

THE BULLETIN

THE DISASTER IN THE SOVIET UNION AND THE TROTSKYITES

*LABOR ACTION'S OWN "FACTS" ON MALAYA
AND BURMA* -George Marlen

THE TROTSKYITES'
"REVOLUTIONARY"
MASS WORK

- J. C. Hunter

A "UNITED FRONT"
AND ITS
AFTERMATH

WHAT ROAD FOR THE INDIAN MASSES - "1776" OR "OCTOBER 1917"

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION
TWO POSITIONS ON "THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE"

THE RED STAR PRESS

P. O. BOX 67

STATION D

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
The Disaster in the Soviet Union and the Trotskyites	1
<u>Labor Action's Own "Facts" on Malaya and Burma</u>	8
The Trotskyites' "Revolutionary" Mass Work	
J. C. Hunter	12
A "United Front" and its After- math	22
The Road for the Indian Masses - "1776" or "October 1917"	
George Marlen	25
For the French Workers: Bourgeois or Proletarian Traditions	30
<hr/>	
<u>THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION</u> Two Positions on "The United States of Europe"	33

Address Communications to:

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

**THE DISASTER IN THE SOVIET UNION
AND THE TROTSKYITES**

AS matters stand today, the Soviet Union, undermined for almost two decades by the counter-revolutionary Stalinist bureaucracy, faces certain destruction. The most crucial task of the advanced workers is to determine whose policy can provide the Soviet Union with a genuine defense. It is the Stalinist rulers and their reactionary political line who have brought matters to their present tragic state. The key point, therefore, in evaluating any policy which is advanced as a defense of the Soviet Union, is to see what relation it establishes between the workers and the Stalinist bureaucracy. Does the policy place the workers on a clear-cut line of overthrowing Stalinism, or does it teach the workers that for some reason or other it is correct to support Stalin and his bureaucracy? Does it make it unequivocally clear that under Stalinist rule the Soviet Union faces inevitable and unavoidable defeat, or does it pose the possibility of a successful defense and even victory for the Soviet Union under Stalinism? These are the acid-test questions that decide whether the policy is one which actually leads to victory for the workers of the Soviet Union or to defeat and a bourgeois fascist military dictatorship.

In The Militant of August 8, 1942 the conditions for preserving the Soviet Union are stated in the following terms:

"To preserve the Soviet Union the Soviet masses must rid themselves of Stalin, they must convert this war into a revolutionary war, they must restore Soviet democracy."

Is this formulation correct? Can

this line lead to a genuine defense and the possibility of victory for the Soviet Union? The answer is: Yes! It is absolutely correct; it is the only line that can lead to a genuine defense and victory for the Soviet Union. Every worker is duty-bound to support this position. It is stated in crystal-clear terms: the Soviet Union cannot be preserved unless the masses rid themselves of Stalin and his gang, transform the war into a war for proletarian revolution and establish a genuine workers' democratic regime. It is a positive and irrefutable fact that Stalin and his bureaucracy can bring the workers nothing but disaster. The Trotskyite leaders themselves accurately observe this fact about the Stalinist leadership: "These policies and this leadership cannot bring anything but disaster." ("The Meaning of the Fall of Sevastopol," The Militant, July 11, 1942.) Thus far, the Trotskyite formulations are absolutely correct. If these formulations represented the real and fundamental Trotskyite line, every revolutionary worker would be obligated to proclaim openly that on this foremost question the Trotskyite leaders hold to a truly Marxist position.

A careful examination of the Trotskyite line, however, discloses that the above-cited correct formulations do not at all represent the actual position of the Trotskyite leaders. Behind these accurate formulations there lurks the actual Trotskyite policy directly negating the line of these formulations. This real policy is embodied in a series of formulations made at different times.

According to the sense of the above correct formulations, the condi-

tion for the victory of the Soviet Union is the overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy. While Stalinism rules, victory is impossible, for the policies of the ruling clique lead only to disaster. The workers, while fighting the imperialist armies, must bring about the overthrow of Stalinism, and thus create the conditions for the possibility of victory. But, a different formulation given by Trotsky in his "Good Soldier" thesis reverses the whole matter and lays down the illusion that victory is possible while the Stalinist bureaucracy is in power. The thesis reads:

"In the Soviet Union, I would try to be a good soldier, win the sympathy of the soldiers, and fight well. Then, at a good moment, when victory is assured, I would say: 'Now we must finish with the bureaucracy.' (The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 289. Our emphasis.)"

The chronology of the events in this thesis is clear: fight well, victory is assured at some moment or other, and then finish with the bureaucracy. Obviously, according to this thesis, this possible "assured victory" is supposed to take place while Stalinism rules and precedes the finishing with the bureaucracy. This thesis is in irreconcilable antagonism with the correct position which we cited earlier.

How does it happen that Trotsky ever came out with such a position? Is this position a peculiar accident, an isolated, chance remark, or does it represent the basic Trotskyite line? With what else in the Trotskyite line is this position connected?

If victory under Stalinist rule is possible or even can be assured, as Trotsky posed it, then according to this logic the Stalinist bureaucracy must fulfill some positive and therefore necessary function in the defense of the Soviet Union. This indeed is the Trotskyite line:

"So long as the Soviet bureaucracy has not been removed by the proletariat - a task which will eventually be accomplished - it fulfills a necessary function in the defense of the workers' state." (L. Trotsky, Bulletin of the Opposition, January 1935, #41. Quoted by Trot-

sky in The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 493.)

Thus, on the one hand, the Trotskyites tell the workers that in order to preserve the Soviet Union it is necessary to remove the Stalinist bureaucracy, that the Stalinist policies and rule lead the Soviet Union to nothing but disaster, and on the other hand, they ascribe a "necessary function" to the Stalinist bureaucracy "in the defense of the workers' State."

What kind of a "necessary function" can this disaster-creating bureaucracy fulfill? Its record speaks for itself. Ostensibly in the defense of the Soviet Union, the Stalinist bureaucracy has disoriented the Russian and the international workingclass politically, has betrayed the masses of Germany, France, Poland, Czechoslovakia and other countries to fascism, has bureaucratically warped the economy, has disrupted the military efficiency of the army, has plundered the fruits of the workers' and peasants' toil through graft, bribery, theft and usurpation and has strangled all the elementary rights of the workers secured through epoch-making sacrifices in the October Revolution and the Civil War. The Stalinist bureaucracy thus has been fulfilling the function of a destroyer, not a defender of the workers' State. This is a fact which gives the lie to Trotsky's story that Stalin and his bureaucracy fulfill "a necessary function in the defense of the workers' State."

When one holds, as do the Trotskyites, that the Stalinist bureaucracy fulfills a necessary function in the defense of the Soviet Union, it is only logical that one's actual position is support to Stalin and his bureaucracy, with the correct formulations against Stalinism serving as a protective cover for this pro-Stalinist line:

"With the Left Opposition, we declared many times we will sustain Stalin and his bureaucracy, and we repeat it now. We will sustain Stalin and his bureaucracy in every effort it makes to defend the new form of property against imperialist attacks. At the same time we try to defend the new forms of property against Stalin and his bureaucracy, against inner attacks

against the new form of property. That is our position." (Leon Trotsky in The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 282.)

This is obviously a position of so-called "critical support" to Stalinism. The form it takes is: In so far as Stalin defends the workers' State, we support him; in so far as he undermines the workers' State, we oppose him. This position of "in so far as" recalls to mind the notorious position of Stalin in March 1917, prior to the arrival of Lenin, with respect to the Provisional Government. Stalin gave "critical support" to Russian imperialism, masking his support with this story of "in so far as" the Provisional Government "fortifies" the revolution:

"In so far as the Provisional Government fortifies the steps of the revolution, to that extent we must support it; but, in so far as it is counter-revolutionary, support to the Provisional Government is not permissible." (Stalin at the Bolshevik Conference, March 1917.)

The arrival of Lenin put an end to this opportunist farce of ascribing to the Provisional Government a "dual function" of on the one hand "fortifying" the revolution and on the other hand undermining it. Lenin unequivocally opposed the line of "critical support"; he fought against any support to the Provisional Government, masked or open. Stalin's line would have led to the establishment of a bourgeois military dictatorship in Russia; Lenin's line led to the October Revolution.

This line of "in so far as" has always been the official and fundamental policy of the Trotskyites with respect to the Stalinist bureaucracy. In the clearest possible terms, it was formulated by Trotsky as follows:

"A complete and unqualified support in so far as the bureaucracy defends the boundaries of the Soviet Republic and the foundations of the October revolution; an outspoken criticism in so far as the bureaucracy hinders by its administrative zigzags the defense of the revolution and of socialist construction." (What Next, p. 127.)

Does this position on the Stalinist bureaucracy correspond to reality? There is no such political duality as a reactionary force performing progressive functions in the interests of the October Revolution. Despite Trotsky's statement that the Stalinist bureaucracy "defends the boundaries of the Soviet republic and the foundations of the October revolution," the actual truth is that this "defense" consists of boastful words and of deeds which render the borders of the Soviet Union historically defenseless against world imperialism. Few people know this as well as the Trotskyite leaders. The only way in which those borders and those foundations can be defended is by the extension of the proletarian revolution in Europe, Asia and throughout the capitalist world. Few people know this also so well as the Trotskyite leaders, as their correct statements, with which they camouflage their support to the Stalinist bureaucracy, indicate.

* * *

The Stalinist bureaucrats have shown a great skill in concealing their counter-revolutionary policies with correct-sounding statements. To give an illustration. In general they create the impression that they stand for the independence of India. At the same time they give the workers a line of support to British imperialism. How do they cover this up? By the clever maneuver of telling the workers that the fight for independence is "subordinated" to the needs of the struggle against fascism. With this line of "subordination" the Stalinist bureaucrats postpone the independence of India to doomsday. The Trotskyite leaders understand very well what the results of this policy of "subordination" will be. In The Militant of August 15, 1942, they cite Trotsky's exposure of this slick trick:

"Communists, according to Manuilsky, 'subordinate the realization of this right of secession...in the interests of defeating fascism.' In other words, in the event of war between England and France over colonies, the Indian people must support their present slave owners, the British imperialists." (Indicated omission in the original.)

This is a correct interpretation of the "subordinate" trickery. But what do we find when we examine the Trotskyite position in relation to the

Stalinist bureaucracy and to the question of its removal as the only correct path towards the genuine defense of the Soviet Union? "Subordination" of the struggle against the bureaucracy presumably in the interests of fighting against imperialism!

"But our struggle against the bureaucracy remains subordinated to the war against imperialism. That is true on the political plane, where we consider our criticism of the parasitic oligarchy as the method of best arming the country against imperialism, and it is also true on the military plane where practical actions against the bureaucracy are subordinated to the needs for defense of the country." (Fourth International, Oct. 1941, p. 231. Our emphasis.)

This position is directly connected with the Trotskyite line of sustaining Stalin and his bureaucracy "in so far as" and of creating the illusion that victory can be assured with Stalinism in power (Good Soldier thesis). By their "subordination" thesis the Trotskyites create an artificial separation between the struggle against the bureaucracy and the struggle on the military front. They give the impression that the struggle against the bureaucracy can in some way impair the struggle on the military front. But what are the facts? While the Stalinist bureaucracy is in power, the needs of the military front against imperialism cannot be fulfilled, for these needs demand in the first place the possibility of victory which does not exist under Stalinism. A genuine defense means one which presents at least a possibility of victory. Such a possibility can exist only under the condition that a Marxist leadership assumes control of the Soviet Union and establishes itself as a guiding factor within the international working class. The Stalinist-controlled "defense" is a gross deception. To speak of "subordinating" the struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy to the needs of the military front is to give the impression that under Stalinist rule the military front constitutes a real fight against imperialism. This impression is an illusion-creating line.

* * *

Many workers undoubtedly have the fear that the overthrow of the Stalin-

ist bureaucracy may weaken the military front due to several factors. Large numbers of Stalin's military and economic flunkies who now occupy administrative posts will very likely flee in the event of a political revolution in the Soviet Union. Seeking to save their skin from the workers' wrath, many of these putrid agents will probably desert their posts, try to organize forces against the workers, go over to the imperialist armies, etc. The workers fear that this may cause a disruption of the military front, since it will take the workers some time to become reorganized under the new revolutionary leadership. Such fears are entirely one-sided, for they overlook the fact that with the overthrow of Stalinism and the establishment of a revolutionary regime, the military front will quickly be strengthened. The revolutionary regime will cause disintegration of the imperialist armies as did the Red Army propaganda of Lenin's time. Even if the imperialist armies make some advances due to the momentary weakening caused by a proletarian upheaval against the bureaucracy in the Soviet Union, they will pay tenfold for their depredations by butting up against a wall of revolutionary politics which will sweep forward under the power of the new Bolshevik regime. With the Stalinist regime in power, as we have stated, there is not even the possibility of victory. With a new revolutionary regime, this possibility appears on the scene. A political revolution in the Soviet Union, therefore, is the chief requirement of the day. Perhaps the workers will have to pay for such an achievement — and the poison of two decades of Stalinism cannot be eliminated without some cost to the workers — it is absolutely essential that the task be met without flinching. Above all, the workers must not fall into the trap of accepting the position of "subordinating" the overthrow of Stalinism to the needs of the Military front, because of the fear that a political upheaval may momentarily weaken the latter. They must look forward to the final outcome, to the two alternatives, either sure destruction of the Soviet Union under Stalinism, or by the overthrow of Stalinism through a workers' political revolution the creation of a possibility of victory over the imperialist armies. The Trotskyite leaders play upon the fears of the workers, directing them along an ave-

nue of political paralysis through the "subordination" thesis.

* * *

There are two dangers besetting the workers. One is the Trotskyite pro-Stalinist position of "critical support" to Stalinism. The other is the so-called ultra-Leftist line which advocates a policy of disruption of the military front, labelling this policy "revolutionary defeatism" in the Soviet Union. The correct position has nothing in common with either the Cannonite disguised pro-Stalinist line or the so-called ultra-Leftist "revolutionary defeatism" in the Soviet Union. The correct line is to create the conditions for the victory of the Soviet Union by the revolutionary overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy and the establishment of a Bolshevik regime, while holding the military front.

The Trotskyite leaders, who have a line of "sustaining Stalin and his bureaucracy" under the cover of an "in so far as" clause, who ascribe a "necessary function" to Stalinism, who urge the workers to "subordinate" the fight against Stalinism in the sphere of both political criticism and practical actions, shed crocodile tears about the disastrous condition of the military front in the Soviet Union:

"Had the masses proceeded from the beginning to rid themselves of the bureaucratic millstone around their necks, to restore Soviet democracy and embarked upon a policy of revolutionary war against the Nazis, the military situation would undoubtedly have been infinitely more favorable for them today." (The Militant, August 8, 1942.)

Surely this is a low mark of revolting hypocrisy and duplicity!

Who was it that was outstanding in helping to tie the "bureaucratic millstone" around the neck of the toilers of the Soviet Union? At the time when Lenin, greatly handicapped by illness, nevertheless began to fight for the removal of Stalin from power, who was it that said to Stalin's closest partner, Kamenev, "I am against removing Stalin"? It was Trotsky. (See L. Trotsky, My Life, p. 486.)

Who was it that in 1940 for the first time came out with a definite hint that Stalin poisoned Lenin? It was Trotsky. (See Liberty, August

1940, article "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?") For sixteen long years Trotsky kept buried in his mind what he knew about Lenin's death. (See our pamphlet, "After Sixteen Years of Silence".) Having grown immensely powerful under Trotsky's protection, Stalin could afford to, and did disregard Trotsky's belated and ineffective revelations.

Who was it, that in full knowledge of Lenin's fight against Stalin and Stalin's policies, not only kept this fight secret from the workers, but at the VII All-Ukrainian Party Conference in the Spring of 1923 presented Stalin's policies as Leninist? Who turned the Twelfth Congress of the Russian Party, in April 1923 — the very Congress which Lenin designated as the battlefield against Stalin but was prevented from fighting by illness — who turned that Congress into a boisterous Stalinist affair of consolidation of bureaucratic power? It was Trotsky. (See our pamphlet, "Did Trotsky Collaborate with Stalin?")

Who cooperated with Stalin in concealing from the workers Lenin's "Will" which had been read on May 22, 1924 in the secret session of chosen bureaucrats at the Thirteenth Congress of the Russian Party? Who shielded Stalin from Eastman's exposure and lied to the workers of the whole world? It was Trotsky.

"Comrade Lenin has not left any 'Will'..... All talk with regard to a concealed or mutilated 'will' is nothing but a despicable lie.... There is no sincere worker who will believe in the picture painted by Eastman." (L. Trotsky, Imprecorr, September 3, 1925.)

Who, in June 1926, after Stalin's "Comintern" jointly with the British trade union fakery had betrayed the General Strike in England, stirred the deceived Russian workers with deadly lies about Stalin's "Comintern" transferring the Bolshevik methods of 1917 to the English soil? It was Trotsky. (See our article, "Myths and Facts About Trotsky's Position on the Anglo-Russian Committee," THE BULLETIN, Aug. 1942.)

Who was it that in the infamous "Declaration of the Opposition" on October 16, 1926 urged upon the anti-Stalin workers the line of uncondi-

tionally submitting to the dictates of Stalin's Central Committee, Central Control Commission, Party Congress, and the line of denying the right to carry on any sort of agitation against Stalin's "Comintern" and Stalin's "C.P." of the Soviet Union? It was Trotsky and his then lieutenants, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Piatakov, et al.:

"We consider the decisions of the XIV Party Congress of the Central Committee and of the Central Control Commission as absolutely binding for us, and we shall unconditionally submit to them and carry them out. We call upon all comrades who share our views to do the same.... We emphatically deny the right of those who carry on an agitation of any sort against the Comintern, the C.P. of the Soviet Union or the Soviet Union, to lay claim to any solidarity with us." (Declaration of Trotsky, Zinoviev, etc. Inprecorr, 1926, #68, p.1173. Our emphasis.)

Who was it that for many years tied the workers to the mirage of "correcting" the treacherous, counter-revolutionary Stalinist "Comintern," at the same time urging them to support Stalin's international organizations - with "criticism," of course? Who was it that exhorted the German workers to vote for Stalin's Thaelmann? Who cried "All eyes to the Communist Party!?" It was Trotsky. (See Germany, What Next, p. 186.) Who by this method helped Stalin open the path for the victory of Hitler in Germany and thus for the present imperialist attack on the Soviet Union? It was Trotsky and his Cannons and Shachtmans!

The Trotskyite line of "critical support" to Stalin (i.e., support camouflaged with "criticism") is an old one. In the bureaucratic degeneration of the Soviet leadership in the period of 1922-1925, Trotsky formed a political bloc with the Stalinist "Troika" (Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev) to share power with them. The subsequent drive of the Stalin clique to oust Trotsky entirely from power left him no other line than to support Stalinism and cover up this support with "criticism." Trotsky was converted into a "loyal opposition." His policy was admittedly one of "peacemaking and conciliation" with Stalin (See Trotsky's letter to Muralov, New Inter-

national, November 1934, p.126). When Hitler came to power in 1933, primarily through the treachery of Stalinism, the shock of the workers was terrific. Amongst the anti-Stalinist workers there was disappointment with the Trotskyite line of "correcting" the Stalinist. Meeting the needs of this situation, Trotsky and his Cannons and Shachtmans put on an air of breaking irrevocably with the Stalinist bureaucracy. The Trotskyite leaders began to call themselves a "Fourth International" thus giving the impression of complete independence from Stalinism. But the old line of "critical support" to Stalinism continued fundamentally, with more subtle camouflage. The "independent" organizational form assumed by the Trotskyite leaders after Hitler came to power is but a new disguise of the old pro-Stalinist line. Today, this pro-Stalinist essence is composed of Trotsky's "Good Soldier" thesis, the yarn about Stalinism's "necessary function," the direct exhortation to "sustain Stalin and his bureaucracy" under the protective cover of an "in so far as" clause, and the thesis of "subordinating" the fight against Stalinism.

* * *

Among the Trotskyite demagogic cover-statements which serve as a screen for the pro-Stalinist line, we read this assertion:

"Heroism and morale alone will not win the war. Above all a correct policy is necessary. It is not yet too late!" ("Stalin Policy Means Disaster," The Militant, Aug. 8, 1942.)

We don't know whether the Soviet Union is past hope or not. Nobody knows. This positive assertion "It is not yet too late!" has been often used by the bureaucrats of the Comintern, by Lovestone and by Trotsky to describe a perfectly hopeless situation. The flunkies of the big bureaucrats term this "revolutionary optimism." We are neither optimistic nor pessimistic, for we realize that history will establish whether at this terrible period in the life of the toiling masses it is not yet too late to save the remnants of the October revolution or whether the destruction caused by the politics of Stalin, Trotsky and other opportunists is beyond repair. But we do know certain things quite definitely. One of these things is

that regardless what history holds, whether the Soviet Union will perish under the wheels of Hitler's mechanized divisions or whether a new revolutionary wave will arise to dash Fascism to fragments, every revolutionary worker owes it to his class to fight now to save the remnants of the October conquests. The first step along that line is to break with Stalinism

not only subjectively, as did the honest Trotskyite workers, but also objectively - a thing they have yet to accomplish. In order for the anti-Stalinist workers to break with Stalinism objectively, it is necessary for them to break with the Trotskyite leadership and join in the work of creating a genuine Marxist movement.

** ** *

— THE DEFENSE

OF THE

SOVIET UNION —

FOR ARTICLES WHICH ANALYZE ITS
MANY PROBLEMS, WHICH EXPOSE THE
DECEPTIONS OF THE OPPORTUNISTS
AND WHICH PRESENT THE MARXIST
LINE --- READ -

"UNCONDITIONAL DEFENSE OF THE USSR" (An
Examination of the Trotskyite Line)

FOR REVOLUTIONARY DEFENSE OF THE SOVIET
UNION

FALSE DEFENDERS OF THE SOVIET UNION

WEATHER SHACHTMAN

THE IMPERIALIST ATTACK ON THE SOVIET UNION

THE TROTSKYITES AND THE SOVIET UNION

THE QUESTION OF NATIONAL EQUALITY IN THE
U.S.S.R.

FREE COPIES

Address:
P.O.Box 67
Station D.
New York

LABOR ACTION'S OWN "FACTS" ON
MALAYA AND BURMA

WHEN the Japanese began to advance into Burma early this year, the British had at their disposal, besides their own forces within Burma, a big Chinese army standing on the border. Numerically, the British forces within Burma, according to reports, were approximately equal to those the Japanese brought in at the start. Roughly, this amounted to two divisions. The Japanese sent in reinforcements until their forces in Burma amounted, according to the average estimate, to 50,000-60,000 men. The logic of the situation, if the British imperialists were pursuing a policy of actually fighting and defeating the Japanese fascist forces, called for the British to bring in reinforcements. Since the claim is made by the "democratic" imperialists that they and the Chinese are allies, one would expect that the British would make use of the Chinese army on the border of Burma, which, according to reports, numbered a half million well-equipped and well-trained troops.

The British policy, however, was just the opposite. For some "mysterious" reason the British rulers put every possible obstacle in the way of making use of the Chinese forces on the Burmese border. This became so obvious that even the bourgeois press found it inconvenient to conceal it. The fact slipped through more or less openly in print. Out of the large mass of documentary evidence of this fact, we cite a few examples.

In a very long and embittered letter to the Editor of The New York Times, the prominent Chinese bourgeois author, Lin Yutang, complained:

"Chinese soldiers were ready at the Burma border in December. In

fact, plans for defense of Rangoon were offered earlier and rejected. A plan for Chinese defense of Burma was submitted to the British Government as early as February 1941. By political chicanery it was sidetracked." (New York Times, May 31, 1942. Our emphasis.)

This Chinese bourgeois clearly sees the "democratic" policy is not to fight Japan, but he does not understand why. In his letter he states that it is a matter of "appeasement." Meanwhile, his letter gives some very revealing information on how the British rulers acted in regard to the Chinese troops. He relates that even when the Japanese occupied an important point in February, the Chinese troops were not permitted to enter:

"When Moulmein fell in the beginning of February, Chinese soldiers were still not permitted to cross the border." (Ibid. Our emphasis.)

We draw attention to the words "not permitted" because this expression was appearing in the bourgeois press with remarkable frequency. It was reported that the British rulers time and again were receiving requests to permit the Chinese forces to strike at the Japanese rear in Burma. Whether the "democratic" bourgeoisie liked it or not, the attention of many people was becoming focused on this peculiar situation. Comments appeared in all the big New York papers, setting the tone for the whole American press. The British rulers, having a large Chinese army on their hands and evidently pursuing a policy of awiding using it against the Japanese Fascists, naturally had to make some pretense, especially before the Chinese "liber-

als" and the masses generally, that the fight against the Japanese fascists was meant seriously. Therefore some Chinese soldiers were permitted to cross the border, but only when the Japanese were entering the important city of Rangoon. The above-cited Chinese writer mentions this:

"These soldiers were permitted to cross the border on March 7 and 8, when Rangoon fell." (Ibid.)

And even then, the British rulers had placed their flunkys on the border to count heads to make sure that not too many Chinese soldiers came in:

"And then there were ridiculous bureaucrats standing at the border, with pencil and paper, to check the number of Chinese that got into Burma, to be sure that not too many came in and that the same number should leave Burma when the war should be over." (Ibid.)

Advanced workers, of course, understand that this business of the "ridiculous bureaucrats" was not an accident, but represents the policy of the higher-ups, the real rulers. This same story of the British agents at the Burmese border appeared also in other sources:

"In Burma, there was much talk about Chinese aid, but British agents up at the border, armed with notebooks, kept count of the number of Chinese allowed in - and they were pitifully few." (Ed. Hunter, New York Post, May 18, 1942. Our emphasis.)

It is obvious that the British use of Chinese troops in Burma was a mere sham.

The case of the "democratic" imperialists avoiding to make use of the Chinese forces in the Burmese situation is quite clear. If any use at all was made of some of the Chinese troops it was obviously for show purposes, with no serious intention of preventing the Japanese fascist forces from occupying Burma.

The refusal of the British rulers to use the Chinese troops in Burma was nothing new. Before that they had refused to use Chinese troops in the Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaya situations. This also became known in the

bourgeois press which did not find it convenient to conceal this ticklish matter. In regard to the Hong Kong affair, a prominent bourgeois paper, The New York Post, contained this information:

"A year ago, 200,000 to 500,000 trained Chinese soldiers were located in Kwantung and Kwansi Provinces waiting - anxiously - to cooperate in preparations for the defense of Hong Kong. Permission was sought to assist in constructing supply and defense lines that could have immeasurably strengthened the British crown colony while there was still time.

"That permission failed to come. And Hong Kong fell as the price of its isolation." (Dec. 29, 1941.)

Sometime later, when the Japanese were moving toward Singapore and Malaya, this policy of the British rulers continued. The bourgeois press was constrained - it sometimes engages in this "loyal criticism" - to ask the question--

"Who is blocking permission for China to send hundreds of thousands of trained soldiers to strike at the rear of the Japanese invasion forces threatening Singapore and the Burma Road. The troops are available. They are idle in China's Hunan Province. Chungking has offered them. What stops them from going?" (The New York Post, Dec. 31, 1941.)

Two days earlier this same paper had given the answer to this question:

"They are waiting - anxiously - for the permission to come to the assistance of the desperately-pressed British forces defending the approach to Singapore. But the permission fails to come." (December 29, 1941.)

The policy of the British rulers to refuse to employ Chinese troops against the Japanese fascists was a general one - for that matter it still continues. The "alliance" of the British with China "against" the Japanese fascists is patently of a most "peculiar" character. Its "peculiarity" points to the factual existence of the inverse kind of alliance, with the paper British-Chinese "alliance" serving as a cover for that hidden inter-

imperialist collaboration.

But when people have a political line which is opposed to reality, they are compelled to stand things on their head and invent a whole series of facts. A remarkable instance of this is offered by Labor Action, the Shachtmanite organ, in its "analysis" of the relation of the "democratic" imperialists to China. The Shachtmanites, flying in the face of the whole course of events before and after September 1939, hold that the imperialists are engaged in a real, life-and-death struggle amongst themselves, like in 1914-1918. Hence it is necessary for these "Marxists" to present a picture of the imperialists actually fighting. Since reality is the opposite, the Shachtmanites have to introduce fantasies. One of these fantasies is their yarn about the "democratic" imperialists making use of the Chinese army against the Japanese occupation of Burma. Shachtman's paper goes to the lengths of using the case of Burma as "an excellent example" to prove its assertion that the "democratic" rulers strive to make use of the Chinese troops "in the imperialist war." Using the term "we" to mean the "democratic" rulers, Labor Action presents this myth:

"Today, when we seek to use China's masses and China's soldiers in the imperialist war (the use of Chinese troops to retain Burma for the British Empire is an excellent example of what we have in mind).."
(July 20, 1942.)

The above citation requires no extended comment. It is an obvious distortion of the most elementary facts.

Indeed, Shachtman's paper carried its inventions to the extreme degree of pretending that the British made use of the Chinese armies not only in Burma, but also in Malaya "and a few other points":

"...we found Chinese troops were mighty handy for use in Malaya, Burma and a few other points. They could serve well in the imperialist struggle with Japan." (Ibid.)

Only those who are oblivious to the most rudimentary facts will be taken in by these inventions of the Shachtmanite paper.

Despite the glaring fact, more vivid with every new phase, that there is no real struggle on the part of the "democratic" rulers to stop the Fascist forces, that their peculiar inaction suggests the very opposite policy, the Workers Party does not budge an inch from the position that there is a real war among the imperialist powers. The entire so-called "imperialist war," from the very outset, presents an enormous collection of circumstances illogical from the military point of view - illogical, if one regards the situation as a real war. When Hitler's Panzer divisions and air armada, unfolding great striking power, entered Poland and began a real war there, ravaging towns and villages, wreaking its formidable and appalling rage particularly upon the workers and peasants, the "democratic" powers sent no aid to Poland. That country was transformed into an inferno, while the "democratic" imperialist tactics in the main were confined to dropping bourgeois leaflets over Germany, and occupying a wood on the so-called Western Front - which wood was promptly and quietly evacuated after their "ally" Poland had been ground under the wheels of the Nazi war machine. Then followed a long "Sitzkrieg," with both the "Allied" and the Nazi troops idling away months of time. This was followed by the Nazi occupation of Norway on the heels of the so-called "greatest naval battle since Jutland" supposedly taking place in the Skaggerak. This "battle," from the sense of Churchill's subsequent statement that the surface ships of the British Navy had not been in the Skaggerak during the Nazi occupation of Norway, obviously took place only in the newspapers. It was a few weeks later that the world was electrified by the newspaper cry about the so-called "Battle of France," which also never took place as was later admitted in the capitalist press. The "democratic" imperialists opened the path for the Nazis into France to establish Fascism therein and facilitate the attack on the Soviet Union.

While "strange" and "mysterious" events were occurring, such as the ferrying of the Nazi Panzer divisions to Africa across the British-controlled Mediterranean and the see-saw "campaigns" in the Libyan desert, an incessant rain of "explanations" was coming down upon the heads of the workers who were sickened by the unin-

errupted advance of the Fascist monster. The Shachtman-led Workers Party was adding its share of "explanations," rejecting the only answer that fits the picture, namely, that world imperialism acting as a

unit in disguised collaboration is employing the Fascist troops in one country after another, and carrying out the destruction of the remnants of proletarian revolution in the former Tzarist empire.

** ** *

WHY DO THE OPPORTUNISTS HAVE TO INVENT "FACTS" ABOUT THE SO-CALLED "SECOND WORLD WAR" ?

WHY DO THE TROTSKYITE LEADERS HAVE TO CONCOCT "BATTLEFRONTS" WHERE THERE ARE NONE ?

WHAT ARE THE REAL FACTS WHICH BROUGHT THE "SECOND WORLD WAR" ON THE HISTORICAL SCENE AS THE "PHONEY WAR" ?

MANY ARTICLES IN THE BULLETIN CONTAIN THE ANSWER TO THESE QUESTIONS. BACK ISSUES CAN BE OBTAINED FREE.
WRITE IN FOR THE FOLLOWING TITLES.

THE OPPORTUNISTS AND THE "SECOND WORLD WAR"
MARK ON A SHAM WAR
THE CASE OF SINGAPORE
"WHY BURMA FELL"
BEHIND THE FOG OF THE ALEUTIAN AFFAIR
THE "WAR" REACHES THE PACIFIC
UNDER THE CLOAK OF WAR
"MYSTERIES" OF THE "SECOND WORLD WAR"
THE SHAM BRITISH BLOCKADE
THE CASE OF HOLLAND, BELGIUM AND FRANCE
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON WAR

READ THESE ARTICLES IN -

THE BULLETIN

FREE BACK ISSUES

Address:
P.O.Box 67
Station D.
New York.

THE TROTSKYITES' "REVOLUTIONARY"
MASS WORK

HERE is hardly any field which offers such rich pickings for careerists as the trade unions. Arising originally as bonafide organs of self-protection for the workers, with leaders who in many instances became truly martyrs in the cause of the oppressed, the trade unions have long been transformed into machines manipulated by leaders who are self-seeking intriguers, disguised agents of the imperialists, sometimes plain pick-pockets and thugs, often smooth talkers indistinguishable from a banker in ideology and methods. With the political collapse of the Second International, the trade unions became, moreover, the happy hunting-ground of fake "Socialist" leaders. And with the bureaucratic degeneration of the Third International they became infested in addition with a vast host of "Marxist-Leninist" leaders whose sole purpose is to profit by betraying the workers. All in all, the trade unions today - and this is true in every country in which they exist - are cesspools of corruption such as the original founders of long ago never imagined even in their wildest nightmares.

Where there are careerists, there are clique fights for power. This is an iron law. Merely to list the clique fights that have taken place amongst the careerists in the unions would require a tremendous volume. A major portion of the energies of the trade union movement is expended in these bickerings. For the most part, the rank-and-file workers are not even

aware that the inner-union squabbling which breaks out periodically under the instigation of the various Lewises, Hillmans, Greens, Frankensteens and their lesser brethren is nothing but gang-warfare for bureaucratic power, wealth and privilege in the unions. Each careerist leader, naturally, deceives the particular section of the workers under his domination into believing that he stands for principles.

Marxists in the unions have, amongst other things, the special task of exposing the careerist nature of these machinations. This means to expose all the crooked cliques. Any other policy functions to make the workers subservient to this or that gang of careerists in any particular squabble, and to the whole system of careerism in general.

Nothing illustrates Marxism so concretely as to contrast with it the policy of opportunist tendencies. The most instructive and most subtle examples are provided by the policies of the most "Left" opportunist tendencies, those which on the surface look very much like Marxism. A good case-history of opportunism in the trade unions is contained in the maneuvers of that very "Left" grouping, the Trotskyite organizations, the Socialist Workers Party led by Cannon and the Workers Party led by Shachtman. The relation of the Trotskyites to some of the clique fights that have occurred is a revealing measure of this political tendency's role in the trade union movement as a whole.

A

THE TROTSKYITES IN THE
TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

In May 1938, a burocratic gang-fight for power emerged from its concealed form and broke into the open in the United Auto Workers, CIO, with the Stalinist clique, led by Frankenstein and blessed by Lewis, making a strong bid against the power of President Homer Martin. The most insidious, opportunist trap that the workers can fall into is to hook themselves on to the tail of one or another of the contending gangs of burocrats. It is absolutely imperative for the workers to struggle against all the power-seeking carcerist cliques, to expose the gang-warfare nature of these machinations.

Characteristically, the Trotskyites, at that time united under Cannon and Shachtman, came out in full cry in support of Homer Martin. The Trotskyite leaders went so far as loudly to play down the question of differences with Martin. At the outbreak of the clique warfare, they declared:

"Support Martin

"The policy here recommended does not imply extensive negotiations over questions of program, etc. It does not necessitate formal agreements of any kind. The most important facts are already known, and the duty of responsible militants is clear. In the crisis provoked by the Stalinite bid for power, the militants have no choice but to support the Martin administration as against the Stalinite-Frankenstein combination. And this support should be given openly, frankly and aggressively." (Socialist Appeal, Editorial, May 11, 1938, p. 4. Original emphasis.)

Over three months later, they were still writing in this vein:

"Differences with Homer Martin or other members of the Board - however serious and justified - are not at issue now. Progressives must realize that every ounce of support must be thrown in the scales of the Martin forces against

the Lewis-Stalinist complot." (Socialist Appeal, p. 2. Sept. 3, 1938.)

For months, the Trotskyite leaders painted up Martin as a progressive who allegedly was leading a real fight against the Stalinists, a fight supposedly in the interests of the workers. As late as September 3, over three months after the outbreak of the clique fight, as we have shown above, the Trotskyites were still shouting lustily for "every ounce of support" to Martin and Company. Martin, of course, was interested only in burocratic maneuvers at the top. In this instance he was out-manuevered by his factional opponents. Martin turned out to be the wrong horse to bet on. In consequence, by November 1938 the Trotskyites were compelled to switch their line.

Taking the sting out of the crassness of their support to the Labor faker, Martin, whose Red-bating speeches embarrassed them not a little, the Trotskyite leaders engaged in "self-criticism," admitting that they had failed even to take the precaution of adequately "differentiating" themselves from the Martin crowd:

"In our failure to give sufficiently clear criticism of certain reactionary maneuvers of the Martin forces, we did not, however, draw a sharp enough line between our program and the limited program of Martin and his allies." (Trade Union Resolution of National Committee Plenum, Socialist Appeal, November 26, 1938, p. 5.)

While all along they had been trumping up Martin as allegedly leading a fight against the Stalinists in the interests of the workers, the Trotskyites themselves gave the lie to their line when they made the admission, considerably after the whole affair had died down, that Martin and the Stalinists, in the two-year gang fight that had gone on, were nothing but mirror images. According to the Trotskyite leaders, in 1937, and 1938,

* * *

precisely when they urged the workers to support Martin, that careerist tried to fight the Stalinists only as a reactionary politician:

"For two years, Martin and his supporters have attempted to fight the Stalinists, not as militants, but as reactionary union politicians. If the Stalinists were dictatorial, Martin fought them by his own dictatorship. If the Stalinists signed rotten union agreements with the employers, Martin fought them by signing equally rotten union agreements." (Socialist Appeal, Editorial, February 14, 1939, p.4. My emphasis - J.C.H.)

One would deduce from the Trotskyites' "self-criticism" in which they admitted the opportunist nature of their support to Martin, that their policies would undergo a real change and they would refrain from tying the workers in the unions to this or that labor faker. As a matter of fact, however, their trade union policy became even more brazenly opportunistic, as will be shown directly, indicating their "self-criticism" to be insincere, face-saving words.

IN so far as serving to entrench the Trotskyite leaders in the unions, the Martin episode came to nothing. Martin was in no position to follow the usual tactic of the clique leaders, namely, to reward those who worked for him with some posts and offices. Some time after the Martin affair, however, the Trotskyite leaders executed a trade union maneuver in which they were moderately successful in getting some rewards from the "big shot" clique leaders. This was the case of the Trotskyites' support to the Stalinist bureaucrats of New York Local 302 of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees Union, A.F.L. in the December 1940 elections of that union. In August 1940, only five months prior to the subsequent elections, the Trotskyite paper had written that in the forthcoming December elections the Stalinist administration in Local 302 was certain to be ousted:

"...the Stalinist administration is now a 'lame duck,' no longer re-

presenting the membership and certain to be ousted at the December regular elections." (Socialist Appeal, August 3, 1940.)

During the flirtation with the Red-bating Homer Martin, and in the same editorial calling for support to him, the Trotskyite paper had stated that in the unions the Stalinists are more dangerous even than all the bosses themselves:

"The Stalinists are a greater danger to the trade union movement than all the bosses precisely because they attack from within." (Socialist Appeal, May 14, 1938, p. 4.)

But in the course of a deal made with the Stalinists in Local 302 whereby the Trotskyites were granted minor posts, the Trotskyite S.W.P. formed an electoral bloc with the Stalinists and helped vote them into the major posts in the union, thus saving the Stalinists from the certain defeat of which the Trotskyites themselves had spoken only a few months before. This bloc with the Stalinist bureaucrats — who, remember, are more dangerous than all the bosses themselves — was palmed off by the Trotskyite leaders in the light of a real workingclass blow against the so-called "right wingers," i.e., the other crooked gang fighting for power in Local 302:

"The right wingers yell loudest about the Trotskyites and Stalinists uniting against them." (Socialist Appeal, December 21, 1940.)

And so the Trotskyists, those self-styled crusaders against Stalinism, helped boost what they themselves admitted to be the most dangerous gang, the Stalinists, back into control of the union.

At that time Shachtman was no longer in the Cannon organization. Shachtman's trade union line in the Local 302 affair, however, was identical in every fundamental detail with that of Cannon. Shachtman, by his own admission, urged the workers in Local 302 to form the bloc with the Stalinist bureaucrats. In an article dealing in part with the elections in Local 302, Shachtman wrote:

* * *

"The writer for his part, in discussion with these militants, urged upon them the propriety and necessity of a bloc with the Stalinists.... We still believe the bloc we advocated was correct." (Labor Action, March 17, 1941.)

Shachtman's only "criticism" of Cannon's line was that the latter did not make enough "anti-Stalinist" noise.

ANOTHER bureaucratic swindler to whom the Trotskyites threw support in a wholly opportunist fashion is John L. Lewis. This occurred when Tobin attempted to oust the Trotskyites from control of the Minneapolis teamsters union, originally an AFL affiliate. Seeking a new and "safer" berth, now in the CIO, Cannon and Co. began to "discover" virtues in Lewis who was then engaged in a squabble with Hillman. Before the gang fight broke out involving the Trotskyites in Minneapolis, they plainly and correctly declared that the rumpus between Lewis and Hillman was nothing but a clique fight:

"For — to get down to cases — the fight between Hillman and Lewis is nothing but a clique fight. Hillman is trying to push Lewis out of the leadership of the CIO; Lewis is retaliating in kind." (Socialist Appeal, Sept. 28, 1940, p. 4.)

Hillman and Lewis, wrote the Trotskyites prior to the Minneapolis row, are two faces of the same counterfeit coin:

"In a word: show us one union situation in which Lewis has been advocating a class-struggle program against the class-collaboration program of Hillman. You can't show it because it doesn't exist." (Ibid.)

It should not be imagined that Lewis was a new figure in the Trotskyite field of vision. Cannon and his aides knew this powerful trade union bureaucrat for many years. One can find considerable evidence of this in the old Militant. They spoke of "the corrupting influence of the reactionary Lewis-Walker clique" (Militant, Oct. 1, 1932). They told the workers years ago that Lewis was a flunkey of the

Peabody coal interests, that Lewis and henchmen terrorized and even shot miners:

"There are Lewis-Walker and henchmen who steal ballots and club and shoot miners who protest their corruption and fakery." (Militant, October 1, 1932.)

"There can be no doubt about the real character of the Peabodys and their flunkys, Lewis and Walker. With them there can be no peace." (Ibid.)

Cannon knew well the character of Lewis's policies:

"... the treacherous sell-out policies of the Lewis-Walker machine." (Ibid.)

But when the maneuvers of the Trotskyite leaders required the opposite tune, they promptly "forgot" the long history of Lewis' service to the capitalists, his betrayals of the workers, all about the putrid clique fight between Lewis and Hillman, and urged the workers to support Lewis!

"... progressive trade unionists must support Lewis against the Hillman-Stalinist bloc." (The Militant, September 6, 1941.)

Cannon and his lieutenants succeeded in making some capital out of this maneuver, for the Minneapolis union was taken under the "sheltering" wing of the Lewis CIO gang. The cost to the workers, as in the case of the Trotskyite "mass work" in general, was increased confusion on the whole trade union problem, the essence of which is precisely not to support any of the frauds who now control the trade union movement, but to create their own revolutionary leadership in the unions thus transforming them into genuine organs of proletarian class struggle.

WHAT IS BEHIND THESE ZIGZAGS

PEERING through the procession of weird gyrations executed by the Trotskyite leaders in the trade unions, is the careerist nature of the Trotskyite function in the unions. Cannon and Shachtman know perfectly well that

* * *

a labor faker like Homer Martin could not possibly lead a genuine, proletarian struggle against Stalinist bureaucrats in the unions. A careerist like Martin can fight only on a careerist basis, and this is not in the interests of the workers. Cannon and Shachtman — and on this we have their explicit statement — are entirely aware that the Stalinist leaders in the unions are the most dangerous crew of swindlers. As for the notorious Lewis, we could compile a regular volume of statements by the Trotskyite leaders of both organizations showing clearly that in no way does Lewis serve the interests of the workers, that Lewis plays the role of the Leiparts, the Caballeros and the

Jouhauxes who, amongst others, prepared the path for Hitler, Franco and Petain. Nevertheless, at a certain juncture, the Trotskyite leaders opportunisticly come out for support to this or that trade union scoundrel. Each juncture is a clique fight. Such a squabble opens the path for the lesser but no less eager, careerists to shout Hurrah for one or the other big, powerful cliques and so ingratiate themselves with the real powers in the union. If one bets on the right horse, one may win a fair prize, in the case of careerism in trade unions, some offices or union jobs of one sort or another. This, of course, is the jackal's role, albeit it parades under the name of "Marxism-Leninism."

B

THE TRADE UNIONS,
THE "INDEPENDENT" LABOR PARTY
AND THE "WORKERS GOVERNMENT"

THE political destiny which genuine Marxists desire for the reformist trade unions is this: to achieve a complete change in the political ideology of the rank-and-file, to oust the opportunist leaders, to cleanse the unions of their reformist class-collaborationist character and convert them into revolutionary organizations. While the unions remain reformist, they can only serve the function of catering to the wage-slave ideology of the politically backward workers, of utterly limiting the mentality and actions of the workers to being better-paid wage-slaves. In this form, the unions cannot participate in any liberation of the toilers as a class from wage-slavery in general. As reformist organizations, the unions serve as props to imperialism, buying off the labor aristocracy with some small bribes in the form of an increase in wages now and then, while tying the whole workingclass to the chariot of imperialism. The idea that the function of the trade unions is only "economic," is, of course, a myth. The unions serve a political function; every reformist union openly or with some disguises supports the world policy of Wall Street imperialism.

are palming off the reformist unions, and in particular the UAW-CIO, as organizational centers of proletarian liberation. The form this deception takes is to call for the UAW to organize what the Trotskyite leaders call an "Independent Labor Party" which in turn, according to them, will form a "Workers' Government." Writes Shachtman's paper:

"The UAW should take the lead in organizing a national Labor Party! ...Form an independent Labor Party to fight for a Workers' Congress. A Workers' Congress means a Workers' Government! A Workers' Government means simply that labor takes control of its own destiny." (Labor Action, August 3, 1942.)

Cannon's paper has a similar line, or to put it more accurately, it is really a case of Shachtman taking this line along with him from Cannon's outfit to his own, the so-called Workers Party:

"It is now more necessary than ever for the labor movement to conduct a fight on the political field, by launching an independent labor party. The UAW, with its tremendous strength and influence among the masses of workers, is in a

The Trotskyites, thoroughly in line with their opportunist policies,

* * *

strategic position to lay the groundwork for a labor party." (The Militant, August 1, 1942.)

med down the throats of the union:

"APPEASEMENT POLICY NO GOOD!
"Watch out! Watch out! If this policy continues, if the leaders continue to cram it down the throats of the union, they will only succeed in promoting a movement of indifference among wide circles of union members." (August 3, 1942. My emphasis - J.C.H.)

There is a little political miracle involved in this Trotskyist position. According to Cannon-Shachtman, the UAW is supposed to take the lead in organizing an independent Labor Party. Independent of whom, it may be asked? Independent of the capitalists, naturally, Cannon-Shachtman will answer. But let us carry this questioning a little further. Is the UAW itself independent of the capitalists, that it should be posed, as Cannon-Shachtman do, as a possible leader in organizing an independent (of the capitalists) Labor party? In reply, we have merely to cite the statements of the Trotskyites themselves about the UAW. In a long article on the UAW on the eve of its August 3rd convention of this year, Shachtman's Labor Action declared:

And The Militant declared-

"... the leadership of the union by its treacherous policy of retreat has backed the UAW into a dead-end street." (Aug. 1, 1942.)

The August 3rd convention re-elected the old leadership, continued its line of support to the capitalist government, and served as a bridge to the further bureaucratization of the UAW.

"It [the UAW] supports the present administration in Washington. It supports the head of this administration, President Roosevelt." (August 3, 1942, p. 1.)

In a word, according to the Trotskyites, the UAW, with its class-collaborationist policy, its admitted support to imperialism, its increasing bureaucratism, and foisting of sacrifices on the workers in the interests of the capitalists, should take the lead in organizing an independent (of the capitalists) Labor Party! Such is the "revolutionary" concoction the Trotskyite leaders feed the workers!

After the convention was over, a full page article on it in Cannon's The Militant contained this statement:

"The majority of the delegates, while hostile to the policies of the leaders on intra-union questions and protesting against the union retreats, still followed the political policies of the leaders, supporting the capitalist program of the Roosevelt administration." (August 15, 1942, p. 2. My emphasis - J.C.H.)

LENIN ON A LABOR PARTY

The rank-and-file of the UAW has been very alive and militant on economic issues; the UAW administration as a whole is probably less bureaucratic than most trade union administrations are. Nevertheless, the Trotskyite papers are constrained to show in what a treacherous and bureaucratic manner the UAW leadership has been acting. In its article on the eve of the UAW convention, Labor Action indicated the leadership's policy of "appeasing" the bosses and the fact that this class-collaborationist line was being cram-

THE Trotskyists' line on the Labor Party, that the organization of a political party based on the trade unions would constitute a workers' political party, is one against which Lenin fought consistently. Lenin maintained that a so-called Labor Party based on the trade unions is not a workers' political party but a bourgeois party in political content. Class-collaborationist unions do not change their skin by virtue of forming a political party: the latter can only be class-collaborationist like its parents. In a letter written at the time of the Second Congress of the Comintern, Lenin, arguing against McLaine, one of the British radical leaders, declared:

"He calls the Labour Party the

* * *

political organization of the trade union movement. Later on he repeated this when he said: the Labour Party is the political expression of the trade union movement. I have heard the same expression of opinion in the organ of the British Socialist Party. It is not true and partly is the cause of the opposition, to a certain degree justified, of the British revolutionary workers. Indeed, the concept: 'the political organization of the trade union movement,' or the 'political expression' of this movement, is mistaken." (Lenin On Britain, p. 267. My emphasis, JCH.)

Many people imagine that the membership-composition of a party determines its class character. Lenin refuted this notion, pointing out that policy, not composition, determines the class nature of a political party:

"Of course, for the most part the Labour Party consists of workers, but it does not logically follow from this that every workers' party which consists of workers is at the same time a 'political workers' party': that depends upon who leads it, upon the content of its activities and of its political tactics. Only the latter determines whether it is really a political proletarian party. From this point of view, which is the only correct point of view, the Labour Party is not a political workers' party but a thoroughly bourgeois party, because, although it consists of workers, it is led by reactionaries, and the worst reactionaries at that, who lead it in the spirit of the bourgeoisie and with the aid of the British Noskes and Scheidemanns, they systematically deceive the workers." (Ibid. My emphasis - J.C.H.)

Confronted by the accomplished organization of these "bourgeois labor parties," Lenin declared ruthless war against them. In 1916, he wrote:

"The fact is that 'bourgeois labour parties,' as a political phenomenon, have already been formed in all the advanced capitalist countries and unless a determined

ruthless struggle is conducted against these parties all along the line — or, what is the same thing, against those groups, tendencies, etc. — it is useless talking about the struggle against imperialism, about Marxism, or about the socialist labour movement." (Ibid. p. 148. My emphasis - J.C.H.)

In the transitional stages to the proletarian revolution, Lenin estimated, the opportunist Labor Party tendency would grow stronger, and hence the Marxist struggle against it would have to grow more and more strenuous:

"There is not the slightest reason for thinking that these parties can disappear before the social revolution. On the contrary, the nearer the revolution approaches, the stronger it flares up, the more sudden and violent the transitions from one stage to another will be in the course of the revolution, the greater will be the role in the labour movement of the struggle of the revolutionary mass stream against the opportunist philistine stream." (Ibid. Emphasis in original.)

Such was Lenin's transitional program on the question of the Labor Party, in contradistinction to the Trotskyist "transitional program."

History has provided plenty of experience with Labor Parties based on the reformist trade unions. Without a single exception these parties have functioned in the interests of capitalism. The case of the British Labor Party is, of course, notorious with politically educated, class conscious workers. Even when Lenin called for support to the British Labor Party in a certain election, his program was to destroy this opportunist organization; he called for support "as a rope supports a hanged man"; all his tactics had as their purpose, not to build and strengthen, but to wipe out the influence of the so-called Labor Party. In Lenin's political system, a government formed by the Labor Party would be not — to use the Trotskyist phrase — a Workers' Government giving the dos-

THE TROTSKYITES' "REVOLUTIONARY" MASS WORK

* * *

tiny of their class into the workers' own hand, but rather a bitter and costly experience, a bourgeois "Labor" government which he believed would thoroughly expose itself as an agency of imperialism, a treacherous machine whose criminality would lay the basis for its destruction and replacement by a proletarian dictatorship.

Of course, the Trotskyite leaders will argue that they do not propose a Labor Party of the old style. If this argument is taken at its face value -- which we do not do even for a moment -- then there is but one conclusion, that the Trotskyists are proposing the organization of a myth, a chimera which never existed and never will exist. Between a Bolshevik Party and a reactionary party there is no middle; every party which is not Bolshevik is pro-capitalist and can be nothing else. Every non-Bolshevik party, be it a Labor Party, a Social Democratic party, a Stalinist party, an Anarchist party, or any other opportunist body, serves the historical interests of capitalism. This is the fundamental law of modern politics. This is the teaching of history. But to invoke this historical lesson is not merely a matter of maintaining that "what has been, must always be." Look concretely at the essence of what the Trotskyists propose. They call for the present trade unions, which politically are opportunist organizations, to form a Labor Party. Let the UAW take the lead in forming a Labor Party, cry the Trotskyite tops. In effect, this is calling for the reformist agents of imperialism to form a Labor Party -- and a "Workers' Government" to boot -- this is serving the interests of imperialism.

THE TROTSKYITE LABOR PARTY POLICY
IN PRACTICE

ACTION is the test of everything in life. The actions of the Trotskyites with respect to the Labor Party problem are the real clue to the nature of their policy. For the most part, the Trotskyists shout for a Labor Party based on the trade unions while at the same time standing in verbal "opposition" to the Labor

Parties which actually exist. But sometimes in action they give the game away. The character of those whom the Trotskyists have supported concretely in the Labor Party movement is the acid test of the nature of the Trotskyist line. There is no more fitting commentary on the Trotskyite tendency than to recall their support to the Stalinist A.L.P. stooge, Eugene Connolly, in the March 1941 New York elections. In the guise of answering objections, after the elections, Goldman admitted black-on-white this support to a Stalinist-controlled organization:

"Many well-meaning people are horrified at the idea that we are supporting a Stalinist-controlled party." ("Why We Supported the A.L.P." The Militant, March 15, 1941.)

During the campaign, however, these "anti-Stalinists" deliberately concealed the fact that Connolly was a Stalinist! Connolly was presented by the Cannonite paper as a bonafide independent labor candidate opposed to the top imperialists:

"Connolly stands in the elections as an independent labor candidate opposed to the war-mongering candidates who represent the Sixty Families." (The Militant, March 8, 1941.)

Clearly, Cannon and Co. "forgot" about the "independent" Connolly's abject dependence on the counter-revolutionary Stalinist bureaucracy. After the elections, which were held on March 11, 1941, the Trotskyite leaders were constrained to give the lie to their previous declarations that Connolly was a bonafide opponent of the war policy of the so-called Sixty Families:

"Connolly campaigned merely on the basis of negative opposition to the lend lease bill. He did not offer a real alternative to the war plans of the Sixty Families." (The Militant, March 22, 1941, p. 5. My emphasis - J.C.H.)

Here is the real content of the Trotskyite line on the Labor Party. On paper they shout for an "Independent"

Labor Party, a genuine working class party, a party of proletarian politics. In action, this noise turns out to be a line which admits of support even to counter-revolutionary Stalinist bureaucrats who prowl around the reformist Labor Party movement.

Shachtman, of course, had the same line as the Cannon outfit. In writing about the A.L.P. elections, Labor Action had the brazenness to present support to a whole assortment of "Labor" frauds as in line with revolutionary workingclass principles:

"Now, no revolutionary or working class principle is violated in endorsing a Social-Democratic or Reformist or Stalinist candidate for office in an election." (March 17, 1941, p. 2.)

Again, Shachtman's "objection" to the way Cannon carried out the Trotskyist support to the Stalinists was that Cannon did not make enough "anti-Stalinist" gestures!

It is not an accident that the Trotskyist leaders got the workers to support the Stalinist-controlled section of the A.L.P. The whole Labor Party line of the Trotskyites is a dose from the Stalinist closet of political poisons. During the ultra-Rightist zigzags of the Stalinist, an integral part of its treachery to the workers is to call for a Labor Party based on the trade unions. This policy diverts the workers from the path of proletarian revolution. This is the basic interest and purpose of the Stalinist ultra-Rightist line on the Labor Party.

THEY ARE PERFECTLY CONSCIOUS OF THEIR TREACHERY

PEOPLE who know the truth and still deceive the workers are conscious betrayers of the working-class. The Trotskyite leaders fall into the latter category. They are entirely aware that Marxism in the present period is opposed to initiating the building of a Labor Party. During a past period the Trotskyite magazine wrote:

"For it is not the business of the revolutionary Marxists, above all in the present stage of the relationship between capitalist disintegration and social reformism, to initiate or to help organize and found in addition to their own party another party for the 'second class citizens,' for the 'backward workers,' a 'Labor' party, i.e., a third capitalist party, even if composed predominantly of workers." (The New International, March 1935, p. 36.)

That a Labor Party based even on the trade unions can be nothing but a reformist party, the Trotskyite leaders know perfectly:

"... as all history proves, a Labor party, even when it has a genuine trade union base, is a reformist party and nothing else can be expected from it." (Ibid., August 1935, p. 146.)

How little these absolutely correct words were sincerely meant by the Trotskyite leaders is vividly demonstrated by the fact that when the whole Stalinist system was fully in the ultra-Rightist zigzag known as the Popular Front, the Trotskyite leaders paralleled the Stalinist line and completely reversed themselves on the question of the Labor Party based on the trade unions. Acting always as a prop to the Stalinist system, albeit a prop disguised by many devices, one of them being their sham criticism of Stalinism, the Trotskyite leaders are now crying in full blast for the Labor Party, a position they themselves repudiated - in insincere words, it is true, but repudiated, nevertheless.

The noise of Cannon-Shachtman for an "independent" Labor Party based on the trade unions is an ultra-Rightist trap; their slogan of a "Workers Government" formed by some hodgepodge of fake "Labor" Parties is a method of diverting the proletariat from revolution and the establishment of a genuine dictatorship of the proletariat. It is the Trotsky version of Stalin's "Popular Front." It harks back to Trotsky's proposal of a Blum-Cachin government (see Whither France, p.44). The only government which is in the

* * *

interests of the proletariat is a government of Bolshevik-led Soviets. Any other form of government is a reactionary snare, however well camouflaged it may be with "Labor" and even "Communist" trimmings.

There is no middle ground between a bourgeois dictatorship and a proletarian dictatorship, as Lenin taught:

"Those who have read Marx and have failed to understand that in capitalist society, at every acute moment, at every serious conflict of classes, only the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat is possible

have understood nothing about the economic or the political doctrines of Marx." (Selected Works, Vol. X, p. 37.)

Today the concrete Marxist teaching is: Either a government of Bolshevik-led Soviets or a bourgeois rule of fascist military enslavement. To rely on some "middle course," on some "Labor" government or some "Workers'" government as the Trotskyites propose, (really a bourgeois government in "revolutionary" disguise), will make the triumph of fascism inevitable.

J. C. Hunter
August 15, 1942

MORE EVIDENCE ON TROTSKYITE "MASS WORK" —

READ THESE ARTICLES

IN

THE BULLETIN

THE S.W.P. AND THE FOOD WORKERS UNION

SHACHMAN AS "TRADE UNIONIST"

THE CANNONITES AND JOHN L. LEWIS

THE A.L.P. AND THE TROTSKYITE LINE

FREE COPIES

Address:
P.O. Box 67
Station D.,
New York.

A "UNITED FRONT" AND ITS AFTERMATH

IN the foregoing article of this issue, "The Trotskyites' 'Revolutionary' Mass Work" (page 14), we gave material dealing with an electoral bloc of the Trotskyites and Stalinists in the December 1940 elections of the New York Local 302 of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees Union, A.F.L. Recent events in that union throw a glaring light on the disastrous results to the workers which flow from such an opportunist "united front" with one or another careerist, power-grabbing clique of labor fakery. We go back for a moment to those elections so that the recent events will be seen in their proper light.

The December 1940 elections in Local 302 resulted — with Trotskyite help — in the election on one ticket of Stalinist bureaucrats, Costas Dritsas and Sam Kramberg, to the leading posts of President and Secretary-Treasurer, respectively, and of a so-called "Progressive," Larry Phillips to the post of General Organizer. At that time the Trotskyites, completely dropping their front of "criticism" of the Stalinists in Local 302, painted the electoral "platform" of the Stalinist-dominated "united front" slate as an unmitigated blessing for the workers. In its report of the elections, the Socialist Appeal wrote:

"What is more, the united front was based on a genuine fighting program in the interests of all food workers against the bosses." (December 28, 1940.)

Making absolutely no distinction between the Stalinist bureaucratic clique and honest workers, the Socialist Appeal at that time lumped them all in

one pot as follows:

"All combined on the one supreme immediate task confronting the union membership: smashing the menace of racketeers and boss-controlled labor fakery." (Ibid. My emphasis - J.C.H.)

Apparently, on the line of Cannon-Shachtman, this "one supreme immediate task" of combatting rotten union policies could be facilitated by electing Stalinist bureaucrats to leading posts.

In a rally after the elections, the victorious Stalinist thugs made fine speeches promising the workers great things. Continuing the line of dressing the Stalinist bureaucrats in sheep's clothing, the Socialist Appeal wrote up the Stalinist stooge Dritsas' speech in this rosy light:

"Dritsas struck the keynote when he spoke of the fight for a better union contract for the 10,000 members of the union." (Jan. 4, 1941.)

The Trotskyite paper contained not even a whisper of warning that the Stalinists' promises were just so much eyewash, even though their filthy record in the past was well known and often depicted in the Socialist Appeal in previous years.

With these remarks we come to the recent events in Local 302.

An article on Local 302 in The Militant of August 8, 1942 (page 2) begins with these words:

"An attempt by the Stalinist leadership of New York Local 302 of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees

Union, AFL, to cram a rotten agreement down the throats of the membership in violation of democratic union procedure, resulted in a riot at the union's last meeting, July 30, at Manhattan Center."

The Militant goes on to report that the so-called "Progressive," Larry Phillips, who had been elected in December 1940 as part of the bloc with the Stalinists, was viciously beaten up by Stalinist thugs and put in the hospital. It goes without saying that any person who makes a deal with such crooks as Stalinist bureaucrats for jobs in the unions is a careerist and job-hunter. The whole matter has all the odor of a clique fight. Having been sufficiently strengthened by the support of the Trotskyites and "Progressives," the Stalinist leaders now obviously feel strong enough to try to run the whole show themselves. And so they crack the heads of their erst-while "friends" of the December 1940 "united front." It is revealing that in its report of the riot and the beating up of Phillips, The Militant diplomatically keeps silent about the 1940 "united front" deal which put the Stalinists in power in Local 302.

It is not an accident that The Militant makes absolutely no mention of the fact that the Stalinist gangsters were elected to the leadership of Local 302 with Trotskyite help. The united front "against the corrupt right wing officials," as the Socialist Appeal of December 21, 1940 called the Stalinist-Trotskyist "Progressive" bloc, gave Local 302 a leadership which is the very quintessence of corruption, in a word, a Stalinist leadership.

Naturally, it would be embarrassing for The Militant to report the recent doings in Local 302 in light of the Trotskyite line in that union. Hence, The Militant confines itself wholly to the present, omitting the context of the past. This makes the reader of The Militant, who either never knew or has forgotten about the Trotskyites' support to the Stalinists in Local 302, imagine that the Trotskyite paper, and the Trotskyite organization, in general, are conducting a powerful fight in the food workers

union against Stalinism.

In the article, "The Trotskyites' 'Revolutionary' Mass Work," we stated the thesis that in regard to the squabbles of the various power-grabbing cliques in the unions: "The most insidious, opportunist trap that the workers can fall into is to hook themselves on to the tail of one or another of the contending gangs of bureaucrats. It is absolutely imperative for the workers to struggle against all the power-seeking careerist cliques, to expose the gang-warfare nature of these machinations." There could not possibly be a better illustration of the truth of this thesis than the events of Local 302. It must be recalled that in 1940 the Trotskyites were given a few sops, some minor posts, in the "united front" electoral deal. For the sake of these few posts, the Trotskyites entered into a bloc with the Stalinist bureaucrats and got the workers to elect a Stalinist leadership. This bloc was palmed off by the Trotskyite leaders as a fight in the interests of the workers. Actually, the workers were tied to the tail of one crooked clique, the Stalinists, against another crooked clique, the so-called right wingers. The right wing officials were defeated in the elections. But did this mean a victory for the workers? Not in the least! The right wing officials, or any other reactionaries for that matter, are mere beginners in the art of betraying the workers when compared to those past-masters, the Stalinist bureaucrats. Steer clear of all the reactionary cliques; this is the true Marxist line. The Trotskyite policy of tying up with one or another rotten careerist clique prevents the workers from developing independent class forces in the unions. This assures the victory of reaction. The Trotskyite trade union policy tends to corrupt the workers along careerist lines by involving them in a chase after offices.

Cannon's tactics in Local 302 — (and Shachtman's who approved of the Stalinist-dominated bloc) — do not differ essentially from those of the Stalinist bureaucrats. The latter, while generally shrieking against the Trotskyites, entered into the electoral bloc with them also for the sake of offices. Trotskyite help was very

useful to the Stalinist bureaucrats in winning the election, especially in light of the fact that the Stalinists were rapidly losing control of Local 302. This is how all the careerist clique leaders maneuver. First comes the opportunist, office-chasing "united front"; then, the skull-busting period. Sometimes it is the other way around; it makes no essential difference. This game is utterly divorced

from and totally against the interests of the workers.

Marxist mass work in the unions will only begin when the workers have broken with the careerist leaders and office-chasers of the Stalin School, the Cannons, the Shachtmans, the Browders.

J.C.H.

August 14, 1942

NOW COLLECTED AND BOUND IN ONE VOLUME

THE
TROTSKY SCHOOL
OF
FALSIFICATION

THE ARTICLES WHICH APPEARED IN THIS SECTION OF THE BULLETIN ARRANGED IN HISTORICAL ORDER.

PRESENTING A MANY-SIDED EXPOSURE OF TROTSKY'S OPPORTUNIST ROLE IN THE RISE OF STALINISM.

DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF TROTSKY'S SUPPORT TO STALIN IN THE BUROCRATIC DEGENERATION OF THE SOVIET UNION AND THE COMINTERN.

SEND FOR A FREE COPY

Address:
P.O.B. 67
Station D.
New York

WHAT ROAD FOR THE INDIAN MASSES--
"1776" or "October 1917"

THE present situation in India has many markings of an approaching political and social upheaval. If the masses of that country follow a correct path, then not only the centuries-old rule of British imperialism will be uprooted but all exploitation and oppression of the Indian toilers will come to an end and an epoch of liberation of the masses of Asia and the rest of the world will be ushered in. It goes without saying that should the Indian masses proceed along a wrong political line, then instead of marching toward freedom they will collapse into enslavement which may be even more galling than their present condition of oppression.

Among the political tendencies which offer the Indian masses a program supposedly for their struggle for emancipation is the Trotskyist "Fourth International." Many politically educated workers know that the policy which Trotsky followed in 1917 brought about the overthrow of Russian imperialism and the subsequent defeat of world imperialist intervention against the workers' State. Evidently the road which the Russian masses took in 1917 was the only correct road for carrying out the bourgeois-democratic tasks, that is, for the elimination of landlord oppression, and for the socialist tasks, the expropriation of the bourgeoisie and the socialization of ownership of the industrial means of production and exchange.

Is the road the followers of Trotsky propose today for India the correct one? Will the Indian masses solve their problems by any other policy except the one the Bolshevik Party gave the masses of Russia in 1917? Before answering the first question,

let us draw the basic outlines of the 1917 line of the Bolshevik Party and indicate its significance for India today.

In the early years of this century the minds of the Russian revolutionists were set at work to present the masses of Russia with a program that would lead to their liberation from the landlords and capitalists. From observations accessible at that time, Trotsky made out his theoretical prognosis which was summed up under the phrase "The Permanent Revolution." The meaning of the term was briefly this: the working class leading the peasantry establishes the dictatorship of the proletariat through which both the bourgeois-democratic and the socialist tasks are carried out. Lenin's idea of the path for the Russian masses was different. He visualized a regime which would be neither the dictatorship of the proletariat nor the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie but something in-between, a stage preliminary to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin's view was expressed in the formula, "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" — a two-class dictatorship. Moreover, Lenin expected that the Russian masses would go over to the proletarian dictatorship only after the workers of the advanced countries had set up theirs.

In April 1917 Lenin introduced a policy which in essence corresponded to Trotsky's position of Permanent Revolution. Lenin's old formula of the two-class dictatorship in reality did not go beyond the formation of a bourgeois republic, and had he and the Bolshevik Party clung to this formula, the Russian bourgeoisie would have re-

mained in power and the toiling masses would have been crushed. Lenin's April policy, adopting the line of the dictatorship of the proletariat, basically Trotsky's position, led to the October Revolution.

That the oppressed masses of the world would have to follow the same road the Russian toilers had taken in 1917 was emphasized by Lenin and other leaders of the Russian Revolution more than once. Even the masses of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, it was understood, could win their national independence from imperialist oppressors and their social emancipation from their own landlords and capitalists only through proletarian dictatorship. In his book, The Permanent Revolution, Trotsky confirmed this conception:

"With regard to the countries with a belated bourgeois development, especially the colonial and semi-colonial countries, the theory of the permanent revolution signifies that the complete and genuine solution of their tasks, democratic and national emancipation, is conceivable only through the dictatorship of the proletariat as the leader of the subjugated nation, above all of its peasant masses." (Leon Trotsky, The Permanent Revolution, p. 151.)

It is true that the old view held by the Marxists was that the road to the proletarian dictatorship in backward countries lay through a stage of bourgeois-democracy. The theory of Permanent Revolution, and particularly the historic concretization of this theory by the Russian workers and peasants, upset the old view and established the law adhered to by true Marxists that victory to the toiling masses even in the most backward countries can come through no other road except the one along which the Russian toilers marched in October 1917 — the road of the Permanent Revolution, the road of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the same book from which we have given the above citation, Trotsky stated:

"If the traditional view was

that the road to the proletarian dictatorship led through a long period of democracy, the theory of permanent revolution established the fact that for backward countries the road to democracy passed through the dictatorship of the proletariat." (p. xxiv.)

The theory of the Permanent Revolution is the historical and political frame of reference we shall keep in view in dealing with India today.

Tragically enough, after October 1917, the correctness of the theory of the Permanent Revolution was demonstrated in a negative fashion in a whole series of terrible disasters for the toiling masses of both advanced and backward countries where the masses were misled by opportunists. Now in Germany, now in China, now in England, now in Spain, the masses had the objective possibility of freeing themselves from oppression, but each time, at first Social-Democracy and afterward chiefly Stalinism, diverted them from the correct road. One can declare with certainty that unless the toilers of India adopt the policy proved correct in the crucible of the Russian experience of October 1917, they will not only fail to free themselves from their own native exploiters but will not secure even national independence. For the road to national independence of the colonial countries passes only through the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Now, what road do Cannon and his organization map out for the Indian toiling masses? Do they warn the Indian masses against any other road but the one irrefutably established by the experience of October 1917? Not at all! They direct the mind of the Indian toilers towards a different path, as follows:

"1776 Showed The Way for India."

This is a headline in an editorial in The Militant of August 22, 1942. Do the Trotskyites offer as inspiration to the Indian toilers the April Thesis of Lenin which pointed to the path of a Soviet Government? Not at all! The Trotskyites dig up the Declaration of Independence of the American bourgeoisie and slave-owners:

"Yet the people of India can find inspirations and weapons in their fight for freedom in America — not in the war Roosevelt carries on today but in the Revolutionary War for Independence (likewise from the British Empire) not in the Atlantic Charter, but in the Declaration of Independence." (Ibid.)

That the American Revolution, occurring over a century and a half ago, was a progressive event in history goes without saying. But the movement was not for the liberation of the immense multitudes of slaves and toilers. Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto written many decades after 1776 declared that "All previous historical movements were movements of minorities or in the interests of minorities." The American movement of 1776 was led by and in the interests of a small minority of the colonial population. It was organized and directed by New England merchants, shipbuilding capitalists, bankers, masters of indentured servants and by the Southern slave-owning aristocracy. National independence was achieved, but slavery and oppression continued, masked by a million beautiful phrases about liberty. Negro slavery was extended and intensified and the ground was prepared for establishing wage-slavery as the basic institution of American society. The 1776 movement was never meant to emancipate the crushed and exploited masses of the world, or of the British empire, or even of the American colonies. Unlike the Revolution of October 1917, which, before it degenerated bureaucratically, was indeed a movement to free all the oppressed and which for that reason was met with furious hatred by all exploiting classes and all capitalist governments, the movement of 1776 received support from a section of the feudal nobility of Europe, notably from the monarch of France and his statesmen. Even before 1776, spurred by his rivalry with England, "Louis XV dispatched agents to America to observe the course of events, to report on the prospects of revolution, and even to aid discreetly the party of discontent," (Beard, The Rise of American Civilization, Vol. I, pp. 244-245.) The French monarchy was anxious to see a clash of arms between

England and the American colonies. French monarchist generals and admirals led armies and fleets against the British at Yorktown, bringing the war for American independence to a victory for the colonies. Not that it was incorrect for the American capitalists and slave-owners to utilize even such reactionary forces in the fight for independence. We point out these facts to bring out the class features of the American war of 1776, features entirely omitted by the Trotskyites in urging "1776" as an "inspiration" for the Indian masses today. Finally, we must mention the general apathy of the American slaves, workers and poor farmers to the war against England, a state of indifference caused by the utter lack of a program of liberation for the toilers in the capitalists' and slave-owners' war for independence.

The New England capitalists and Southern slaveowners carried out the struggle for national independence only because capitalism was in its infancy; there was no modern proletariat standing as a realistic threat to all exploitation and oppression. But in the present period all exploiters tremble at the prospect of a new "October 1917." Even the colonial bourgeoisie and their petty-bourgeois "enemies," when the critical period arrives in their homeland, invariably side with the imperialists, because the real struggle for national independence unfolds in this epoch along the road of the dictatorship of the proletariat (Permanent Revolution), not along the road of "1776" (dictatorship of the bourgeoisie). This means abolition of all classes, a prospect the bourgeoisie dreads.

At the time of the Second Congress of the Communist International Lenin established the prospect of the backward countries passing to the Soviet system and to Communism without passing through the capitalist stage:

"The Communist International must lay down, and give the theoretical grounds for, the proposition that, with the aid of the proletariat of the most advanced countries, the backward countries may pass to the Soviet system and,

after passing through a definite stage of development, to Communism, without passing through the capitalist stage of development." (Selected Works, Vol. X, p. 243.)

The Indian proletariat, the only class that can lead to national independence which is now inseparable from the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, has different sources of inspiration, a different terrain to heed, a different path to follow than that indicated by the Trotskyites. The way to freedom, national and social, for the Indian workers lies along the path of their own class, the path of October 1917. The Trotskyite editorial, "1776 Showed the Way for India," demonstrates conclusively that the Trotskyite leaders betray the great proletarian traditions and policies and attempt to shove the Indian masses upon a path that will lead towards a bloody debacle and Fascist enslavement for the Indian toilers.

Is it an accident that Cannon and his collaborators trample upon the Marxian principle that the national and social emancipation of the colonial and semi-colonial countries lies through the dictatorship of the proletariat, the path of the Permanent Revolution? Not in the least. Trotsky himself, when the October Revolution entered its Stalinist period of degeneration and betrayal, quietly dropped his own great theory and gave support to sham "workers' governments" in Saxony and Thuringia in 1923. These governments, resting upon the bourgeois parliament, the Landtag, were headed by German Social Democrats, treacherous agents of imperialism, and were participated in by Stalin's agents in Germany. Trotsky at that time likened these bourgeois governments guarding the interests of German imperialism to the government the Bolsheviks had set up after the overthrow of the Russian bourgeoisie (see Trotsky's speech to the Moscow Metal Workers, Izvestia, Oct. 21, 1923, quoted in this issue of THE BULLETIN, p. 36) Trotsky continued his new line of betraying the Permanent Revolution through all the subsequent turns of history. The most outstanding and glaring example of his betrayal of the

policy of the Permanent Revolution is evident in the Spanish situation. He and his Cannons and Shachtmans sold the workers the policy of "bourgeois democracy vs. fascism," the line of "critical" support to the Stalinist-Socialist-Republican government headed by Azana. By the combined effort of all the opportunist forces, Stalinism performing the major part in this work, the Spanish workers and peasants were prevented from finding the path of October 1917. The result of the line of "democracy vs. fascism" laid down by Stalin's demagogues at the Seventh Congress of the "Comintern" was the bloodiest debacle and the establishment of Fascist military slavery in Spain. The open admission that such was the Trotskyist policy during the Spanish Civil War was made by the Trotskyists, who style themselves "Marxists," in the following words:

"In that struggle, by the way, the revolutionary Marxists were in favor of giving material support to the Spanish Loyalists because we recognized it to be a struggle between fascism and capitalist democracy and between the two we prefer the latter." (The Militant, May 24, 1941.)

Remarkable to note, in the same issue of their paper in which they openly admit their support to bourgeois democracy in the Spanish situation, they made the following declaration:

"To admit the truth would be to confess that bourgeois democracy is not the opposite of fascism, but paves the way for fascism in this epoch of capitalist decay."

By diverting the eyes of the revolutionary workers of India from the correct path and focusing their attention upon ideas and traditions of the bourgeoisie, the Trotskyite leaders are setting up a deadly political trap for the Indian toilers. If the revolutionary workers, in the first instance those who have broken with the treacherous Social Democracy and left in disgust the even more dangerously treacherous Stalinist "Comintern," but who cling to the Trotskyite opportunists, do not break in this epoch with all aspects of pseudo-Bolshevism,

the cause of the Indian masses will be lost. Only the exposure of the false leaders of the proletariat and the work of setting the Indian masses upon

the correct path can advance the struggle for their national and class freedom.

George Marlen

READ-

MARX ^{ON} _A SHAM WAR

THAT THE BOURGEOISIE WAGE REAL WARS IS KNOWN TO EVERY POLITICALLY EDUCATED, CLASS-CONSCIOUS WORKER.

BUT WHAT IS NOT SO WELL KNOWN, INDEED, WHAT IS VIRTUALLY UNKNOWN TO THE WORKERS IS THAT THE BOURGEOISIE, WHILE PRETENDING TO BE WAGING A REAL WAR, CONDUCT SHAM WARS AT CERTAIN TIMES.

THESE SHAM WARS ARE DEVICES BY WHICH THE PRETENDED "OPPONENTS" DISGUISE THEIR SECRET COLLABORATION.

IN CERTAIN RELATIVELY OBSCURE, LITTLE KNOWN WRITINGS, MARX AND ENGELS PRESENTED AN ELABORATE ANALYSIS OF A SHAM WAR OF THE LAST CENTURY "WAGED" BETWEEN THE ANGLO-FRENCH IMPERIALISTS AND RUSSIA.

WHAT ARE THE TEACHINGS OF THIS REMARKABLE WORK OF MARX AND ENGELS? WHAT HAVE THE WORKERS TO LEARN FROM IT? WHAT IS ITS BEARING ON THE PRESENT, THE EPOCH OF THE "PHONEY WAR"?

READ-

MARX ON A SHAM WAR

FREE COPIES

Address:
P.O.B. 67
Station D.
New York

FOR THE FRENCH WORKERS:
BOURGEOIS OR PROLETARIAN TRADITIONS?

THE Trotskyite leaders profess to school the workers in Marxism and instruct them in the traditions of the proletariat as different and distinct from the traditions of other classes. How distant this profession is from actual practice can readily be seen from the day-to-day education they pass on to the workers. Let us take for illustration an editorial "France's Struggle" in the July 18, 1942 issue of The Militant. Incidentally we must observe that the title of the editorial has nothing in common with revolutionary Marxism. Anyone who has studied Marxist works will recognize immediately that the title represents a bourgeois, not a proletarian ideology. When speaking of an imperialist country Marxists make a separation between the interests of the masses and those of the bourgeoisie and use class language to designate that separation. Marxists speak of "the struggle of the French workers," "the struggle of the German workers," but only such people as bourgeois ideologists and the Stalinist bureaucrats during their Rightist maneuvers speak of "Germany's struggle against Versailles," "France's Struggle," etc. "France's Struggle" for what? Struggles in capitalist society proceed along class lines. With "classless" phrases the opportunists verbally obliterated the fact that "France" contains exploiters and exploited.

We would naturally overlook the incorrectness of the title and regard it as a mere editorial slip, were it not for the content of the editorial itself. This, however, we cannot regard as merely slipshod writing. The essence of its ideas is Left petty-bourgeois "Socialist" rather than revolutionary-proletarian. The editorial in The Militant advances the following falsehood:

"With its slogan of Liberty,

Fraternity and Equality the French Revolution is even today a challenge to fascism with its oppression, racialism and bookburnings."

This places bourgeois-democratic phrasemongering in the category of a challenge to Fascism. Any politically educated revolutionary worker knows that even during the French Revolution itself the slogan "Equality" was a cloak concealing the terrible discrepancy between the poverty and misery of the French masses and the wealth of the rising bourgeoisie, the slogan "Liberty" hid the enslavement of the French toiling masses by the French capitalists, and the slogan "Fraternity" tended to conceal the fact that French society, after the overthrow of the feudal powers, was rent asunder by irreconcilable class interests. Every politically educated revolutionary worker also knows that there is only one true challenge to Fascism, and that is the proletarian revolution led by Marxists, not misled by opportunists. Every other "challenge to Fascism" is a fraud and a deadly snare for the workers, delivering them inevitably to Fascism. Such a fraud was the policy of the Popular Front which supposedly challenged Fascism in Spain and France; such a fraud is Stalin's bureaucratic and counter-revolutionary policy today which ostensibly is combatting Fascism while in reality is playing into the hands of Hitler and world imperialism.

The actual role of the bourgeoisie during the French Revolution is distorted by the Trotskyite "educators" of the workers. The Militant editorial says: "The French Revolution was led by the rising capitalist class when it was young and progressive..." When the history of the actual function of the French capitalist class is analyzed closely, it becomes obvious that the French Revolution was led not

by the "rising capitalist class" but by the extreme Left petty-bourgeoisie represented by the Jacobins. "The rising capitalist class" though young was already reactionary. Represented by the Girondists, the French capitalist class sought to arrest the revolution, to mislead it into conservative, counter-revolutionary channels. It assassinated Marat, destroyed the Left petty-bourgeois revolutionists, crushed the toiling masses, and became bloated with wealth under the slogans of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," which it inscribed on its repressive institutions including the prisons in which it confined many revolutionary workers. The real aim of the French capitalist class was to come to terms with the monarchist aristocracy. Shielded with the delusive slogan of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, the French capitalist class misled the French peasantry, the workers and the town petty-bourgeoisie into the strait-jacket of Bonapartist dictatorship, a "Fascist" form of bourgeois State of those days, under which the French capitalists exercised their class oppression and exploitation.

Virtually every paragraph in the editorial "France's Struggle" is permeated with reactionary petty-bourgeois "Socialism" which subtly diverts the workers from the ideology of their own class. It ends with the following words:

"The French working class is not interested in restoring monarchists to power nor in helping the slaveholders to regain their slaves. It will carry on the traditions of the sans-culotte stormers of the Bastille by fighting against national oppression, fascism and imperialist war - for Socialism and peace."

But don't the workers of France have proletarian traditions of their own class? Must they go back politically a hundred and sixty-one years to seek inspiration in the national traditions of the Left petty-bourgeoisie, who, though revolutionary in the days of the storming of the Bastille and the destruction of the Bourbons, are

today deceivers of the workers and slavishly subservient to imperialism. What of the great proletarian class battles of June 1848! What of the immortal international traditions of the Parisian Communards of 1871 who made the first attempt to establish a working class society! And above all, what about the great international tradition of the October Revolution! The Russian toilers in 1917 and through the civil war, under the leadership of Lenin, fought a victorious battle against Russian Fascist generals and world imperialist intervention! The editorial "France's Struggle" copiously expatiates on the bourgeois revolutionary traditions of 1789, but of the proletarian revolutionary traditions of recent years it does not utter a word.

During the Popular Front period the unfortunate French workers were thoroughly miseducated by the Stalinists and Social Democrats whose chief stock-in-trade for a number of years was "the traditions of 1789."

The method of the Stalinist "Comintern" is to mix as thoroughly as possible the traditions of October, which is the revolutionary heritage of the proletariat, with bourgeois traditions which serve reaction. The purpose of the Stalinist counter-revolution is to prevent the workers from crystallizing a Marxist ideology. The admixture of bourgeois ideas is particularly great when the Comintern executes its Rightist zigzags. Today these masters of demolition of Marxism are particularly emphatic in strengthening the deadly ideological concoction by pouring into it as many deceptive petty-bourgeois "revolutionary" abstractions as they can handle. The appeal of these treacherous renegades is to "France" not to the French proletariat. Their exhortations say "France, arise and fight for liberty!" (The New York Times, August 20, 1942). And the Trotskyite leaders "criticizing" the Stalinist destroyers of Marxism, create essentially an identical combination of proletarian and bourgeois ideas. In many instances their writings contain much of "Leninist" verbiage, with a reactionary thought

here and there skillfully intertwined. But in the case under examination, the editorial "France's Struggle," there is not a single idea representing the traditions of the Commune of 1871 or the October Revolution. From the be-

ginning to the end it is a work of bourgeois delusion, objectively serving the reactionary forces within modern society.

George Marlen
August 20, 1942

A BURNING ISSUE-

INDIA

ALONG WHAT PATH CAN THE TOIL-
ING MASSES OF INDIA WIN
THEIR FREEDOM? BOURG-
EOIS-DEMOCRACY? PRO-
LETARIAN DICTATOR-
SHIP?

WHICH TENDENCY IN THE WORK-
ING CLASS RANKS OFFERS THE
CORRECT SOLUTION TO THE
VAST PROBLEMS FACING THE
INDIAN WORKERS? THAT WHICH
ISSUES THE CALL FOR A
CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY?
OR THAT WHICH SOUNDS THE
CRY FOR A SOVIET
GOVERNMENT?

READ

THE BULLETIN

FOR THE MARXIST ANSWER TO
THESE QUESTIONS

Send for a FREE copy of:-

INDIA :

1. The Trotskyites Resurrect
A Slogan
2. The Workers Party and Indian
Independence
3. The R. W. L. and India

Address:
P.O.B. 67
Station D.
New York

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

TWO POSITIONS ON "THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE"

FROM time to time, the Trotskyite magazine, Fourth International, reprints articles by Trotsky in its archive section, "From the Arsenal of Marxism." Some of these articles of Trotsky's are indeed from that arsenal, for it cannot be denied that at one time in his life, very long ago, Trotsky stood on a fundamentally Marxist line. Other articles by Trotsky, however, are from a totally different arsenal, coming from the period of the Stalinist bureaucratic degeneration of the leaders of the October Revolution.

It is enlightening to compare articles written on the same topic in these two opposite periods. Two recent issues of the Cannonite magazine reprinted articles by Trotsky dealing with the question of the United States of Europe. One article, (Fourth International, May 1942, p. 156), is from the 1915-1917 period in which Trotsky, growing greater in revolutionary calibre, was rapidly moving towards the Leninist trend; the other (Ibid., July 1942, p. 220), was written in the early Summer of 1923, in that latter phase of Trotsky's political career, during the rule of the Trio (Zinoviev-Kamenev-Stalin).

The first article, from the period of Trotsky's maturation as a revolutionary, takes a clear and unmistakably Marxist stand on the position of the United States of Europe. Sharply differentiating himself from the bourgeois demagogues who were also using the phrase, United States of Europe, but as a cover for imperialist depredations, Trotsky categorically identified the Marxist concept of the United States of Europe with the socialist dictatorship of the European

proletariat. In this earlier article Trotsky wrote:

"The victorious European revolution, however, no matter how its course in the sundry countries may be fashioned can, in consequence of the absence of other revolutionary classes, transfer the power only to the proletariat. Thus the United States of Europe represents the only conceivable form of the dictatorship of the European proletariat." (Reprinted in Fourth International, May 1942, p. 158. My emphasis-J.C.H.)

This identification of the United States of Europe with the dictatorship of the proletariat was fully in line with Lenin's writings on that subject. The idea of a United States of Europe under capitalism was repudiated by Lenin as either a myth or an imperialist bludgeon:

"From the point of view of the economic conditions of imperialism, i.e., capital export and division of the world between the 'progressive' and 'civilized' colonial powers, the United States of Europe under capitalism is either impossible or reactionary." (Collected Works, Vol. XVIII, pp. 269-270.)

Lenin even considered the term, United States of Europe, to be insufficiently broad, for he identified the concept in its final meaning with ^{the} stateless society of fully developed Communism and pointed to the United States of the World as the scientifically more correct term:

"The United States of the World (not of Europe alone) is a state

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

form of national unification and freedom which we connect with Socialism; we think of it as becoming a reality only when the full victory of Communism will have brought about the total disappearance of any state, including its democratic form." (Ibid., p. 271.)

In these terms of the international power of the proletarian dictatorship was the concept of the United States of Europe (or of the World) framed in the Marxist system in its classical writings.

With the growth of the bureaucratic degeneration of the leaders of the first workers' State, virtually every one of them made it a policy and a practice utterly to distort every Marxist concept. The degenerated leaders began to introduce policies which diverted the workers from the achievement of a Communist revolution and a proletarian dictatorship.

Since the Leninist concept of the United States of Europe is organically united with the dictatorship of the proletariat, the bureaucratic renegades had to confuse the workers on the nature of the latter in order to confuse them on the nature of the former. We shall outline how this deception was engineered.

Through the course of the Russian Revolution, history had proved conclusively that there is no middle or transitional ground between a bourgeois and a proletarian dictatorship:

"The main thing the Socialists fail to understand and what constitutes their theoretical shortsightedness, their captivity to bourgeois prejudices and their political treachery to the proletariat, is that in capitalist society, as soon as there is any serious intensification of the class struggle on which it is based, there cannot be any middle course between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat." (V. I. Lenin, Selected Works, Volume VII, p. 229. My emphasis - J.C.H.)

This formulation was meant not only as an analysis of state forms but also as a political directive warning against confusing some form of bourgeois dictatorship with the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the present epoch, any state which is not the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessarily the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie — such was the Leninist principle. Therefore, a real Workers, or Workers and Peasants Government can exist only under a proletarian dictatorship. In the early Soviet vocabulary, the term Workers or Workers and Peasants Government came to be used as a synonym for the dictatorship of the proletariat; the Russian Revolution and its aftermath in Europe pointed to and justified such usage.

What were the historical facts which established this usage? All governments formed by petty-bourgeois "labor" or "socialist" parties proved to be capitalist governments, agencies of world imperialism. These treacherous "labor" or "socialist" governments occasionally tried to palm themselves off as Workers or Workers and Peasants Governments, but this was mere demagogy concealing their capitalist content. To this day the only genuine Workers, or Workers and Peasants Government that ever existed was the one formed through the dictatorship of the proletariat created by the Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917.

The bureaucratic renegades from Bolshevism, in line with their policy of diverting the toilers from proletarian revolution, began to give the workers the impression that there could exist real Workers, or Workers and Peasants Governments not under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The degenerated Soviet leaders began to issue cautiously-worded, equivocal formulations which spoke of a middle course between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat, of "stages towards" the proletarian dictatorship, of "transitional phases" which would not be the proletarian dictatorship but nevertheless would be Workers, or Workers and Peasants Governments. Naturally, the object of the renegades was to en-

tangle the workers in support of these non-Bolshevik and therefore capitalist "Workers" Governments, thus pushing the toilers off the path of proletarian revolution.

The year 1923 marked a high stage of the Stalinist bureaucratic degeneration of the top leaders of the Soviet State. Lenin, who attempted to combat the Stalinist degeneration, was rapidly sinking out of the picture due to illness. Particularly in the early part of 1923 Lenin's illness mounted to a severe pitch, putting him out of all political work.

By 1923 the Stalinist renegades with their hands practically completely free had already firmly established the poisonous notion that Workers or Workers and Peasants Governments are possible on a non-proletarian-dictatorship basis.

Trotsky's article of the early Summer of 1923 on the United States of Europe coincides with this period. The line taken by Trotsky in this article reveals into what camp he had fallen. Sharply departing from his former revolutionary position of identifying the United States of Europe with the proletarian dictatorship, Trotsky now spoke of the United States of Europe as a possibility without the proletarian dictatorship. Trotsky now identified the United States of Europe with those alleged "Workers," or "Workers and Peasants" Governments which all the bureaucratic renegades were describing as not the actual dictatorship of the proletariat but a "stage towards" that dictatorship. His changed position on this vital question reads as follows:

"It might be argued that we are in reality speaking of a European Socialist Federation as part of a World Federation, and that such a regime can be brought about only by the dictatorship of the proletariat. We will not stop to answer this argument, since it was refuted by the international analysis during the consideration of the question of a 'Workers' Government.' 'The

United States of Europe' is a slogan in every respect corresponding with the slogan 'A Workers' (or Workers' and Peasants') Government.' Is the realization of a 'Workers' Government' possible without the dictatorship of the proletariat? Only a conditional reply can be given to this question. In any case, we regard the 'Workers' Government' as a stage towards the dictatorship of the proletariat." (Reprinted in Fourth International, July 1942, p. 222. My emphasis — J.C.H.)

Note how carefully equivocal Trotsky was on the question whether a Workers Government is possible without the dictatorship of the proletariat. "Only a conditional reply can be given to this question," wrote the 1923 Trotsky. History had long given a categorical NO - to this question, — as Trotsky well knew; but now he had a reason — the same reason Zinoviev, Stalin, Kamenev, Bukharin and the other renegades had who also gave a "conditional" reply to this question — for avoiding a direct Leninist answer. The "Workers Government" was now palmed off as "in any case" a "stage towards" the dictatorship of the proletariat. Since there is no middle ground between a bourgeois dictatorship and a proletarian dictatorship, it is clear that a "stage towards" the latter is in reality a bourgeois dictatorship. Thus Trotsky advanced the slogan of a United States of Europe as identical with the alleged "Workers" Government which was said to be possible without the dictatorship of the proletariat. In brief, Trotsky now posed the United States of Europe under the regime of capitalism, a position repudiated by Lenin at all times, and by Trotsky when he too was a revolutionary.

What was involved here was not just a matter of a different formulation of a slogan. In that same year, 1923, the new policy which these new slogans represented was put into deadly effect on the international scene under the aegis of the degenerated leaders. The deceptive slogan "Workers Government" without the dictator-

ship of the proletariat, identified by Trotsky in 1923 with the idea of the United States of Europe, was used by the bureaucrats to confuse the workers on the difference between a bourgeois and a proletarian dictatorship.

It was in Germany, ripe for proletarian revolution in 1923, that these deceptions led to their first concrete, major and epoch-making betrayal of an imminent proletarian revolution, a piece of treachery engineered by the bureaucratic cancer in the Soviet Union which eventually came to be known as Stalinism. The bourgeois-democratic, parliamentary (Landtag) regimes of Saxony and Thuringia, where the upsurge of the workers was particularly intense, were painted up by the Soviet bureaucratic renegades as "Workers" Governments, a subtle deception reinforced by the trick of having three German Stalinist agents, Brandler, Thalheimer and Boettcher, participate in them in ministerial posts. Coalition bourgeois-democratic governments consisting of "Left" Social-Democrats, Right Social-Democrats (the Scheidemannites), and the few Stalinist bureaucrats as a tiny minority, were thus formed in the German capitalist state. in the Saxon and Thuringian bourgeois Parliaments.

In line with the policy of getting the workers to confuse a bourgeois with a proletarian dictatorship, Trotsky, in a speech during the fateful events of October 1923, equated the bourgeois-democratic, parliamentary coalition governments of Saxony and Thuringia with the Bolshevik government in which a few Left-S.R.'s participated as a small minority, a Soviet government established in Russia in 1918 after the proletarian overthrow of the capitalist regime and the creation of a proletarian dictat-

orship. Designating Brandler and his mates, who had gotten their instructions from the Stalin clique in the Kremlin, as "Communists," Trotsky said:-

"At the present time the situation is clear. The coalition of Communists with the Social Democrats in the government of Saxony and Thuringia is comparable to the coalition of the Communists and Left Social Revolutionaries in Russia." (Izvestia, Oct. 21, 1923.)

Trotsky, of course, knew perfectly well the difference between the bourgeois-parliamentary Landtag governments of Saxony and Thuringia and the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia in 1918. His October 1923 deceptive equation of a bourgeois with a proletarian dictatorship was already contained in his article on the United States of Europe, written earlier that year, wherein he pretended there could be a Workers Government without the dictatorship of the proletariat. The whole fraud in turn was preceded by the fundamental degeneration of the Bolshevik leadership, a malignant process which consisted of the transformation of revolutionary leaders into power-usurping bureaucrats who first intrigued against the workers for permanent entrenchment in their high posts and then squabbled amongst themselves for the lion's share of power.

The smashing defeat of the German proletariat in 1923 due to the treacherous line foisted on them by Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Stalin, Bukharin and other deserters from Marxism paved the way for the recovery of imperialist power which led to the present assault on the Soviet Union.

J. C. Hunter
August 10, 1942

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION
can now be obtained in a bound volume. The previous articles have been collected and arranged in historical order. The entire material presented in this section can be read in this convenient collection. Send for a FREE copy.