agents of British imperialism and as builders of Stalinism in Britain.

The millions of colonial slaves groaning under the yoke of imperialist oppression enforced by the labor traitors can thank the British Trotskyites for helping forge the chains of capitalist slavery. And if Stalinism is in a position to capture wide masses of British workers who become disillusioned with the Laborites, the Jock Hastons and other British Trotsky leaders can pride themselves on their achievement. In Britain, and elsewhere, the Trotskyites function to tie the revolutionary anti-Stalinist workers back to the Stalinist system and thus stand as a stumbling block to any development toward a revolutionary British party. The first real "gain for revolution" will occur when the revolutionary minded Trotskyite workers in Britain bring their subjective desires into harmony with objective reality and break from their present pro-Stalinist leadership.

A.B.  
December 1946

---

WRITE FOR THESE ADDITIONAL ARTICLES DEALING WITH GREAT BRITAIN

Lenin's Position on the British Labor Party

The Third British "Labor" Government

The Issue of Palestine

Myths and Facts About Trotsky's Position on the  
Anglo-Russian Committee

A Discussion with the Socialist Workers League  
of Great Britain

\$.05 per copy

Address all communications to: Red Star Press  
P.O.Box 67 Station D  
New York City



\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* \* \* \* \*  
 \* A FRAUDULENT LABOR PORTRAIT \*  
 \* \* \* \* \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

In the United States the characteristic labor leader is an open defender of capitalist class relations. The fact that these labor lieutenants of imperialism have not as yet seen fit to adopt an anti-capitalist political disguise is a measure of the present political backwardness of the American workers. The ideas of revolutionary Marxism must be implanted to heighten the class consciousness of the duped American workers who are continually sold down the river by these labor fakers. This means that those workers who have already risen to the level of trade union consciousness must be politicized and made aware of the role and nature of the labor misleaders.

In this sphere as elsewhere Stalinism has functioned to deaden the class consciousness of the American workers by distorting the role of the labor agents of Wall Street and thus preventing any struggle to cast them out of the trade unions. Depending on their particular zigzag, John L. Lewis is at one moment pictured by the Stalin bureaucrats as an agent of the Nazis and at another moment as a sincere fighter in the interests of the working class. Today, the head of the C.I.O., Philip Murray, is played up by the Daily Worker as one of the great heroes in working class history-tomorrow, in another tack by the same Stalinist paper, he will be branded as a labor judas.

Among the anti-Stalin advanced workers this two-faced Stalinist method is somewhat apparent. These workers have been given the impression that in this field as in all others it is their leadership which provides the true Marxist guide and teaches the workers to know the real character of the capitalist labor stooges. This publication has consistently proved otherwise by documentary evidence. A good case in point in this instance is the Shachtmanite Workers Party evaluation of the powerful bureaucrat, Philip Murray.

Murray has a long and dark past filled with treachery to the toilers. This past is systematically hidden from the workers by Murray himself and by all the direct and indirect supporters of the trade union bureaucracy. Murray was the hatchet man for John L. Lewis in the United Mine Workers Union and worked diligently at building and consolidating a powerful gangster machine in that union to throttle the rebellious miners. According to reports, Murray did not shrink from organizing frame-ups of militant miners in collaboration with the bosses. For example, after working to betray a mine strike in 1931 Murray helped the class enemy in its attempt to railroad militant miners to jail, as was reported by the Cannon-Shachtman leadership at the time:

"The most despicable feature of the whole trial, which may end with five year terms for each of the defendants involved is the fact that looming directly behind the prosecution are the two principal officials of the Pittsburgh district of the United Mine Workers of America, Pat Fagan and Phil Murray, two men who have grown fat on their betrayals of the <sup>coal</sup> miners for years gone by." ( The Militant, Aug. 29, 1931 )

Murray indeed grew rich on the sweat of the miners and never swerved from selling them out to the mine-owners. The broken bones, the mangled bodies, the slow strangulation of starvation which sent the miners to early graves paved a path of gold for the utterly putrid Philip Murray. The

Wall Street government was quite cognizant of this valuable labor cop of theirs in the mine fields and never hesitated to call upon him in a tough situation. In 1933 Murray openly boasted of his usefulness to the bosses after breaking up a mine strike as reported in the Trotskyite paper, edited at that time by Max Shachtman:

"Says Murray in calling the miners back to work:  
 "' The President then said to me, ' Philip, I want you to get these men back to work.' I replied ' If there is anything in God's world that I can do for you, I will be glad to try.'" ( The Militant, Oct. 7, 1933 )

As head of the C.I.O. Murray has been in an even better position than before to serve the bosses and betray the unsuspecting workers following his lead. These workers are kept in the dark by Murray's henchmen who, ironically enough, refer to him as "Honest Phil Murray". But there exist some Murray merchants who go so far as to wrap their poison packages in bright red. The purveyors of the following evaluation of Murray are of this type:

"For not only is Murray the head of the CIO but he is an honest labor leader with ability and a genuine interest in the advancement of the working class." ( The New International, July 1941 p. 140 My emphasis-A.B. )

The journal from which the above is cited is the voice of Max Shachtman's Workers Party. The strangled cries of the miners crushed by Murray's thuggery are eloquent testimonials to Murray's "genuine interest in the advancement of the working class!"

Did Murray perhaps change his spots when Lewis handpicked him as his successor to lead the C.I.O.? If Murray did, then it has been the best-kept secret of all time. The truth is that Murray never deviated one inch in his steadfast policy of sell-outs in the service of the bosses. The Shachtman boost to Murray was written soon after this labor bureaucrat became head of the C.I.O. In other words, just when it became a burning necessity to warn the uninformed workers of the knife which Murray had ready for them, Shachtman came out with an affidavit for Murray's sincerity and palmed off his hypocrisy as being a "genuine interest in the advancement of the working class." This was in line with the general ultra-rightism then carried to extremes by Stalinism on the subject of the good intentions of the labor fakery.

The fact is that Murray remains an uncompromising enemy of the victims of wage slavery and no one knows this better than the leaders of the Workers Party:

"Murray, Thomas and Reuther are voluntarily supporting their own ruling class, their own imperialists." ( The New International, Sept. 1942 p. 236 )

One might imagine that Shachtman had just come upon this discovery in the year 1942. As a matter of record, he knew for a long time of the nature of Murray, whom he recommended to the workers as an honest labor leader:

"Murray is an outspoken patriot and a loyal member of a religious faith that has no tolerance for 'radicalism.' Murray is not just opposed to Stalinists and Stalinism; he is equally against any and all forms of opposition to what he would call 'our democratic institutions'." (Labor Action, Dec. 2, 1940 )

The latter citation was published prior to the evaluation wherein Murray was given a bouquet for a non-existent loyalty to the working class. In short, it was not confusion which produced the Shachtmanite encomiums of Murray.

The Shachtmanite critical verbiage on the role of the Murrays gives the workers the illusion that the W.P. leaders function to expose the labor agents of imperialism. But these statements are not the key to Shachtman's real line but serve rather as the device to put the real line across on the anti-Murray minded workers. The real line currently presented to the revolutionary anti-Stalin workers who follow Shachtman is basically identical to the present phase of the Stalin line. The latter tirelessly "explain" to the workers that Murray is really their representative and can be made to serve their interests. Here is what Labor Action tells the workers on this subject:

"That is why we take Murray to task so severely. Truman? We expect nothing from him other than to do what the profiteers who put him where he is, want him to do. Truman is not our representative. Murray is! And, it seems, unless the situation and the demand of the rank and file compel him to act differently, that he will again by-pass the needs of the workers in fruitless appeals to the White House." (Labor Action, Aug. 26, 1946. )

The reactionary bureaucrat Murray is always pictured by the Shachtmanites as having some possibility of acting in the interests of the workers. This is a variation on the Stalinist theme that post-cards, petitions and other supposed methods of "pressure" can get the labor lieutenants of the capitalist enemy to fight against the bosses.

Contrary to the Shachtmanite fabrications Murray is no more a "representative" of the workers than Truman. Murray like Truman represents the bosses, only Murray plays the role of a labor leader. No amount of "pressure" from below can force Murray to change his line as labor thug for Wall Street. All that such pressure can do is force Murray to adopt more effective anti-boss disguises to retain the misplaced confidence of the duped workers:

The Shachtmanites first raised the idea that Murray had a real choice to make as far back as the year 1941:

"Murray must make a choice. Either complete and militant leadership of the workers or become a captive of the bosses and their government."  
( Labor Action, June 23, 1941, Editorial page. )

Even a Shachtmanite worker who would insist that his leaders were really sincere in believing that Murray had a possibility of acting in the interests of the workers would have to allow that Murray continued to serve the bosses since the above was written in 1941. Is there any basis then for spreading the same idea in the year 1946 about the strike-breaker Murray? Is it possible that people who know Marxism inside out like Shachtman are simply "confused" about such a relatively obvious point about the role of Phil Murray? Let the thoughtful worker following the lead of the Workers Party ask himself that question.

A.B.  
December 1946

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* AN EXCERPT FROM THE POLITICAL \*  
 \* BIOGRAPHY OF LOUIS BUDENZ \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

After ten years of unbroken service to Stalinism in which time he knowingly supported every anti-working class crime of that black counter-revolutionary organization, Louis Budenz in October 1946 went over lock, stock and barrel to the Catholic Church. First pretending to believe in the doctrine of Stalin infallibility and in all the other Stalin legends, Budenz has now transferred his bought and paid for allegiance to push the myth of the Holy Ghost and the doctrine of papal infallibility. Viewing the development of a war atmosphere between Stalin on the one hand and the Anglo-American imperialists on the other, Budenz hastily jumped over to what he calculated will be the safer and winning side. In this respect, Budenz is not the first and certainly will not be the last in this particular species of Stalinist time-servers. Lying first for Stalinism he now lies directly for the bourgeoisie pretending that Stalinism and revolutionary Communism are one and the same and that Stalin aims at "world revolution."

The ease with which Budenz went over directly to the capitalists caused the Stalinist leadership to do a bit of "explaining" to the rank and file. Conveniently glossing over the last ten years of loyal service by Budenz, the Stalin bureaucrats suddenly remembered that Budenz has been an opportunist long before he entered the American Communist Party. This charge happens to be quite true. Budenz functioned as a stalking horse for the trade union fakers and for many years assiduously peddled the Musteite dis-pensation to uninformed workers. The essential point which is concealed is that the Stalin gang knew beforehand that Budenz was but a rotten labor careerist and picked him up as a hardy intellectual thug when he came sniffing around for a job to Foster-Browder and Company.

An essential phase in the political biography of Budenz was also noted in The Militant, organ of the Socialist Workers Party. This phase deals with the period of Budenz's membership in the Cannon-Muste Workers Party late in 1934 and early in 1935. It is interesting to observe that like Browder-Foster the Cannon-Shachtman leadership knew from the beginning that Budenz was a hardened careerist:

"Budenz had always been an anti-Marxist and American nationalist. He bitterly fought the AWP fusion with the Trotskyist organization. Then he could not prevent the fusion, he remained inside the new party to fight Trotskyism from within. Against the ideas of international socialism, he countered his own reactionary nationalism that he termed the 'American approach.'" ( Oct. 26, 1946 p. 7 My emphasis-A.B. )

Thus Budenz "had always been an anti-Marxist." He "bitterly fought" the fusion of the Trotskyites with the Muste organization and when he could not prevent the fusion he remained there "to fight Trotskyism from within." So far The Militant sticks strictly to the facts. How then did Cannon-Shachtman deal with this known and hardened reactionary? Significantly, those facts are not mentioned in the above-cited article. When the true story is known, the reason for this omission becomes quite obvious.

While fully aware of the rotten politics of Budenz, Cannon-Shachtman rewarded him with a leading post as part of a horse trade with Muste for

the fusion. Budenz was given the juicy plum of national organizer as the price for the "you scratch my back, and I'll scratch yours" proposition:

"Louis Budenz and Arne Swabeck will be the national organizers." ( The Militant, Dec. 8, 1934 )

The known "anti-Marxist" Budenz, was thus elevated to the top leadership where he could continue poisoning the workers with his opportunist ideas more effectively than he could as a rank-and-filer. Did the rank-and-file readers of The Militant know at that time about Budenz's opportunism and that he "bitterly fought" the fusion behind the scenes for his own reactionary purposes? Cannon-Shachtman made sure that no inkling of this got out publicly and instead told the workers the following about Budenz's attitude:

"Budenz Hails Party From Sickbed." ( Headline, Dec. 15, 1934 )

Budenz was pictured as highly enthusiastic with the new development and was played up in the Trotsky press as a sincere fighter in the interests of the workers. The same article went on to say: "Budenz was optimistic about the new party and sorry not to be able to get into the field at once." ( Ibid. )

The above was written at the end of the year 1934. But in his book, The History of American Trotskyism Cannon spills a few facts about Budenz at the time of fusion with Muste:

"By 1934 Budenz, who had no socialist background, was a 100 percent patriot, three-fourths a Stalinist, tired and somewhat sick and looking for a chance to sell out. He was a vicious opponent of the unification." ( p. 176 )

Cannon, of course, diplomatically neglected to add that this was the treacherous element which he agreed to elevate into the top leadership as part of his bargain with Muste.

As for Budenz's "enthusiasm" hailed by Cannon-Shachtman's paper, Cannon records in the above-mentioned book:

" Budenz, as one of the leaders of the American Workers Party, had automatically come over into the new party- but without any enthusiasm." (p. 207 My emphasis-A.B.)

That's how "optimistic" Budenz was about the new party!

Thus Cannon and Shachtman concealed the truth about this political hack, trumping up a non-existent enthusiasm and dabbing his rotten politics with a complete coat of Marxist whitewash. These facts are today buried by the Trotsky leaders and for a good reason.

There is another important aspect of the truth which is now distorted by the Trotsky press about their past attitude to Budenz. While still a member in the Cannon-Shachtman-Muste organization, Budenz used the medium of a known opportunist magazine to write openly of his anti-Marxist ideas and attacked the position of his own organization. The Trotsky leadership would have one believe that they then jumped to the defense of Marxism and that they "answered with a sharp attack against Budenz's anti-Marxism:"

"While still formally a member of the Trotskyists, he attacked the Trotskyist ideas publicly in the Modern Monthly, March 1935, three months after the fusion. The Militant answered with a sharp attack against Budenz's

anti-Marxism." ( The Militant, Oct. 26, 1946.)

The truth is that the "answer" to Budenz was officially given in The Militant in a series of articles by A.J. Muste, who bore fond feelings for his capable assistant. Budenz's article in the March 1935 issue of Modern Monthly claimed, among other monstrous falsifications, that the theoretical disputes in American "radicalism" were instigated by those evil Europeans who muddied the pure waters of the American labor movement. Budenz wanted an "American approach", meaning specifically an appeal to the most backward nationalistic prejudices instilled into the American workers by the capitalist propagandists. The reactionary nationalistic poison of Budenz dripped in every line of his article; it was really an ideological preparation for a jump to the C.P. which was moving to the ultra-right line in that period and reviving the American nationalistic traditions. Search as one will with a microscope, there doesn't appear even a remote phrase in Muste's answer to Budenz which could be construed as this "sharp attack against Budenz's anti-Marxism." On the contrary, the extreme nationalism of Budenz was talked out of existence by Muste who gave his old pal a clean bill of health on this crucial point:

"There is here, be it said in passing, a hint that it is only European radicalism which is afflicted with broils, that American radicalism would be free of them if these bad Europeans had not brought them over or if, perhaps, foolish Americans had not imitated the Europeans. There is surely no foundation in fact for such an assumption of the peaceableness of Americans red or any other color, and a tendency is evident here to slip into language which might easily be given a nationalistic interpretation WHICH ITS AUTHOR WOULD BE THE FIRST TO DISOWN." ( The New Militant, May 18, 1935. My capitals <sup>g</sup> AB)

The Trotskyite readers were assured by Muste that Budenz "would be the first to disown" any nationalistic interpretation of his ideas! That was the type of "education" given the workers by the Trotsky leaders in their organ. The supposed "sharp attack" against Budenz's open opportunism turns out to be a cover for Budenz.

It is interesting to observe the entirely different treatment accorded by the Cannon-Shachtman leadership to their internal opposition on the French Turn as compared with the attitude towards the honored "guest", Comrade Budenz. Although the Oehler-Stamm faction had accepted the Trotskyist myths and fables until 1934 as their ideological heritage, they did expose the rottenness of the Trotsky line on the "French Turn" towards Social Democracy in 1934-1935. Cannon-Shachtman feared any attack on their new opportunist line. The "opposition" of Budenz, on the other hand, exposed nobody and actually strengthened the hand of Cannon-Shachtman as "revolutionists." The anti-French Turn faction was bureaucratically suppressed by Cannon-Shachtman and when it tried to make its ideas public, it was unceremoniously expelled. But the known opportunist, Budenz, was rewarded immediately with a top post, and when he came out publicly in an anti-Marxist magazine with opportunist ideas he was still considered a member in good standing and referred to as "Comrade Budenz." Whereas the Oehler-Stamm faction allegedly committed a crime by coming out openly with the suppressed facts about the French Turn, Budenz was given a pat on the back for his flagrant breach of Cannon's discipline:

"In raising a discussion as to the real meaning of the term in a recent article (Modern Monthly, March 1935, 'For An American Revolutionary Approach'), Comrade Budenz has rendered a service." ( The New Militant, May 11, 1935 p. 3 )

When Budenz disdainfully rejected the Cannon-Shachtman overtures and went over to the C.P. anyhow, it was not through lack of trying by the Trotsky leaders who attempted to hang on to his coat tails.

These concealed facts around the Budenz incident in 1935 constitutes but another characteristic example of the methods employed by the Trotsky leaders in building their organization. This method is one of entangling the Trotsky workers with all varieties of labor swindlers ranging from the Stalinist gang, the old Musteites, the Social Democratic "stinking corpse," and now in the call for a labor party, with the trade union fakers.

A.B.  
December 1946

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

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

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

\*\*\* HAVE YOU SEEN OUR NEW PUBLICATION \*\*\*

P O L I T I C A L C O R R E S P O N D E N C E

of the WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

Some Copies of the First and Second Issues -- Are Still Available

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

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

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

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

## FROM THE ARCHIVES OF TROTSKYISM

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \*\*\* TROTSKY'S STATEMENT ON LENIN'S TESTAMENT \*\*\*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

Editorial Note:

In the last issue this publication reprinted in its entirety, one of the documents of the Trotsky-Opposition, the Declaration of October 16, 1926, to demonstrate to the reader that our charge against Trotsky's policy of cringing before the Stalin clique is no product of imagination.

In this issue we present Trotsky's statement on Max Eastman's disclosures in his book, "Since Lenin Died," published in 1925. In this book Eastman told of the existence of a Lenin letter (the famous "Testament"), which evaluated the party leadership and advocated the removal of Stalin from the post of General Secretary. Eastman told of the conspiracy in the top leadership of the Russian Communist Party to suppress this Lenin document and revealed some other dark machinations of the Stalin ring. Until the publication of Eastman's book the workers hadn't even heard of any Stalin clique or of such an astounding thing as a suppressed Lenin document. The Eastman revelations came like a bombshell to the uninformed workers following the Comintern, and they looked to the leadership in Moscow for an authoritative statement on Eastman's disclosures. In this respect the key figure was Trotsky, because Eastman had pictured him as the butt of Stalin's machinations.

Trotsky disavowed the existence of Lenin's Testament, pictured Stalin and his treacherous crew as "our leading comrades," and denounced Eastman for revealing a few facts about the crookedness of the Stalin ring. In view of the prevailing story of Trotsky's apologists that the criminal statement he made was "foisted" on him by Stalin, we call attention to several important aspects of the scandal.

Trotsky's story about a "foisted" statement was made many years later in answer to queries concerning his motivation in denying the true facts, while he was still in the Soviet Union and had the ear of the Russian and world masses. It is instructive, in this connection, to know of Trotsky's impulsive reaction to Eastman's personal proposal to print the facts about the suppressed Testament. Eastman met Trotsky accidentally and informed the latter of his intention to tell the story about the hidden Lenin document. Trotsky immediately became alarmed and warned Eastman to keep his mouth shut. The fortuitous nature of this meeting and Trotsky's spontaneous reaction shows that it was Trotsky's deliberate policy to keep the Lenin Testament hidden from the masses. Eastman writes:

"Subsequently I met him (Trotsky -Ed.) for a moment accidentally; I told him then that I know about The Testament of Lenin, and he told me to regard whatever I knew as an 'absolute secret.' That has been an additional reason for my delay in writing this article." ("Since Lenin Died", Footnote p.26)

The words "foisted" and "ultimatum" which Trotsky employed to excuse his unpardonable act conjure up the threat of execution by the GPU hanging over his head -- in the summer of 1925! The truth of the situation was that even three years later, after Trotsky had been expelled from the Politburo, the Central Committee, the Comintern Executive and the Party, after he had been exiled to Central Asia, the Stalin



clique would not dare place him under arrest. This fact is testified to by Trotsky himself: "In 1928 when I was expelled from the party and exiled to Central Asia it was still impossible to talk not only of execution but even of arrest." (Fourth International, November 1940.)

Far closer to the truth was the statement made by Trotsky to his friend Muralov: "My then statement on Eastman can be understood only as an integral part of our then line <sup>toward</sup> conciliation and peacemaking." (New International, Nov. 1934.)

That is what we have been telling the workers, but it is only a small part of the truth. The whole story is, as we have demonstrated with conclusive documentary proof, that Trotsky was himself involved in the original Stalinist bureaucratic development and was thus tied to Stalin. Hence the policy of conciliation with Stalin of shielding Stalin, and last but not least, a policy of political support to Stalin, was the basis of Trotsky's position. This policy is continued to this day by Cannon and all others who adopt the post-October Trotsky heritage.

In reprinting Trotsky's denial of Lenin's Testament, we call the attention of the reader to the fact that this document is the final text. The original statement, which Trotsky said he did not write but "only" signed, was objected to by some Stalin lackeys in France. Trotsky agreed to make the denial stronger by certain changes in the text and the below is the end product of Trotsky's revisions.

Reprinted From:

International Press Correspondence - (Imprecorr) Sept. 3, 1925, p.1004

FINAL TEXT OF TROTZKY'S LETTER ON EASTMAN'S BOOK: "SINCE LENIN DIED".

We publish below the final text of Comrade Trotzky's letter, in which he categorically condemns Eastman's work - which condemnation is entirely in accordance with the demands of the International. Ed.

Soon after my return from Sukhum to Moscow, a telegraphic inquiry from comrade Jackson, editor of the "Sunday Worker" in London, informed me of the publication of a book: "Since Lenin Died", which was used by the bourgeois press in order to attack our Party and the Soviet power. Although my reply to Jackson was published by the press at the time, it will be as well to repeat the first part of it here:

"The book by Eastman which you mention is unknown to me. The bourgeois newspapers quoting the book have not reached me. It need not be said that I categorically repudiate in advance any commentary directed against the Communist Party of Russia."

In the following part of my telegram I protested against the insinuations alleging that I was turning towards bourgeois democracy and towards freedom for trade.

I afterwards received the book in question ("Since Lenin Died") from comrade Inkpin, secretary of the Communist party of Great Britain, who at the same time sent me a letter to the same purport as comrade Jackson's telegram. I had no intention of reading Eastman's book, much less of reacting to it, being of the opinion that my telegram to Jackson, which was published everywhere by the British and foreign press, fully sufficed. But Party Comrades who had read the book expressed the opinion that since the author referred to conversations with me, my silence could be regarded as an indirect support of this book directed entirely against our Party.

This placed me under the obligation to devote more attention to Eastman's book, and above all to read it carefully through. On the basis of certain episodes in the inner life of our Party, the discussions on the methods of democracy in the Party, and the state regulation of our economics, Eastman arrives at conclusions directed entirely against our Party, and likely, if given credence, to discredit the Party as well as the Soviet power.

We shall first deal with a question which is not only of historical importance, but of living actuality at the present moment: the Red Army. Eastman asserts that the Red Army, owing to the change of persons, has been decomposed in its leadership; that it has lost its fighting capacity, etc. I do not know where Eastman has got all this absurd information. But its absurdity is obvious. At any rate we would not advise the imperialist governments to base their calculations on Eastman's revelations. Besides, he fails to observe that in thus characterising the Red Army he revives the Menshevist legend of the Bonapartist character of our army, its resemblance to a Pretorian guard. For it is plain that an army capable of "splitting" because its leader is changed is neither proletarian nor communist, but Bonapartist and Pretorian.

In the course of the book the writer quotes a large number of documents, and refers to episodes which he has heard second hand or even from more indirect sources. This little book also contains a considerable number of obviously erroneous and incorrect assertions. We shall only deal with the more important of these.

Eastman asserts in several places that the Central Committee has "concealed" from the Party a large number of documents of extraordinary importance, written by Lenin during the last period of his life. (The documents in question are letters on the national question, the famous "will", etc.) This is a pure slander against the Central Committee of our Party. Eastman's words convey the impression that these letters, which are of an advisory character and deal with the inner Party organisation, were intended by Lenin for publication. This is not at all in accordance with the facts. During the time of his illness Lenin repeatedly addressed letters and proposals to the leading bodies and Congresses of the Party. It must be definitely stated that all these letters and suggestions were invariably delivered to their destination and they were all brought to the knowledge of the delegates of the 12th and 13th Congresses, and have invariably exercised their influence on the decisions of the Party. If all of these letters have not been published, it is because the author did not intend their publication. Comrade Lenin has not left any "will"; the character of his relations to the Party, and the character of the Party itself, exclude the possibility of such a "will." The bourgeois and Menshevist press generally understands under the designation of "will" one of Comrade Lenin's letters (which is so much altered as to be almost illegible) in which he gives the Party some organisatory advice. The 13th Party Congress devoted the greatest attention to this and the other letters, and drew the conclusions corresponding to the situation obtaining. All talk with regard to a concealed or mutilated "will" is nothing but a despicable lie, directed against the real will of Comrade Lenin, and against the interests of the Party created by him.

Eastman's assertion, that the Central Committee was anxious to conceal (that is, not to publish) Comrade Lenin's article on the workers' and peasants' inspection, is equally untrue. The different standpoints held on this subject within the Central Committee- if it is possible to speak of a "difference of standpoints" at all in this case- were of a purely secondary significance, dealing solely with the question of whether the publication

of Lenin's article should be accompanied by a declaration from the Central Committee or not: a declaration pointing out that there was no occasion to fear a split.

But in this question also a unanimous decision was arrived at in the same session. All the members of the Political Bureau and of the Organisation Bureau of the Central Committee present, signed a letter addressed to the Party organisations containing (inter alia) the following passage:

"Without entering, in this purely informatory letter, into the criticism of the historically possible dangers pointed out at the time by comrade Lenin in his article, the members of the Political Bureau and of the organisational Bureau, consider it necessary, in order to avoid all possible misunderstandings, to declare unanimously that there is nothing in the inner activity of the Central Committee giving occasion to fear the danger of a "split".

Not only is my signature attached to this document along with the others signatures, but the text itself was drawn up by me. (27. January 1923)

In view of the fact that this letter, expressing the unanimous opinion of the Central Committee on Comrade Lenin's proposition with regard to the workers' and peasants' inspection, also bears the signature of comrade Kuibyshev, we have here a confutation of Eastman's assertion that comrade Kuibyshev was placed at the head of the workers' and peasants' inspection as "opponent" of Lenin's plan of organisation.

Eastman's assertions that the Central Committee confiscated my pamphlets or articles in 1923 or 1924, or at any other epoch, or by other means have prevented their publication are untrue, and are based on fantastic rumours.

Eastman is again wrong in asserting that Comrade Lenin offered me the post of chairman to the council of people's commissars, and of the council for labour and defence. I hear of this for the first time from Eastman's book.

An attentive perusal of Eastman's book would doubtless give me the opportunity of pointing out a number of other inaccuracies, errors, and misrepresentations. I do not however think that it would be of interest to go further.

The bourgeois press, especially the Menshevist press, make use of statements of Eastman, quote from his reminiscences, in order to emphasise his "close relations", his "friendship" with me (as my biographer) and by such indirect means attaching an importance to his conclusions which they have not and cannot have. I must therefore devote a few remarks to this matter.

The character of my real relations to Eastman is perhaps best shown by a business letter, written by me at a time before there was any thought of Eastman's book "Since Lenin Died".

During my stay in Sukhum I received from one of my friends in Moscow, a collaborator in the publication of my books, the manuscript of a book by an American journalist, M. Eastman: "Leo Trotzky, a youthful portrait." My collaborator informed me in his accompanying letter that the manuscript, which had been sent to the Stat Publishing Office by the writer, for the purpose of being published in the Russian language, had made a strange and unusual impression among us on account of its sentimental tone.

In my letter of 3. April 1925 I replied as follows:

"Even without being familiar with the contents of Eastman's manuscript, I am perfectly in agreement with you that the publication of the book is inopportune. Although you have been kind enough to send me the manuscript, I cannot read it. I have absolutely no inclination to do so. I readily believe that it does not suit our taste, especially our Russian and Communist taste.

Eastman has been endeavoring for a long time to convince me that it is difficult to interest the Americans in Communism, but that it is possible to interest them in the Communists. His arguments have been fairly convincing. For this reason I gave him certain help, of a limited nature. The letter which I sent him shows these limits<sup>1</sup>; I did not know that he had the intention of publishing this book in Russia, or I should probably have advised the State Publishing Office at that time not to publish it. I cannot however prevent Eastman from publishing this book abroad; he is a "free writer"; for a time he has lived in Russia and collected material; at present he is in France, if not in America. I am not sufficiently intimate with him to ask him as a private favour not to publish this book. And such a request would hardly be in place."

I repeat once more that the subject of this letter was a biographical sketch, the description of my youth up to about 1902. But the tone of my letter leaves no room for doubt on the nature of my relations to Eastman, relations which differ in no way from those maintained by me to other foreign communists or "sympathisers" who have turned to me for help in understanding the October revolution, our Party and the Soviet state - there can be no question of anything more.

Eastman sneers with vulgar aplomb at my "Don Quixotry" in my relations to the comrades of the Central Committee, of whom I have spoken in friendly terms even in the midst of the most embittered discussion. Eastman seems to think himself called upon to correct my "error", and he characterises the leading comrades of our Party in a manner which cannot be designated as anything else but calumny.

We see from the above that Eastman has attempted to erect his construction on completely rotten foundations. He seizes upon isolated incidents occurring within our party in the course of some discussion, in order by means of distorting the meaning of the facts and exaggerating the relations in a ridiculous manner, to slander our Party and undermine the confidence in it.

It seems to me however that the attentive and thoughtful reader will not require to examine into the assertions made by Eastman and his documents (which is not possible for all) but that it suffices to ask: "If we assume that the malicious characterisation of our leading Party comrades given by Eastman is only partly correct, how is it possible that this Party should have emerged from long years of illegal struggle, how could it stand at the head of masses of millions carried through the greatest revolution of the world, and further the formation of revolutionary parties in other countries?"

There is no sincere worker who will believe in the picture painted by Eastman. It contains within itself its own refutation. Whatever Eastman's intentions may be, this piece of botched work is none the less objectively a tool of counter-revolution, and can solely serve the ends of the incarnate enemies of communism and of the revolution.

1. July 1925.

L. Trotsky

1) On 22. May 1925 I sent the following reply to Eastman's repeated requests:

"I shall do my utmost to assist you by means of certain information. But I cannot agree to read your manuscript, for this would make me responsible not only for the facts, but for the characterisations and estimates as well. This is of course impossible. I am prepared to undertake the responsibility, if only a limited one, for the information on the facts which I send you in reply to your request. For everything else you alone bear the