

T H E BULLETIN

OF THE WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

THE TRUTH BEHIND THE EUROPEAN "PEACE" CRISIS

**—ARTHUR BURKE
—GEORGE MARLEN**

**Part V.— THE WORK OF CANNON And SHACHTMAN
IN THE TRADE UNIONS.
THE SELL-OUT OF THE FOOD WORKERS**

**SHOP TALK: HOW TO EXPLAIN A "TRANSITIONAL
PROGRAM" TO A SIMPLE WORKER.**

**SOME ASPECTS OF TROTSKY'S LINE IN THE
CHINESE REVOLUTION.**

THE RED STAR PRESS

P. O. BOX 67

STATION D

NEW YORK

THE BULLETIN

of the

WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

Vol. IX - No. 4. (Whole Number 47) Sept. - Oct. 1946.

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

	<u>PAGE</u>
The Truth About the European "Peace" Crisis - Arthur Burke - George Marlen	1
THE WORK OF CANNON AND SHACHTMAN IN THE TRADE UNIONS: Part V.: The Sell-out of the Food Workers. - A.B.	16
SHOP TALK: How To Explain a "Transitional Program" to a Simple Worker.	25
Some Aspects of Trotsky's Line in the Chinese Revolution.	29

THE BULLETIN and its PURPOSE

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

The immediate aim of the WORKERS LEAGUE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY is to arm the revolutionary workers with an understanding of the pseudo-revolutionary organizations now controlling the proletarian vanguard and to organize these workers into a new party.

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

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

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

THE TRUTH BEHIND THE
EUROPEAN "PEACE" CRISIS

EDITORIAL NOTE:

• The following is a Discussion Article written in line with the "Thesis on the International Situation" published in the June-July 1946 issue of THE BULLETIN.

- - - - -

Although the ending of the "Second World War" situation occurred in an atmosphere of "unity" and "collaboration" between the Soviet Union and Anglo-American imperialism, the present situation is dominated by a profound diplomatic conflict between these former "Allies". Almost a year and a half has passed since the "unconditional surrender" of Germany in May 1945 and yet there is a mounting crisis on the subject of the proposed "peace treaties." After a series of highly publicised meetings among the Ministers of the so-called Big Four, a few rough drafts of treaties have been prepared for Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Finland. At the present writing these drafts are being presented to a "peace" conference of twenty-one nations in Paris who have the power of discussion and recommendation and nothing more. After this present "peace" gabfest is over, the so-called Big Four are presumably to take the recommendations into account and work out the final texts.

Even the bourgeois press refers to the present drafts as dealing only with the "periphery" of the "peace problem." Any treaties must necessarily hinge on the plans for Austria and Germany in the heart of Europe; yet treaties for the latter two are not even on the agenda. According to the capitalist press "even if the Paris Conference should agree on a peace draft for Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria it will have succeeded only in making peace in the rear areas - while in the front line - Austria - fighting is still going on." (N.Y. Times, July 29, 1946) And of those treaty drafts that have been presented for discussion, The New York Times has pointed to the following significant feature:

"The one surprise is the large area on which the Big Four have not been able to agree." (July 31, 1946)

Contrary to the hypocrisy of this imperialist organ, there is really no "surprise" whatsoever. An analysis of the present relationship between the Soviet Union and the Anglo-American imperialists will show that there can be no basic agreement and that the "peace" crisis is destined to continue to its logical conclusion - the explosion of the basic antagonism between the bourgeois property dominated by Anglo-American imperialism and the proletarian form of property controlled by the Stalinist apparatus.

The preliminary build-up to the Paris conference was marked by a skillfully effected ideological change in the propaganda line of Anglo-American imperialism toward the Soviet Union and viceversa. In contrast to the atmosphere of "unity" presented at Teheran in December 1943, Yalta in February 1945 and Potsdam in August 1945, the current ideology now

spread is one of basic cleavage and growing hostility between Anglo-American imperialism and the Soviet Union. Speaking of the change manipulated in the imperialist countries, The New York Times noted:

"There are many diplomats who believe this change was deliberately engineered by the Administration in Washington. The momentum of the pro-Soviet feeling, carefully engendered and built up during the war - which carried on through Potsdam and Moscow conferences - has been halted and replaced."
(April 17, 1946)

On every point, ranging from Stalin's maneuvers in Manchuria, Korea, Iran, Austria, Germany, all the Balkan states, his attitude toward reparations, the use of the veto power in the "United Nations Security Council," the question of "control" of atomic energy - the list is endless - the picture given to the masses is one of sharp division between Stalin and the "Western Powers." All this is accompanied by uninterrupted military preparations on both sides.

These military preparations indicate what is really behind the present conflict which thus far is in its diplomatic stage. In the bailiwick of American imperialism it has been noted that "unlike the Army's post-war experience twenty-eight years ago, there has been no sharp and sudden slump in weapons experimentation and development." (N.Y. Times, May 13, 1946. Our emphasis.)

It is quite clear that the American imperialists are not looking forward to any period of peace. Bigger and more destructive weapons are being built continuously despite the pacific pretenses of the official imperialist spokesmen:

"The trend toward increased fire power, mobility and armor, noticeable during the war, has continued in the post-war months and bigger and better guns, tanks and bombs have been developed." (Ibid. Our emphasis.)

According to some revelations by the Stalinist magazine, "Bolshhevik," the United States since 1940 has built 432 military bases, of which 228 are in the Atlantic. Negotiations are in progress with Britain, Denmark, Portugal, Australia and other countries for the acquisition of another forty bases (N.Y. Times, Aug. 1, 1946). American technical experts are reportedly preparing to construct air bases in Turkey which is close to the Soviet Union, and German prisoners are now being used to build air bases in Foggia, Italy, facing Stalin-controlled Yugoslavia. The United States Army already has bases in Alaska and Greenland in the Polar regions and recently a joint expedition of American and Canadian forces explored the northern regions of the continent to gain additional military information. There is hardly any secret as to whom the American imperialists are preparing to fight; the target of the imperialist military preparations is the Soviet Union and almost everyone knows it. Indeed, when negotiations were in progress for a lease on Icelandic bases, The New York Times openly stated as a matter of course that Iceland is on "the direct air route from Washington and New York to Moscow and also is strategically located with reference to the route to Murmansk." (April 28, 1946)

Added to all the above is the feverish production of atomic bombs and continued experimentation with all conceivable types of infernal military weapons. All the while, these war preparations supplement

the concerted diplomatic wrangle of Anglo-American imperialism with the Stalinist bureaucrats

In the Anglo-American imperialist countries, the line is being spread that Stalin endangers "world peace" and threatens the "security" not only of small nations but even of the large western powers! The previous "wartime" agreements are presented in the light of "appeasement" which added to the appetite of Stalin as it allegedly did to Hitler before him:

"Step by step, from the partition of Poland, to the Yalta deal for Russian concessions in Manchuria and the final mutilation of Germany at Potsdam, the western Allies surrendered principle in favor of power politics. They did so in the hope of preserving the wartime unity of the United Nations, which is equally essential to peace; but they did this by making successive and one-sided concessions to one Power only - Russia - with the inevitable result that the Russian appetite grew and at the same time stimulated the appetites of others. Today these appetites have grown to proportions which not only endanger the prospect of a common peace but also begin to threaten the interests and security of the Western Allies themselves." (N.Y. Times, April 22, 1946. Our emphasis.)

The cry against "appeasement" is being raised to make the situation analogous with the days when Hitler, occupying one country after another, was building his military machine. Subtly and persistently Stalin is being cast as a "Hitlerite" aggressor, and this campaign is being pushed by official as well as unofficial spokesmen of imperialism. George S. Messersmith, the present American ambassador to Argentina, "described the international situation as an 'armed truce' and suggested that Russia's policy today was similar to that of Germany during 1933-38." (N.Y. Times, May 12, 1946) A statement by the leader in the House of Representatives was almost as blunt:

"The House Democratic leader, John W. McCormack of Massachusetts, said today that 'fear and uncertainty' prevailed throughout Europe because of Soviet influence. Efforts of the other powers to achieve permanent peace 'have been deterred' by Russia's actions, he declared." (N.Y. Times, May 13, 1946)

A Foreign Affairs sub-committee of the same House of Representatives conducted a tour of Europe and the Near East. The result was a report which according to The New York Times, "reflected a considerable degree of alarm over Soviet activities in countries under USSR domination and over growing Russian influence in other nations." (June 19, 1946) The report, significantly enough, recommended a break with alleged "appeasement" of the Soviet Union.

In referring to wartime "pledges" made by the Big Three, a New York Times editorial warned ominously:

"It is up to the Big Powers, especially Russia, to see to it that their wartime pledges are more than scraps of paper." (June 7, 1946. Our emphasis.)

If these are the statements emanating from the cautious sections of

the capitalist press, one realizes the extent of the present diplomatic war against the Soviet Union.

The trade union bureaucracy hews unswervingly to the line laid down by imperialism. This agency of the bosses provides a good bellwether for the present imperialist propaganda offensive:

"As Mr. Byrnes returned the executive council of the American Federation of Labor issued a statement in which it 'viewed with the gravest concern the threat of another war,' called for a 'tough policy' toward the Soviet Union and accused Moscow of having used 'methods of aggression' in Asia and eastern Europe since the end of World War II." (N.Y. Times, May 19, 1946)

In England the same tendency is to be observed with Churchill in the forefront and the labor stooges of the imperialists, Attlee and Bevin, echoing his demagoguery on the present world situation.

From all sides and all angles, the imperialist propagandists are getting the masses accustomed to the idea that a war between Anglo-American imperialism and the Soviet Union will take place sooner or later.

What is vital is a thoroughgoing understanding of how the groundwork for the present diplomatic maneuvering was prepared. An unraveling of this pattern will show the reason for the transformation in political atmosphere from the outward appearance of "unity" to open hostility between the former "Allies." Only on the basis of this understanding can the situation be clarified to the masses who can then be put in a position to counter the plans of the imperialist and Stalinist gangs.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRESENT SITUATION

The fictitious unity between Anglo-American imperialism and the Stalinist bureaucracy was created during the period of the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union. The Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union represented the second intervention of world imperialism. When the Nazi Army was decisively beaten by Stalin's Red Army, the imperialist world was plunged into a tremendous crisis. In its preparation for war against the Soviet Union, the entire resources of Europe had been turned over to the Nazi military machine. At the same time the Nazi forces were used to protect their rear by terrorizing and policing the European masses. This function was inescapably connected to its use as a military battering-ram against the walls of the Stalin-ridden Workers State. The defeat of the Nazi Army in the Soviet Union meant the end of the Nazi regime inside Germany and the occupied territories. This necessitated the replacement of the Nazi forces by those of Anglo-American imperialism which then took over the job of policing the European workers to head off an upsurge from below. The chief function of the Nazi regime was to organize an attack on the Soviet Union; when this attack failed, imperialism had to remove that regime from the historical stage.

As the first step along these lines, the Allied High Command established contact with the European underground and attached it to the specific military maneuvers. With the underground in hand, Anglo-American imperialism gradually took over Western Europe, the change of hands being accompanied by only a token of resistance from the Nazi Army. In Germany itself the working class was dealt with in a special way. To paralyze any spontaneous development to overthrow the Nazi regime, the Allied imperialists subjected the German masses to a horrible

slaughter and terror by precision bombings of turbulent and potentially rebellious districts in key centers. Millions of workers and peasants strait-jacketed in German uniforms were dispersed to various portions of the continent and dealt with piecemeal.

The failure of the second intervention of the Soviet Union makes a third one historically inevitable for imperialism. History has already shown that a revolutionary crisis in capitalism may postpone such a hazardous undertaking; but so long as Stalinism exists and paralyzes the masses, a new imperialist attack on the Soviet Union is inevitable. In the present historical period, the new intervention can be led only by the military forces of Anglo-American imperialism. The investigation of the development of the post-Stalingrad period of the sham war shows how this new intervention has been prepared.

While the contradiction between the form of economy in the Soviet Union and that in the imperialist world can be settled only by a clash of arms, the "democratic" form of political rule in the main sectors of the imperialist world dictate the present preparatory ideological approach to maneuver the masses into such a war. In the case of the second intervention, a whole historical period was needed to create a military instrument and the necessary political setting. The vanguard of the German working class was wiped out by the Nazi terror. The Nazi military machine was then organized and strengthened with the financial help of the Anglo-American imperialists. Finally, at the proper moment, and without more ado than tearing up a treaty, the Nazi Army was plunged into Russia. The defeat of the Nazis put the burden for fulfilling a definitive military solution on the shoulders of Anglo-American imperialism directly. However, due to the "democratic" form of rule, the American and British imperialists cannot use the tactic employed by the Nazi leaders who drove the masses into the shambles of war with Russia by means of open terror. The Anglo-American imperialists possess the necessary military machine; their main task, however, is to establish a suitable ideological atmosphere, to turn the sentiments of the masses against the Soviet Union. In this all-important sphere, the primary stumbling-block was the tremendous prestige gained by the Soviet Union due to Stalin's military victory over the Nazi Army. The method worked out to overcome this is embodied in a series of agreements with Stalin from Teheran to Potsdam running through 1943 to 1945. Taking into account the independent predatory and rapacious appetite of the Stalinist bureaucracy for the grabbing of territories, the imperialists fitted this into their own schemes. A wide range of territories was opened to the Stalinist bandits through agreements containing all sorts of catch phrases which call for all kinds of "guarantees." The present anti-Stalin campaign is based precisely on these territorial occupations by Stalin and its relationship to the seemingly innocuous pledges which covered this entire manipulation. Now that the Stalin gang is fully entrenched in most occupied countries, which Stalin entered through the door opened to him by the Anglo-American imperialists themselves, the latter have cunningly set to work to transform the ideology of the masses from one of sympathy to one of active hostility to the Soviet Union. The Stalinist maneuvers and grabs, political terror, and unmistakable military preparations in the occupied countries form the solid basis for the entire imperialist propaganda barrage.

As the imperialist press works up its ideological campaign against Stalin, revelations have been forthcoming regarding the machinations during 1943-45. It now turns out that while the Nazi Army was still deep in the Soviet Union, the imperialists at Teheran in December 1943

arranged with Stalin that he occupy all the Balkan countries except Greece and also came to an agreement with him concerning his entry into the "war" against Japan. (N.Y. Times, Aug. 11, 1945) In February 1945 while Stalin was still at peace with Japan, the Anglo-American imperialists at Yalta, under the pretext of securing Stalin's "help to defeat Japan," guaranteed him the restoration of the old Tsarist rights in Manchuria, and gave him Port Arthur, the Kurile Islands, Sakhalin, and half of Korea. In truth, the Far Eastern maneuvers provided the most striking features in the entire imperialist-Stalin development during 1943-45. Three months before Stalin actually declared war on Japan, it was noted even by the capitalist press that Japan was already "defeated" by the U.S. and that Russian military intervention "to help defeat Japan" was not necessary in the Far East. (N.Y. Times, May 11, 1945) Yet a few days after Stalin declared war on Japan (August 8, 1945) it was revealed that the American imperialists had signed a commitment to send one billion, seven hundred million dollars worth of Lend-Lease supplies to Stalin's Far Eastern Army and that this equipment was made a condition for Stalin's entry into the "war" against Japan:

"Russia's declaration of war on Japan Wednesday made good a promise given at the Big Three conference at Tehran. She then pledged herself to join Great Britain and the United States in the war against that country within six months after the defeat of Germany.

"Indeed, because of the agreement this country has been engaged for more than six months in building up a tremendous stockpile of ammunition and other material in Siberia so that Russia could strike Japan in Manchuria.

"This stockpile, it can now be revealed, was made a condition to Russian participation in the Japanese war."
(N.Y. Times, Aug. 11, 1945 Our emphasis.)

But an even more noteworthy fact was the Japanese policy toward the shipping of these war materials. Although the Japanese were quite well aware of the direction and intent of this war material sent to the Soviet Far East, here is how they reacted:

"One of the amazing features of this situation is that while the Japanese know the character of those cargoes, they permitted the ships to make their trips without molestation." (Ibid. Our emphasis.)

The Japanese policy in relation to these shipments was in harmony with their line on land. Stationed in Manchuria were almost a million Japanese troops led by the crack Kwantung Army. The territory was easily defensible and was protected by natural barriers, shielded by high mountains and narrow passes in many strategic sectors. For many years it had been an open secret that the Japanese force in Manchuria was being groomed for eventual use against the Soviet Union. Yet when Stalin entered Manchuria, the powerful Kwantung Army put up no resistance. Stalin's troops marched as much as 105 miles in one day without meeting opposition. The Stalin-Japanese "war" in Manchuria lasted six days and the Kwantung Army surrendered without a single action that could be described as a real battle. Thus, just as the Japanese imperialists for many months allowed war materials to go through their waters to Stalin's Far Eastern forces unmolested, so they allowed his land forces to move through Manchuria without setting up any impediment. Wasn't the Japanese policy of no opposition to Stalin's Army another "condition" for Stalin's entry into that situation? It would seem that after four years of

unprecedented slaughter of the Russian masses in Europe Stalin could not chance to start another slaughter in the Far East - a fierce war could easily have developed if such was the Japanese policy. What excuse could have been given to the Russian Masses by Stalin to justify another terrible blood-letting, this time in the Far East? At least in Europe the masses could see the logic of his advance into foreign territories on the grounds that this was done in the wake of beating the Nazi invasion. But Japan did not attack the Soviet Union and was being eliminated in the eyes of the masses as a threatening force. Why, then, Stalin's war against the Japanese? The fact that no resistance was offered by the Japanese points to a guarantee given Stalin by the Anglo-American imperialists, to the effect that he could have Manchuria on a silver platter.

With the wind-up of the "war" situation in the Far East, the next aspect of the imperialist policy was gradually pushed to the foreground. This is the phase of disagreement between the imperialists and Stalin. The key fact is that it is precisely over the territories handed over to Stalin that this disagreement attitude has developed which has now turned into a full-fledged diplomatic offensive by the imperialists and a counter-offensive by Stalin. The Stalin-occupied territories are described as police states hidden from the outside world by an "iron curtain" behind which are speeded preparations for aggressive war. No advanced worker will question the foreknowledge of the imperialist politicians that Stalin can build nothing but a "police state" in so far as the political form of rule is concerned in the occupied territories. But in the "appeasement" period, the imperialists pretended that Stalin's occupation of territories was the product of the world-wide victory of "democracy against fascism." A typical example of how the bourgeois propaganda machine operates can be seen in the current disclosure of the Stalin fortifications in Albania. Just as the European "peace" conference opened, these facts were heralded in the capitalist press. The tenor of the articles painted a dark picture of terrorism in this Stalinist puppet state and a hint that the military fortifications were directed against the British puppet, Greece. Other articles on the subject showed the intimate tie between these developments and Stalin's direct military preparations:

"The Albanian Army at present is considered virtually a part of the Yugoslav Army, which, in turn, is to all intents and purposes a cog in the Russian military machine.

"The presence in Albania of Yugoslav and Russian advisers and instructors is accepted here as indisputable fact. The character of the Albanian Army dispositions, presumably ordered by these experts, appears to be not only defensive." (N.Y. Times, Aug. 1, 1946)

What is hidden from view is the telling fact that the Anglo-American imperialists had landed in Albania in October 1944 but withdrew from the country and allowed Stalin's stooge, Tito, to take over. Similarly, in Yugoslavia directly, Anglo-American imperialism abandoned their own stooge, Mikhailovitch, and gave official support to Stalin's man, Tito, in 1943 and authorized his hegemony over Yugoslavia. But now that the Anglo-American imperialists helped this Stalin puppet to power the new line is put into effect. The "Allied" imperialists knew, of course, what would happen in Yugoslavia when they agreed to recognize Tito but they kept this hidden in 1943. Now, however, they make a big to-do about their confirmed expectation:

"There is neither political nor religious nor any other freedom in Yugoslavia. The press is shackled, the opposition has been crushed, and the OZNA, or Secret Police sees to it that all Yugoslavs without exception join the Tito forces and hail the Leader, or they do not eat." (N.Y. Times, June 3, 1946 editorial.)

After the Allied imperialists deliberately opened the door to this Stalin agent, they suddenly became self-righteous about the character of his regime. With an indignant air, the capitalist mouthpieces declare:

"The assurances given to the people of Yugoslavia and other countries of eastern Europe during the war must still be redeemed. (Ibid.)

As with Albania, so with other countries, the imperialist tactic of greasing the path for Stalin now yields political dividends for imperialism, enabling it to transform Stalin in the eyes of the masses in the capitalist countries from an "Ally fighting for freedom" into another Hitler. This transformation is being carried out precisely around the territories which Stalin was more than willing to grab.

The central feature in the growing conflict will more and more hinge on the status of Stalin's occupying forces. From the standpoint of the masses nothing would seem more just and reasonable than the withdrawal of troops so that the people of the occupied countries can "freely" work out their affairs. But the capitalist press takes great pains to point out that there is a bar to this high plan, and this obstacle is none other than Stalin:

"Byrnes Seeks Army Withdrawal Plan Which Can Be Applied Later to Austria and Germany.
"SOVIETS OFFER MAIN OBSTACLE." (N.Y. Times, July 28, 1946)

The imperialists feign that their previous line of deliberately handing over territory to Stalin was being motivated by a sincere belief in Stalin's promises. When Stalin signed a scrap of paper, that seemingly was enough for the imperialists - or so their agents tell the masses:

"All the publicly issued war-time declarations of policy, and the United Nations itself, were based on the assumption that Russia was fighting to drive out the invader and that for the rest she would follow the principles of the Atlantic Charter, to which she had subscribed." (N.Y. Times, Mar. 13, 1946 editorial.)

But now the true motives of Stalin have been "discovered" and as every child could have predicted, he became a violator of pledges and an opponent of the "sanctity" of small nations:

"That Russia has pursued a policy of unilateral aggrandizement in violation of the Atlantic Charter is no longer subject to debate." (N.Y. Times, June 17, 1946 editorial)

It is this understanding which the imperialist propagandists are trying to burn into the consciousness of the masses. The success of the bourgeois propaganda is ensured by the vast number of territories which the imperialist leaders themselves turned over to Stalin in

Europe and Asia. Naturally, without these concrete occupations by Stalin's forces, an air of reality about "Soviet Agression" could never have been created.

The typical article in the bourgeois propagand organs on the present world situation is usually headed: "What Does Russia Want?" Under this suggestive title, the imperialists, who are preparing for war, try to knock out any idea that Stalin is guided by peaceful intentions. The agreements between Churchill-Roosevelt and Stalin are always presented in the light of Stalin's demands of "security" and the imperialist attempt to satisfy that seemingly reasonable request. However, it then turns out that Stalin used the issue of "security" as a blind to cover up an intention for aggression. The previous agreements are then castigated as compromises of principle which only endanger "peace." It is now the fashion to condemn the agreements of 1943-45 as "mistakes" and "weaknesses" of the imperialist statesmen:

"By the bad deals we made at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam we built up Russia to the point where today totalitarianism is as much of a threat to civilization as it was in 1938."
(World-Telegram, July 8, 1946 editorial)

Everywhere in the imperialist press, the story is monotonously the same; everywhere there is feigned an injured air about Stalin's violation of pledges. It is Stalin's opportunist policy of grabbing whenever the opportunity is offered or exists, that gives the meat to the imperialist propaganda offensive. Opportunism always works for reaction; that is a political law which admits of no exceptions. The imperialist schemers utilize Stalin's opportunist appetite to tell the masses that this Frankenstein whom they fed, wants more and more:

"In short, in a war fought under the banner of 'no aggrandizement, territorial or other,' Russia has already acquired territories equal to the larger part of the eastern United States. Yet all Russian pronouncements make it evident that even this is not enough, and new demands are being made through Russian diplomatic channels and through the press for additional territories." (N.Y. Times, March 13, 1946 editorial)

* * * * *

On its part, the Stalinist bureaucracy proceeds along its own lines. Prior to 1939, Stalin was concentrating his power vertically and not horizontally. Today, on the other hand, the Stalinist bureaucracy is entrenching itself in the major portion of Eastern Europe in a chain of territories stretching from the Baltic to the Adriatic and containing nearly one-third of Europe's population, outside of Russia. Steps toward bureaucratic socialization of property are actually being taken in most of these territories while the economy of these areas is being integrated with that in the Soviet Union. The defeat of the Nazi Army opened enormous vistas for the bureaucracy and led to a horizontal extension of Stalin's power. No longer is the Stalinist demagogy voiced: "We don't want an inch of foreign territory." Those days are gone forever. Every territorial advance of the Stalinist bureaucracy carries with it an increase in its material and political power.

The rapacious appetite of the Stalinist bureaucracy and the political

maneuvers developed by the Anglo-American imperialists coincided in the Stalin territorial advances. Each side operates to use the Stalin occupations in its own way. For the imperialists this has provided the basis for a propaganda barrage to whip the masses into line for the slogans of the third intervention. Stalin, on the other hand, is preparing for war by solidifying his military footholds and by countering the propaganda barrage of the Anglo-American imperialists. A whole series of puppet states and military blackhouses is thus being constructed around the old frontiers of the Soviet Union in one way or another by Stalin's Red Army and by his Comintern agents. Where Stalin makes a formal withdrawal of his own troops as in Czechoslovakia, Iran and Manchuria, he uses the native Stalinist forces to retain control. In these cases, the Stalinist band points to the formal withdrawal of the Red Army forces as the fulfillment of an agreement; the imperialists on the other hand, counter with a charge of double-cross of the spirit of the agreement by pointing to the machinations of Stalin's native agents. Even in cases where a presumably "democratic" election is held, where the local Stalinist parties are defeated at the polls, the imperialists charge Stalinist violation of such "decisions" as "in Hungary, the will of the people already registered is being nullified, and where instead of the promised democracy there are being installed new totalitarian police governments as tyrannical as those we fought to overthrow." (N.Y. Times, June 7, 1946)

Despite the fact that the Stalinists polled only 17 percent of the total vote in Hungary, the bourgeois reports indicate that Stalin has elbowed his way into control of the country anyhow:

"Red Control of Hungary Firm Despite Bad Showing in Election." (N.Y. Times, April 24, 1946)

The moral is always that Stalin violates his pledges, which the imperialist naturally expected. If elections show a defeat for Stalin, then he retaliates by imposing his rule in violation of "democracy." The latest in the propaganda campaign around Hungary is the official imperialist charge that Stalin is stripping the country of food, industry, etc., and is ruining its economy. The demand raised is that Stalin adhere to the Yalta "pledges." (N.Y. Times, July 27, 1946)

In Austria, where Stalin also failed to get a majority at the polls, the bourgeois press details the same essential story. In the Moscow declaration of the "Big Three" in 1944 Austria was singled out for a special guarantee of "independence." Now, however, since the elections there, the idea is being implanted that because Stalin was defeated at the polls, he is out to ruin the country and prevent any sort of "independence." In an editorial picturesquely entitled "The Austrian Barricade," The New York Times asserts:

"The purpose is clear. At the least Russia seeks to control the economy and dictate the policies of Austria. Her actions even suggest that she is bent on ruining the country." (July 26, 1946)

Thus, in Hungary and Austria where the Stalinists did not win a majority at the polls, the imperialists use the fact that Stalin seeks to impose his rule by hook or by crook.

At the end of May 1946, an election took place in Czechoslovakia.

where Stalinism proved to be victorious. However, in the province of Slovakia, where Stalinism was defeated at the polls, the bourgeois press headlined the following news:

"Slovaks Said to Riot Over Vote As Reds Seek to Depose Victors." (N.Y. Times, June 1, 1946)

In short, the Stalinist line which is "Rule or Ruin, the only line he has ever followed, is utilized by imperialism to egg on the masses against the Soviet Union.

THE PRESENT PEACE TREATIES

The advanced worker knows how the bourgeoisie shapes and moulds so-called "public opinion." The masses are told what to think; occasionally the unique technique is to tell them what their thoughts allegedly are and in this way the desired ideas are implanted. A typical example of this method was used in The New York Times of August 4, 1946. In a professedly objective article entitled "The American Mood" we learn what the masses are thinking, according to the imperialists:

"Now, however, they (the American people - A.B.) are becoming openly hostile to the Soviet Union, not passively because it is 'left' but because it seems alien in almost every move, and because it seems menacing." (Our emphasis)

It is in the context of this propaganda barrage that the present "peace" drafts are being discussed.

The draft treaties concern five countries; Italy, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary and Finland. In the treaties there are provisions for the withdrawal of troops within ninety days after the ratification of the final texts and some sugary phrases about carrying out the Yalta and Potsdam pledges for democratic "self-government." However, there is a trick clause in the Balkan treaty drafts which gives Stalin the right to maintain military forces for lines of communication with his zone in Austria. The treaties also talk of ratification being accomplished in the "shortest time possible." Since this ratification must come first, a convenient loophole is left to Stalin to wheedle out of the withdrawal commitment and for the imperialists to continue their propaganda barrage on the basis of his maneuvers:

"Since 'the shortest time possible' is an indefinite phrase and nothing in the Russian Constitution tends to make its application more precise, the fear has been expressed in the countries concerned that by delaying ratification, Russia might keep her armies in Hungary and Rumania indefinitely. The temptation to do so undoubtedly exists, since Russian domination of these countries still rests almost solely on military force." (N.Y. Times, Aug. 2, 1946)

In any case, any agreements about troop withdrawals in the Balkans are necessarily fictitious as long as occupation forces remain in Austria and Germany. Yet it is ultimately to these occupation forces that all eyes will sooner or later be directed. Meanwhile, the Anglo-American imperialists have raised a hullabaloo about an "open door" on the Danube which flows through the present Stalin-controlled areas and is the central artery in eastern Europe. The Allied imperialists are also demanding

guarantees respecting Allied property rights in these sectors and are insisting on "most favored nation" treatment in all economic and commercial agreements. The whole issue about an "open door" on the Danube is a convenient wedge for the present imperialist propaganda offensive against Stalin. In line with this offensive, the Anglo-American imperialists have actually seized 372 Danubian ships and are withholding them from the Stalinist-dominated countries pending a "satisfactory" agreement on Danubian rights.

The issues involved in the proposed Balkan treaty drafts are moulded to fit the propaganda line of the imperialists. The masses are told that there is a conflict between Stalin's Hitlerite expansionism and the ideas of a "free world." Discussing the proposed treaty drafts before the European conference, The New York Times editorialized on the "issues" as follows:

"Russia, on the other hand, is demanding a governmentally controlled economy modelled after her own, with bilateral preferential and even monopolistic arrangements in her favor which would in effect integrate these countries into the Russian economy and squeeze them to the limit along the lines of the Nazi Grossraumwirtschaft. In short, what is at issue here is whether the countries in question shall remain parts of a free world, or whether they shall join the closed and controlled world of Russia, which is pre-empting an increasingly large part of the earth." (JULY 31, 1946)

It is quite obvious that the European "peace" conference is nothing but a sounding board for the diplomatic conflict between Anglo-American imperialism and the Stalinist bureaucracy.

War is but the continuation of politics by other, forcible means. Imperialist politics in the present period are designed to provide a feasible ideological cover to hurl the masses under Anglo-American imperialism against the Soviet Union. The imperialist political line has been developed over a period of years precisely to instill the impression that Stalin "is pre-empting an increasingly large part of the earth" as the capitalist hirelings charge on behalf of imperialism. Under the veil of this political, diplomatic and economic offensive Anglo-American imperialism hopes to build up a war atmosphere against the Soviet Union and then to make good where the Nazi Army failed.

A necessary feature of the imperialist demagogy is a distortion of the military status of the Soviet Union. The war with Nazi Germany caused incalculable loss of life among the Russian masses and brought great devastation to European Russia. Whenever the true facts of Stalin's military forces at present are discussed we learn:

"In a military sense, Russia lacks many of the modern weapons and mechanical devices essential in modern warfare. Among her deficiencies are her lack of the atomic bomb, a sizeable navy, a home-equipped mechanized army and especially the absence of a substantial machine-tool industry."
(N.Y. Times, July 7, 1946)

One newspaper man who wanted to prove that Stalin could not chance another war cited the following facts to prove his contention:

"And the Soviet Union, despite its vast and not yet demobilized armed forces, is far too weak. It has the fantastically huge job of recovery at hand. It has no navy. It has no strategic air force. It has no fissionable weapons. It might well take a quarter century of industry, ingenuity and assistance of the German scientists rounded up by the Red Army to overcome this inferiority." (N.Y. Times, June 16, 1946)

As against the Soviet Union stand the two imperialist military giants, Britain and America, with their forces intact, registering phenomenal productive increases in every variety of deadly military weapons. These two powers control immense material and human resources in South America, Africa, and Asia which, no doubt, will be utilized in their attack on the Soviet Union. However if these facts were to be widely assimilated the fable about Stalin as a big military bully, threatening the peace of the world and even the "security" of the imperialist giants, would not and could not make any sense. To make their propaganda campaign against Stalin plausible, the imperialists must paint Stalin as a huge military power. It is only in this light that Stalin can be built up as a "danger" and a "menace" to peace. When the imperialists write in the context of the present basic propaganda they invariably picture the Soviet Union as a true military colossus.

THE OPPORTUNISTS ON THE PRESENT WORLD SITUATION

The imperialist and Stalinist machinations can be exposed only through a Marxist understanding of the policies of both these camps. The main point involves the territorial occupations engineered by the imperialists and the Stalinist bureaucracy in the Balkans and in the Far East during the so-called "Second World War." It was those maneuvers which paved the way for the transformation in ideology toward the Soviet Union in the bourgeois-democratic countries and gives the imperialists an opportunity to build up a case for war. The imperialist maneuvers and the opportunism of the Stalinist bureaucracy can be defeated only by exposing the so-called "Second World War" and the real meaning of the "appeasement" line toward Stalin after the Nazi Army had been defeated in Russia. But the various opportunist political parties really concealed the facts of the whole present international situation. For example, when Stalin entered the Far Eastern picture officially, Cannon and Company came forth with the line that Stalin was jumping in on the kill. Stalin's line was supposedly motivated by fear of American imperialism and to grab off as much territory as possible to prevent American imperialism from getting a toehold:

"For this it was necessary to declare war on Japan so that the Soviet armed forces could plunge into Manchuria, Korea and Inner Mongolia, with the aim of annexing these lands or bringing them under the influence of the Kremlin. Stalin secures a place for the Soviet Union at the 'peace' table. This carries with it the hope of securing juridical recognition of the territorial seizures.

"When the Kremlin declared war on already defeated Japan, Stalin intended it as a defensive move against American imperialism, in the same way that the Red Army's invasion of Poland in 1939 was intended as a defensive move against Nazi Germany." (The Militant, Aug. 25, 1945 editorial)

The facts are opposite to every single point in the Trotskyite analysis. Stalin's declaration of "war" against Japan was arranged almost two years before the event with Anglo-American imperialism at the Teheran conference. Stalin's entry into the Far East was in explicit agreement with the imperialists who poured in huge quantities of war material into Siberia for Stalin's Far Eastern forces. Stalin did not "seize" any territory as the Yalta agreement shows and this agreement was signed six months before Stalin's "war" against Japan. All territorial occupations by Stalin in the Far East were arranged beforehand between him, Churchill and Roosevelt; these occupations had nothing in the world to do with a plan to get "juridical recognition" as a result of de facto occupation - "recognition" was agreed on beforehand. The whole affair took place in intimate agreement between Stalin and Anglo-American imperialism. The simple truth which the Trotskyites conceal is the fact that Stalin was handed these territories by the imperialists who were laying the ground for an ideological transformation to hit back at the Stalinist bureaucracy and paint it as a robber before the world mass.

All branches of the Trotsky system are putting blinkers on the eyes of the proletariat and filling the heads of the workers with illusions about the present world situation. Official resolutions of the English Trotskyites have specifically repudiated any idea of a forthcoming war against the Soviet Union in the present historical period. Their "arguments" are as follows:

"The risks of such an operation (anti-Soviet war - A.B.) are far too great in their political implications, not only in Europe or Asia where the masses would support the Soviet Union, but in Britain and America. Ideologically it would not be possible to mobilize the masses for such a war which would tend to expose the whole nature of the previous struggle against the Axis." (Workers International News, August 1945. Our emphasis.)

Having decided that a war of Anglo-American imperialism against the Soviet Union was out of the question, the English branch of Cannon's political family concluded:

"For the next period, despite the antagonisms, the Allies will be forced to tolerate a deal with the Soviet Union." (Ibid.)

No sooner was this set down on paper that it was exploded by events. However, this is the typical pro-imperialist chloroform which is paralyzing the resistance of the proletariat, and preventing it from realizing the terrible threat hanging over its head.

The Shachtmanite Workers Party assiduously spreads the same deadening opiates and palms this off as a Marxist analysis of the present situation; The workers can look forward to a period of peace for the next historical period, assures Shachtman:

"Obviously we are now living in the aftermath of World War II, in a period of peace, uneasy, unstable, but nevertheless destined to last for a whole historical period in which Big Three collaboration will go on with ups and downs." (The New International, Feb. 1946, p. 38. Our emphasis.)

The Left-Trotskyite Revolutionary Workers League repeats the lying assurances of the Trotsky leaders as it repeated their fables before of a "Second World War." The leadership of the R.W.L. already sees the American military instrument in a process of disintegration:

"Since the army of American imperialism is disintegrating because of enormous social pressure from the workers and the soldiers themselves, there appears to be no immediate danger of military intervention in the Soviet Union by American imperialism." (International News, March 1946, p. 12.)

Instead of a sharp warning, all branches of the Trotsky tendency are deadening the consciousness of the workers and preventing them from comprehending the meaning of the present development. Just as the true story of the "Second World War" must be made known so must the masses be armed with a correct understanding of the current imperialist policy. That means an uncompromising exposure of the imperialist-Stalin territorial manipulation in Europe and in the Far East from 1943-45 in which the masses were used as so many pawns for crooked maneuvering.

By concealing the fundamental policies of the imperialists and of Stalin which brought about the agreements at Teheran, Moscow, Yalta and Potsdam, the pseudo-Marxists are aiding imperialism in its present game to set up an active "anti-Russian" war psychology among the backward masses. A new horrible blood-letting and destruction in the interests of Stalinism and imperialism is in the offing. It cannot be prevented unless the spell cast by the imperialist, Socialist and Liberal demagogues to the effect that Stalin is a new Hitler preparing to capture the globe, is dispelled; unless the mind of the revolutionary workers is freed from the ideological opium that this is an era of peace between imperialism and the Soviet Union, that Stalin entered the Far East and the Balkans in a clash with the policy of Anglo-American imperialism, and other delusory ideas fed to the revolutionary workers everywhere by Stalin's objective and subjective, "critical" and uncritical supporters from Madame Sun Yat-Sen to all the varieties of Trotskyism.

Only on the basis of the exposure of the imperialist-Stalin territorial machinations since Teheran can the masses be spared another terrible catastrophe of blood and destruction engineered by the imperialists and Stalin. Only the winning of the vanguard section of the proletariat toward the correct understanding of the present danger can turn the course of history in the opposite direction. Only this can lead toward the removal of the Stalinist bureaucracy, who played ball with imperialism at Teheran and Yalta, and to the unfolding of the struggle for a workers democratic international socialist republic.

Arthur Burke
George Marlen
Aug. 6, 1946

NOTE: In the "Thesis on the International Situation" (June-July 1946), the following sentence appears concerning Lend-lease to Stalin: "Stalin, as indicated recently in the press, is obligated to repay the Lend-lease after the lapse of a certain specified time." (page 15) The authors had in mind commitments Stalin signed concerning economic and commercial policy and not strict monetary repayment. This is shown on page 16 of the same Thesis which states that in return for aid furnished Stalin obligated himself "to fulfill certain commitments of economic nature."

A.B.
G.M.

THE WORK OF CANNON AND SHACHTMAN
IN THE TRADE UNIONS

PART V - THE SELL-OUT OF THE FOODWORKERS

In regard to the problem of the trade unions, the Trotsky leaders were aware that Stalinism was an even greater danger than the bosses because of its strategic position within the ranks of the workers. The hidden enemy within uses his position to prevent a struggle against the open enemy without. The fight to defeat the known enemy without is inseparable from the battle to cast out the concealed enemy within. On this point the Trotskyites were unambiguously clear:

"The Stalinists are a greater danger to the trade union movement than all the bosses precisely because they attack from within." (J.P. Cannon, Socialist Appeal, May 14, 1938, p4)

The Trotskyite workers harbored a well-grounded hatred for the treacherous Stalinist band. Many of these workers had their own physical reminders of Stalinist gangsterism and they knew of the G.P.U.'s international terror. Accordingly, the tough anti-Stalinist words of Cannon-Shachtman and the solemn vows to destroy Stalinism found responsive listeners and were cheered to the rafters. A typical declaration of "war" against Stalinism was the following:

"Stalinism is the worst and most destructive disease of the labor movement of the world. Stalinism is deception, disruption and treachery organized and subsidized on an international scale." (Ibid.)

The conclusion was rooted in the premises:

"It is high time to diagnose this disease and quarantine the labor movement against it." (Ibid.)

Wherever the workers were afflicted with the Stalinist plague, there the Socialist Workers Party would rush to the rescue - or at least that is what it seemed on the surface. A series of events in an important section of the trade unions gave Cannon an ideal chance to redeem his promises by concrete deeds. Let us see how these deeds compared with the oft-repeated promises.

Among the highly militant trade union workers, the food workers occupied a leading position. Many of these workers were foreign-born and took a keener interest in class struggle issues than the ordinary run of trade union workers. The key section of these workers was organized in Local 302 (Cafeteria Employees Union, AFL) which had mushroomed in a few years from a handful to 10,000. Stalinism cashed in on the political ferment of these workers and in 1936 wormed its way into control. However, not all was serene for the Stalinist leadership. Among the members there was an undercurrent of militant opposition. The Trotsky leaders had some forces in the union and therefore watched the developments carefully over a period of many years. The Stalinist line in Local 302 was the same as that of Stalinism everywhere. There were the usual crooked deals with the bosses enforced by blackjack methods of rule. The heavily exploited food workers were prevented by Stalinism from putting up a genuine fight against the bosses. Some of the Stalinist crimes in this union were detailed in the Trotsky press:

"This is approximately the 27th attempt by the Browderite gang to oust all progressive workers from Local 302. The history of the mismanagement of the local by the Stalinists reads like a nightmare - open collaboration with the notorious Bosses' Association, the Affiliated Restaurateurs, Inc., and organized campaigns of terror against the rank and file who are fighting for clean unionism and democratic control of the local." (Socialist Appeal, Dec. 31, 1938, p. 2.)

The union was divided into three tendencies. One was the Stalinist; the other, a small, openly chauvinist "Right Wing;" the third, was known as the "Progressives" and was headed by the Trotskyites and some "pure and simple" trade unionists. The growing disgust with the Stalinist leadership added to the strength of the "Progressives" and in the Spring of 1940 the latter were catapulted into a leading position. Both the Right Wing and the Stalinists maneuvered to beat back the threat from the aroused rank-and-file. The Rights tried to capitalize on the anti-Stalinist sentiment and raised the cry of "Reds" against the Stalinist leadership, while the latter cleverly made Red-baiting their leading issue.

The danger to the rank-and-file was quite clear. Unless there was a consistent, uncompromising exposure of both the old-line Rights and the Stalinists, the rank-and-file would be caught up in the fake "Red" issue and made pawns in the reactionary game. The whole Red-baiting issue was a political football; the Stalinist bureaucrats were no more "Reds" than were the Right Wingers. Any support to the idea that the Stalinist bureaucrats are in any way "Reds" works for Stalinism and reaction. It was necessary to tear off the false Red mask from the faces of the Stalinist leaders. This would have exposed both the Stalinists and the Right Wingers. The nefarious activities of the Stalinist crew made this task of exposure quite simple. As the going got tougher for the Stalinist bureaucrats, they applied the same chauvinist technique which the Right Wing had been using; only the Stalinist fire was directed against the "Progressives":

"Communist Party 'strategy' in the unions hit a new low when the Stalinist fraction in the Cafeteria Employees Union, Local 302 (AFL) raised the astounding cry of 'alien' against a leading militant at the general membership meeting of July 29." (Socialist Appeal, Aug. 10, 1940.)

One thing at least was clear to the "Progressive" leaders. The Stalinist-Right Wing dispute was not over principles. In the language of Marxism, it was an unprincipled clique fight.

That the Stalinists themselves had to resort to the cry of "alien" to frame up workers was indicative of a new situation in the union. After some four years of strong-arm rule, the Stalinist hold was dislodged somewhat in a union election in the Spring of 1940 when the candidate of the "Progressive" caucus was victorious. Stalin's international diplomatic crimes, the Pact with Hitler in August 1939, the grab in Poland, the war in Finland and so forth did not help matters for Browder's thugs due to the lively political interest of the workers in this union. Everything pointed to the elimination of Stalinism in December 1940 when the main elections for the top leadership were scheduled. The Trotsky leaders wrote of this expected outcome:

"Now, for the first time, with a majority turning against

the C.P., their complete elimination from the leadership of the union in the elections in December is confidently looked forward to." (Socialist Appeal, June 29, 1940, p. 2)

Many words were uttered on the necessity of preparations to oust the Stalinists at this crucial election. The Trotsky leaders pledged to carry out this assignment without fail:

"The big task of the Progressives now is to prepare for the elections in December, when the Stalinists can be completely swept out." (Ibid.)

Events seemed to give a brilliant vindication of the Trotskyite prognosis. The signs were unmistakable and it appeared that at long last the exploited food workers would shake off the Stalinist bureaucrats. Whereas in June 1940, the Trotsky leaders spoke of the possibility of throwing out the Stalinist leadership, in August 1940 they posed this as a certainty. There was no question that the "Stalinist administration is now a 'lame duck,' no longer representing the membership and certain to be ousted at the December regular elections." (Socialist Appeal, Aug. 3, 1940. My emphasis- A.B.) On August 10, 1940 the Socialist Appeal reiterated the point and told its readers to expect the "certain defeat" of the Stalinist leadership.

In the next period all tendencies prepared feverishly for this crucial election to be held in December 1940. Those, indeed, were turbulent days as the workers debated the respective stands of the aspirants to leadership. The fire was directed against the Stalinists, and a worried Daily Worker called attention to the "tensest period" in the history of the union. For a trade union election campaign, the number of political points injected was somewhat surprising. According to the Stalinist admission, the points included: the policy in the Spanish Civil War, the Stalin-Hitler Pact, Stalin's seizure of Eastern Poland, Stalin's policy in Czechoslovakia, etc. The Stalinists naturally derided these as issues and tried to keep attention centered on purely trade union matters, pretending that trade union policies are something apart from politics.

Now that the crisis was at hand each tendency showed its true colors. Kincheloe, one of the leaders of the "Progressives," knifed his own faction and jumped to the Right Wing. That left the Trotsky leaders to carry on the leadership of the "Progressives" freed of the sham progressive, Kincheloe. But this was only the first shock for the workers in the camp of the "Progressives."

The Stalinist bureaucrats, who were very hard pressed, were willing to make a deal, to save their control, with the Trotskyite "Progressive" caucus. In return for Trotskyite support to the Stalinist slate, the Kramberg-Dritsas Stalinist leadership were willing to let the Trotskyites get some secondary posts in the union. This horse-deal was to be presented to the workers under the innocuous label of "United Union Ticket," an electoral bloc of Stalinists, Trotskyites and "Progressives." It is significant that this bloc of Trotskyites and Stalinists was made public in the Trotsky press only after the elections. On December 21, 1940 the Trotsky organ carried the information that the Trotskyites had formed a bloc with the Stalinists under the name of the United Union Ticket:

"The right wingers yell loudest about the Trotskyists and Stalinists uniting against them. The United Union

Ticket answers that it is proud of the fact that it is composed of workers of different political beliefs as well as many nationalities and races, who have united on a program of militant unionism and against the corrupt right wing officials."

The "United Union Ticket" listed two leading Stalinists for key posts; Costas Dritsas for President and Sam Kramberg for Secretary-Treasurer. Larry Phillips, the leader of the Trotskyite "Progressives," got the post of General Organizer and Aviles (of the Spanish section in the "Progressive Bloc") won the position of Labor Chief, while a few Trotskyites received some minor posts. Such was the "United Union Ticket."

All that was required was the award of a few posts to the Trotskyites to make Cannon "forget" his former promises to oust the Stalinist bureaucrats from the union. That piece of treachery wiped out the "Progressives" and hoisted the tottering Stalinist crowd back into power. After having been the target of Stalinist hounding for years and after solemnly dedicating themselves to cast out Stalinism root and branch, the Trotsky leaders, for a consideration, bolstered up the Stalinist gangsters in Local 302.

From the perspective of certain defeat, the Stalinist gang had their necks saved and were rewarded with a smashing victory. What then was the meaning of all the previous "anti-Stalinist" outpouring in the Trotsky press? That of the innumerable vows to cast out the Stalinist gang from the labor movement in general and from Local 302 in particular? All this gave the Trotskyite workers the comforting illusion that the Socialist Workers Party leadership was conducting a life-and-death struggle against counter-revolutionary Stalinism. But words are proven only in deeds. And the deeds of the S.W.P. leadership proved that the previous anti-Stalinist words only concealed a basically pro-Stalinist policy. When the crisis came, the policy was applied and the words were forgotten.

THE "UNITED FRONT" PROGRAM

The Stalinist-Trotskyite "united front" agreed on a program as well as a slate. The Stalinists described this program as follows:

"Planks in the program call for democratic expression in the union; militant struggle to attain improvement in working conditions, for greater efforts to organize the unorganized, and for a strong progressive union free of racketeering." (Daily Worker, Dec. 14, 1940.)

The interest of the Stalinist leadership of Dritsas and Kramberg in such points as "democratic expression," the fight for better working conditions, and the defeat of racketeering elements was as sudden as it was fraudulent. There was not a word of truth in the above statement of intentions, and no one knew it better than the Trotsky leaders. But Cannon and Company had something more than mere abstract knowledge of the Stalinist dishonesty. They had a wealth of concrete facts which annihilated every one of the Stalinist lies. Before the election the Cannon leadership had the ear of the workers in the union as they never had before. The forward-moving food workers would have eagerly listened to an exposure of the Stalinist alliance with the racketeers, their conniving with the bosses, their rotten sell-outs, and their thug

rule. All this could have been pitted against the Stalinist pretenses. The ferment in the union provided a ready-made opportunity for Cannon to make good his anti-Stalinist promissory notes. The prevalence of international issues could have been used with great effect to politicize the just resentment of the workers against the Stalinist bureaucrats. A truly revolutionary Marxist policy would have dealt the Stalinists fatal blows all along the line. But here is how Cannon presented the program which acted as a cover for the Stalinist gangsters:

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

The Trotsky leaders knew that the Stalinist signature to this program was a fraud and knew that they had long since betrayed any program in the interests of the workers. Yet the Stalinist signature was presented to the workers as good coin. But this was not all. Electing the Stalinist bureaucrats into power was actually pictured as an act in the interests of the working class!:

"It (the victory of the United Union Ticket - A.B.) demonstrates once again the capacity of the workers to fight in their own interests and to resist the propaganda of the employers." (Ibid.)

With a wave of the Trotskyite magic wand, the Stalinist bandits became transformed from "a greater danger to the trade union movement than all the bosses" into advocates of the interests of the toilers! This Trotskyite treachery was bought and paid for. Browder and Kramberg knew the true nature of their Trotskyite "oppositionists." The Stalinist bureaucrats were not fooled as are the Trotskyite workers by all the anti-Stalinist noise which appears in the Trotskyite speeches and press. From experience Browder knew perfectly just what Cannon was always fishing for. Browder's agents would have never entered into negotiations for a bloc with the Trotsky leaders without such convenient advance knowledge of the "Marxist" character of Cannon and Company.

HOW THE STALINIST-TROTSKYITE "UNITED FRONT" WAS CARRIED OUT

On their part, the Stalinists had some compelling reasons for making a "united front" with the Trotskyites. The Stalinists had seen the handwriting on the wall, and like Cannon, understood that certain defeat was staring them in the face. That was the reason for cooking up a "union-building" program and trimming it with militant phrases. However, the experienced and cunning Stalinist leaders knew that a militant-sounding program was not enough to clear themselves before the rank-and-file. The program had to be given a veneer of sincerity. The food workers knew that the Trotskyite workers were the most persecuted tendency among the anti-Stalinist rank-and-file; indeed, the most brutal attacks were reserved for the Trotskyite "fascists." What better proof of sincerity could the Stalinist leadership of Ditsas and Kramberg offer than a bloc with their former victims? This would also finish off the opposition grouped around the "Progressives" and demoralize their followers. The Stalinist wire-pullers knew that only such a bloc could save their declining influence and keep them in power. However, a most revealing attitude was shown by the Stalinist press after this "united front" was formed. The candidates of the "united front" slate were given and the names of the former Union fractions were duly listed. The information that a bloc had been formed with the Trotskyists, however, was discreetly

omitted. Only one familiar with the intimate doings of the Union and its internal life would have known from the Daily Worker report that a Stalinist-Trotskyist "united front" had been formed. After all, even in the monolithic Stalinist organization there bound to be some embarrassing questions raised as to the motivation and propriety of such a bloc. It took the Right Wing to call attention to this unprincipled bloc; only then was the information revealed in the Trotsky press.

The Stalinist bureaucrats saw to it that they got the leading positions in this "united front." In their own press they made sure to play up their own direct agents and said nothing about the "Progressives" on the victorious slate. In the article on the victory of the United Union Ticket, the Daily Worker wrote:

"They (the food workers - A.B.) further want an improvement in working conditions, sorely needed in the industry.

"That is a job, they felt, they could trust only to men of the Draitsas and Kramberg type." (Dec. 20, 1940. My emphasis - A.B.)

Notice, not Phillips and Aviles, but Draitsas and Kramberg. The Stalinists were preparing for the future. The Cannon leaders on the other hand kept the workers blindfolded and remained mum on the ominous attitude of the Stalinist press. When the victorious United Union Ticket led a celebration of the food workers union, the Trotsky paper echoed the Stalinist demagoguery. The Stalinist goon, Draitsas, was played up as a hero:

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

That is how the Trotsky leadership presented the Stalinist bureaucrat, Draitsas! The Stalinist gang never bothered to return the handsome compliment. As a matter of fact, the Stalinists allowed no "moratorium" in their attacks on "Trotskyism." Whereas the Cannon leadership whitewashed the Stalin gang in this situation, the Stalinist leaders kept hammering away on their line. Right after the victory in Local 302, the Stalinist sheet printed a lead article reviewing the year's events in the unions. The article ran in the tone of great Stalinist victories. The victories of the Stalinist mob in the Painters' Union and some other workers organizations were brought in as evidence. The victory in Local 302 occupied a prominent place in that catalogue of victories. Summing up, the Stalinist leaders taught their workers the meaning of all these events as follows:

"More than ever before, in 1940, red-baiting became the common ground upon which united the most contemptible criminal leeches in the ranks of labor, Social Democrats, Trozkyites, Lovestonites, Thomas Socialists, Christian Fronters and like elements." - (Daily Worker, Dec. 29, 1940)

The Stalinists remained entirely consistent in their anti-Trotskyite furor. But to Cannon and Company the "united front" meant giving the leading positions to the Stalinist bandits, keeping mum on their crimes, whitewashing their demagoguery, and presenting these double-crossers as sincere representatives of the rank-and-file.

THE OUTCOME OF THE "UNITED FRONT"

The "united front" ran along the usual course. Given the key positions, the Stalinists entrenched themselves in power. This accomplished, they showed their contempt for their saviours by kicking them into the gutter. The Trotsky banner-bearer, Phillips, was viciously assaulted by the Britsas-Kramberg gangsters and put into a hospital. To show in whose interests the food workers really acted when they voted in the Stalinist gang, let us cite some remarks which the Trotsky leaders made on the Stalinist-led union meetings. Naturally, this Trotskyite "criticism" was voiced after they had their skulls cracked by the Stalinist gangsters:

"Those who opposed the Stalinist leadership were deprived of their right to speak. The chairman ran the meeting in typical Stalinist strong-arm manner." (The Militant, Aug. 8, 1942, p. 2)

Of course, the Trotskyites, in this report, kept a discreet silence on the fact that they had prevented the overthrow of this Stalinist leadership. Now that the Trotsky leaders were out in the cold they re-discovered all the Stalinist crimes which they used to detail before they formed a bloc with the Stalinist gang. As has been shown above, when the Trotsky leadership made a deal with the Stalinist leadership in December 1940, they assured the food workers that the Stalinist victory was in their fundamental interests. The workers were led to believe that they had removed the main barrier preventing a fight against the bosses:

"The chief obstruction in the path of the union members has been blasted away." (Socialist Appeal, Dec. 28, 1940)

Now the ground was presumably clear for class struggle policies. Then the "United Union Ticket" held its victory celebration after the elections, the Stalinist bureaucrats addressed the meeting and filled the ears of the workers with a lot of hooey about battling the bosses. The Trotsky paper passed these words on as genuine coin:

"It was clear from the speeches and the splendid morale of the audience that the bosses are in for a fight when the new contract negotiations begin." (Ibid., Jan. 4, 1941. My emphasis - A.B.)

The misguided food workers were told that they were entering the promised land. Afterward, when the Trotskyites were dumped overboard by the Stalinist machine, the Trotsky press told of the "benefits" which the food workers gained from following their advice in December 1940:

"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, Aug. 8, 1942, p. 2)

The chief obstacle to the food workers was the Stalinist gang, now as always. This chief obstacle was never removed, but rather strengthened in December 1940 by the Trotsky leaders. Cannon's story in December 1940 that the "chief obstacle" to the food workers had been blasted away was proven to be a vicious lie.

Who, then, was defeated by the Stalinist-Trotskyite "united front" in December 1940? History shows that it certainly was not the bosses. The real victims were the food workers. It was they who were defeated by the United Union Ticket in December 1940 when Kramberg and Dritsas were hoisted back into power. Did it take too much foresight to see that people whose policy was to line up with racketeers, connive with the bosses, beat up opponents, could only function to sell out the workers? Cannon and Company knew all that in advance. More important, they knew, but the food workers did not know. They knew and the food workers did not know that Stalinism operates only to betray the workers, be it in a trade union or anywhere else. Cannon had his eyes wide open when he fed the workers in Local 302 the deadly poison of supporting the Stalinist gangsters. Although aware of the crimes of the Stalinist gang, Cannon stuffed the heads of the unsuspecting food workers with lies that the Stalinist bandits would fight in the interests of the workers. And for what immediate purpose was this vile deception dished out to those who looked to the Trotsky leadership for guidance? For a few miserable jobs! That represents the essence of the Cannon "revolutionary mass work."

SHACHTMAN IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF CANNON

Was Shachtman's policy in the food workers' union basically different from that of Cannon? Three months after the Trotskyite bloc with the Stalinists in Local 302, Shachtman related discussions he had with the Cannonite workers in this particular union. Here is the line he gave them:

"The writer, for his part, in discussions with these militants, urged upon them the propriety and necessity of a bloc with the Stalinists." (Max Shachtman, Labor Action, March 17, 1941.)

Shachtman, like Cannon, urged upon the workers in the union to put their heads on the Stalinist chopping block. And naturally, like Cannon, Shachtman feels no sense of shame for advocating this line. As a matter of fact, he insists that the bloc with the Stalinists was in the interests of the workers:

"We still believe the bloc we advocated was correct. It united the bulk of the militants, of the most class conscious elements, of the most underpaid workers. In the given instance, it was a distinct service to the union's best interests." (Ibid., My emphasis - A.B.)

When Stalinism got the support of the most class conscious workers, this served the "best interests" of the workers, Shachtman tells us. Voting in the Stalinists to power is a "distinct service" to the toilers, teaches Shachtman with a perfectly serious air. We might interject some questions here. How are the best interests of the workers really served? By sell-outs and gangsterism? This is the only course possible for Stalinism, and Shachtman knows it. Whenever the Shachtmanite "workers Party makes its holiday utterances on Stalinism, they manifest this knowledge. A typical statement reads as follows:

"LABOR ACTION makes no bones about the fact that it looks upon the Stalinists as enemies of the working class, and specifically in the union field, as wreckers." (Labor Action, June 2, 1941.)

But in the food workers' union where there was a rare opportunity to oust the Stalinist gang, Shachtman's policy was to shoulder these very Stalinist wreckers into power! The anti-Stalinist words in Labor Action, as in the Cannonite press, serves as a smokescreen for a fundamentally pro-Stalinist line.

At the moment of the Local 302 elections in December 1940, Shachtman stated that "...a bloc with the Stalinists is permissible under certain conditions..." (Labor Action, Dec. 30, 1940) At the same time, the Shachtman paper was very hazy as to what those mysterious conditions were supposed to be. But the result of the bloc could be no other than to aid Stalinism climb back to power. Since Shachtman later commended the bloc with Stalinism as correct, his conditions become quite patent. The conditions can only mean putting the Stalinists in power. On the other hand, the revolutionary Marxist policy states: Stalinism is a deadly enemy of the toilers and unless it is exposed and defeated, the hands of the workers cannot be freed to struggle against the bosses. Stalinism is the chief obstacle within the working class preventing a struggle in the interests of the proletariat. The interests of the workers can be furthered only by the defeat of Stalinism, not by its victory. When Kramberg and Dritsas were elected back into power that was a defeat of the workers and a victory for reaction. But here is how Shachtman interpreted the result:

"Reactionaries Beaten in Cafeteria Union Election."
(Ibid.)

Just the opposite was true; the reactionaries were victorious in that election. Shachtman's headline was a duplication of the Daily Worker headline. That similarity was not accidental; it was the product of the same line. The Fosters and Krambergs "teach" every day in the week that support to Stalinism is in the workers' "best interests;" the propagation of that lie is the Stalinist bread-and-butter. However, the Fosters and Krambergs naturally do not call themselves "enemies of the working class" when they call upon the workers for support. Were Cannon and Shachtman to advocate support to the Stalinist gunmen without telling the workers that they really oppose Stalinism, they would stand self-indicted as naked supporters of the Stalinist gang.

Now that Shachtman is organizationally independent of Cannon, he has to distinguish his line from that of Cannon, as Cannon does from Foster. So Shachtman rapped Cannon on the knuckles for his line in Local 302 because "There is no criticism of the Stalinist record in the union, no indication ~~of the limited nature of the bloc, no warning as to the future~~ course of the Stalinists." (Ibid.) In other words, Cannon should have been more careful and made more anti-Stalinist noise. Had this been done, the pro-Stalinist policy of Cannon would have been harder to detect. Shachtman criticizes Cannon because the latter did not bother to wear his anti-Stalinist disguise. Aside from this indiscretion, Shachtman endorsed the bloc with Stalinism in Local 302. The revolutionary workers must have a different line. Throw out the Stalinist gang and destroy their influence! That is the beginning point for real revolutionary mass work.

T O B E C O N T I N U E D

S H O P T A L K

How To Explain A "Transitional Program" To A Simple Worker

A TROTSKYITE:- I belong to the Socialist Workers Party, the Trotskyite Party.

A WORKER:- I'm for the Democratic Party.

T.- You shouldn't be. The Democratic Party does not serve your interests.

W.- What Party should I be for?

T.- A Labor Party.

W.- Are you also for a Labor Party?

T.- Yes, naturally.

W.- But you just said you belong to the Trotskyite Party. Is that the Labor Party you mentioned?

T.- No, the Trotskyite Party is different, it stands for proletarian revolution and socialism.

W.- Is a Labor Party also for what you call proletarian revolution and socialism?

T.- Well, no, not exactly.

W.- But you are for proletarian revolution and socialism.

T.- Yes, of course.

W.- Then why are you for a Labor Party?

T.- You see, I'm for a Labor Party because you are for the Democratic Party. You have to get promoted politically, so to speak. For you to be for a Labor Party would be an advance.

W.- Let me get this straight. A Labor Party does not stand for the proletarian revolution and socialism you say you stand for, but for me it would be an advance to be for a Labor Party.

T.- That's about the size of it. We're trying to raise the political level of the working class in general by elevating the workers to being for a Labor Party.

W.- Now, let me ask you this. Since this Labor Party is not for proletarian revolution and socialism, would you say that it is in my interests?

T.- Naturally, we're very critical toward the Labor Party. We don't say point blank that it would directly serve the workers' interests. But it would be a stage toward proletarian revolution and socialism.

W.- Should I have been for a Labor Party Government in the British elections last year?

T.- Yes, of course.

W.- Then you would have wanted me, that is, the workers to vote for the British Labor Party.

T.- Definitely. We told the workers to vote for Attlee, Bevin and the other British Laborites.

W.- Ah, now I understand. The British Labor Party is the kind of Labor Party you want me to be for.

T.- Oh, no! The British Labor Party is a rotten sell-out Party, has been for years.

W.- But still you wanted me to vote for it. Maybe I don't understand, after all,

T.- It's this way. When you're for the Democratic Party, then to change to being for a Labor Party is an advance for you, even though that Labor Party sells you down the river just the same as the Democratic Party.

- W.- Would you have voted for the British Labor Party?
- T.- Yes, that's our line.
- W.- But you knew all along that the Labor Party sells out the workers and has been doing so for a long time.
- T.- Naturally.
- W.- Still, you would have voted for it. Mighty peculiar. Wouldn't it be simpler just to tell me that the Labor Party is a sell-out Party and that it would be foolish for me to support it?
- T.- No, first we try to get you to support what is against your interests because it is in your interests to take that step.
- W.- By the way, what do you think of the British Labor Party Government?
- T.- It's betraying the workers all down the line. Look at the way the British imperialists are murdering the workers of India and Palestine. That scoundrel, Attlee, tries to justify such crimes.
- W.- But since the Labor Party Government is betraying the workers all down the line, as you yourself say, I can't for the life of me understand why I should have voted for the Labor Party.
- T.- Because you are not for a Labor Party yet. If you voted for it, that would be an advance for you.
- W.- But what about the workers of India and Palestine who are being murdered by the British Labor Government troops? How would the workers in those places feel toward me if I helped to elect such a Government? You say I have to get advanced to being for a Labor Party, but wouldn't the workers of India and Palestine have a sneaking suspicion that when I supported the Labor Party I was advancing over their dead bodies?
- T.- Perhaps, but when you would see those workers being murdered by Attlee and Bevin's troops, then you would become disillusioned even with the Labor Party, you would move more to the Left, and that would be a still better advance for you.
- W.- Maybe so, but that wouldn't wash the blood of those workers off my hands which helped to elect the Labor Government. I still say it would be simpler for you just to warn me beforehand that the Laborites are scoundrels and that I should not vote them into office.
- T.- Politics are pretty complicated. We also advocate the formation of a Stalinist-Socialist coalition Government in France, England, Italy, and so forth. That's our Trotskyite Transitional Program.
- W.- Is that a Government in the interests of the workers?
- T.- Well, it's on the basis of capitalism, and the Stalinist Communists and the Socialists certainly don't serve the interests of the workers.
- W.- Therefore I may assume that a Stalinist-Socialist coalition Government will also sell me down the river.
- T.- We don't say point blank that a Labor Party Government or a Stalinist-Socialist coalition Government would be against the interests of the workers. Concretely, such governments sell out the workers, but historically, they do them a lot of good because they expose themselves before the workers and so help them move more to the Left.
- W.- I may seem narrow-minded, but it's very queer to advocate the formation of any government which would sell out the workers, as you say these governments would.
- T.- Mass pressure might compel the Laborites, Stalinists and Socialists who form a Government to pass acts benefitting the workers, though I'll admit there's not too much chance of this.
- W.- What does it all boil down to? If these Parties in the Government improved my living conditions, I would support them. If they did me harm, then you would be in the position of having advocated a government which acted against my interests, and I would hold you respon-

sible. In any case, your Trotskyite Party wouldn't cut much ice with me. Anybody who helps put a Government which injures me is no friend of mine.

T.- Our Transitional Program will get clearer to you when you think it over. Take a simpler case. We supported the Stalinist bureaucrat, Ben Davis, in New York in the election some time back.

W.- I don't believe it!

E.- I can prove it. Here's our paper, THE MILITANT, where it says that the workers should vote for Ben Davis "because he is a Negro candidate on the ticket of a working class party."

W.- Wasn't he on the ticket of the Communist Party, the Stalinists, as you call them, the betrayers of labor?

E.- Yes.

E.- And the Stalinist Communist Party is also a working class Party?

E.- Yes, our paper, THE MILITANT, says so here, black on white.

W.- Just a moment, I'm getting pretty dizzy. In the few minutes we've been talking, you've thrown no fewer than three working class Parties at me, the Trotskyite Party, the Labor Party and the Stalinist Party. Two of these you already have told me betray the interests of the workers. I take it that you consider your Trotskyite Party is loyal to the workers. Yet the two betrayers and the one faithful all seem to be working class Parties, according to your reckoning. Do you want me to be for the Stalinist Party, also? Do you want me to be for all three working class Parties at once?

T.- No, we don't want you to be for the Stalinist Party, we just wanted the workers to vote for its candidate.

W.- Is there a difference? If I vote for a candidate, it's because I'm for his Party, and if I'm for a Party, I vote for its candidates. I don't do any fancy bookkeeping in these matters.

E.- Of course, there's the point that Davis was a NEGRO candidate, and --

W.- Now don't go bringing up the man's race. I'm not so stupid that I'd vote for a man because of the color of his skin. You yourself just told me this Davis was a Stalinist candidate. I should guess from that you don't consider him exactly an angel.

E.- Oh, he's a Stalinist rat, no doubt.

W.- Still, I should have voted for him.

E.- Yes, definitely, as a NEGRO candidate of a working class Party.

W.- You know, if I actually voted for this list of rats, scoundrels and betrayers you've been pushing at me, I'd have to take out my conscience and fumigate it. You look like a nice fellow, but you certainly have a queer way of going about urging people to keep company at the polls with the smelliest assortment of human tripe.

E.- It's part of our campaign to raise the level of the workers.

W.- What makes THE MILITANT say the Stalinist Party is a working class Party? Is it for the workers?

E.- Oh, no, it's against the interests of the workers.

W.- Here we go again. If the Stalinist Party is against the interests of the workers, how is it a working class Party?

E.- We mean that many workers support it.

W.- Well, I'm sure that more workers support the Democratic Party than the Stalinist Party; that makes the Democratic Party also a working class Party. That would be four working class Parties in one afternoon.

T.- No, of course, the Democratic Party is not a working class Party. The fact that many workers support it is not the point. The Stalinist Party pretends to be a working class Party, and many workers fall for it.

W.- Don't tell me its pretenses make it a working class Party!

- T.- Naturally not. The point is that many workers think it's a working class Party.
- W.- I see, you mean that the workers' confusion makes it a working class party.
- T.- In a strictly scientific sense, the Stalinist Party is not a working class Party because its policies betray the workers. Fundamentally, it's an anti-working class Party.
- W.- But your paper, THE MILITANT, said plainly that the workers should vote for Davis because he was a Negro candidate of a working class party. That was one of the reasons your paper gave for voting for Davis. Well, anyway, it's clear the workers wouldn't vote for Davis if they were convinced he represents an anti-working class Party. That would certainly be stupid electioneering, from Davis' standpoint. I'll bet he also told the workers he's the candidate of a working class Party.
- T.- Well, of course, he's a liar. That is, I mean--
- W.- I see what you mean. He's a liar, but THE MILITANT has a Transitional Program. Are there any more working class Parties?
- T.- Well, the Trotskyite Party was discussing uniting with Shachtman's Workers Party.
- W.- What, another one! Who are these guys?
- T.- Oh, a gang of petty-bourgeois revisionists, we call them. Their outfit is strictly no good.
- W.- But you were discussing uniting with them? I don't get it.
- T.- There was nothing definite. We were just discussing. Our leader, Comrade Cannon, was communicating with them about it.
- W.- If they're no good, why talk about uniting with them? I wouldn't unite with a bunch of no-goods. I wouldn't even discuss it.
- T.- In politics it's very complicated. Today you break with people because they're rotten renegades, but tomorrow you may unite with them. That's the dialectical development of history.
- W.- Very interesting. I wouldn't have thought it possible.
- T.- Yes, as Comrade Cannon said in his history of our Party - with us, nothing is impossible.
- W.- I must admit your Transitional Program is quite beyond me. A fellow like me would never support anybody he knows are a pack of fakers, like you know the Stalinist leaders are, and he would never tell others to vote for them. When I know any Party is my enemy, I'm against it, plain and simple. However, as they say, where there's life, there's hope. Maybe some day I'll learn to support my known enemies. In that case I'll join up with your Trotskyite Party. I want to thank you for a very interesting discussion.
- T.- Don't mention it. Always glad to spread Trotskyite enlightenment.

=====

SOME ASPECTS OF TROTSKY'S
LINE IN THE CHINESE REVOLUTION

The Stalinist betrayal of the Chinese Revolution of 1925-27 was one of the most momentous and outstanding crimes of the history of organized Stalinist sabotage of proletarian revolution. Knowledge of the key criminal participants who organized the disruption of this great proletarian upsurge is a necessary step in cleansing the proletariat of its misleaders. Both the lessons of victory and those of betrayal form the political capital of the revolutionary proletariat.

The rumbling of revolutionary developments in China bore an implicit threat to the very position of the Stalinist conspirators in the Soviet Union who were building and consolidating a huge bureaucratic machine to entrench power in their own hands. For Stalinist reaction, a particularly ominous feature of the situation in turbulent China was the impotence of the Chinese bourgeois watchdog - the Kuomintang - whose very weakness expressed the subservient comprador relation of the Chinese gang of exploiters to the big imperialist powers. As a consequence, Stalinism set as its main goal in China the strengthening of the bourgeois Kuomintang and the establishment of its hegemony over the Chinese masses.

The leaders of the new-born Chinese Communist Party (officially established in 1921) were taken in hand by the Stalin clique and converted into willing spokesmen for the counter-revolutionary policy of propping up the Kuomintang and setting a perspective of bourgeois domination before the view of the revolutionary masses of China. The policy of building up the Kuomintang was supported ideologically by a line rigidly excluding the program of proletarian revolution which had led the Russian masses to victory in 1917. A big Stalinist functionary, A. A. Joffe, was sent to China in January 1923 to make it clear to the Chinese bourgeoisie that the Stalinist leadership would collaborate with them to eradicate the spectre of proletarian revolution. Joffe repudiated the line of Soviets for China and lied that conditions in that turbulent country with a very militant proletariat and rebellious peasantry did not warrant a policy of proletarian revolution. On January 23, 1923, Joffe and Sun Yat Sen formally issued a declaration to this effect.

The path of Stalinist treachery in China can be clearly traced. A January 12, 1923 decision of the Executive Committee of the C.I. instructed the Chinese C.P. to "coordinate the activities of the Kuomintang and of the young Communist Party in China." (Quoted in P. Miff, "Heroic China," p. 22) The E.C.C.I. instructed the Chinese revolutionary workers to join the Kuomintang and the Stalinist leaders worked with unflagging energy as self-appointed organizers to remake the Chinese bourgeois party into a powerful instrument. In 1924, with Stalinist funds, the Whampoa Military Academy was set up on bourgeois lines for the instruction of the future butchers of the revolutionary Chinese workers. Chiang Kai Shok, the most promising of the Chinese Kornilovs, was installed by the Stalinist band as director of this bourgeois military academy. Along these lines, the Stalinist pen-prostitutes portrayed Chiang as one of the great proletarian heroes and deliberately blinded the workers on the real role of this pitiless bourgeois hangman.

On March 20, 1926 Chiang organized a coup d'etat in Canton, arrested many leaders of the Chinese C.P., murdered many revolutionary workers, and broke the back of the revolutionary movement in that key center. The whole counter-revolutionary affair was hushed up by the Stalinist

leaders who continued to exalt Chiang Kai Shek with fulsome words of praise. During this period Stalin and Chiang exchanged portraits as a token of their mutual esteem and confidence. Shortly after, Chiang and his gang, with tongue in cheek, applied for admission into the C.I. and had this request granted by the powers in the Kremlin. At the Seventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I. held in the Autumn of 1926, Chiang was actually represented by the participation of a Kuomintang delegate.

In July 1926, the Stalinist leaders organized a "Northern Expedition" for Chiang to consolidate the rest of China under the wing of the Kuomintang. The whole campaign was mapped out by Russian generals and liberally supplied with Stalinist funds and arms. The subordination of the revolutionary Chinese masses to the iron rule of the Kuomintang was now completed. In April 1927, during a key phase of Chiang's "Northern Expedition," (Chiang's entry into the Yangtze delta region) the workers in Shanghai rose and expelled the reactionary military forces then dominating the city. Soon after, Chiang moved on Shanghai to take over the power. The entry was cautiously organized to dispel any suspicions among the revolutionary workers in Shanghai. The maneuver took place under the Stalinist slogan of: "Hail Chiang Kai-Shek," accompanied by enthusiastic greetings sent from Stalinist organizations all over the world. With the ground thus properly prepared, Chiang on April 11, began a huge massacre of revolutionary workers in the city. The horrible slaughter was unprecedented even for China, the heroic Chinese workers having been lead directly to Chiang's chopping block by the criminal policy of Stalinism which blindfolded them and attached them to the leadership of the Chinese bourgeoisie. This series of events washed out the Chinese revolution in a torrent of blood which in late May 1927 was extended to the tri-cities of Wuhan and in December 1927 to Canton, finishing off the entire betrayal.

*

*

*

In 1932, Cannon and Shachtman published a book entitled: "Problems of the Chinese Revolution" by Leon Trotsky. The book consisted of a collection of speeches by Trotsky and some documents pertaining to the great Chinese upheaval of 1925-27. A review of the book was presented to the American Trotskyite workers in the organ of Cannon-Shachtman which purported to give an understanding of its significance. Here is the chief lesson and symbol of that volume according to the Trotsky leaders:

"That the Chinese revolution of 1925-1927 proved to be a tragedy can in no sense be ascribed to the Opposition. There was no excuse for the catastrophe from which the Chinese proletariat has not yet emerged, for opposition sounded the tocsin at every point. As you read the book, you are impressed by the fact that at no time did the Opposition make its criticism post factum, when it is not so difficult to be wise and see clearly." (The Militant, June 25, 1932, p. 3. My emphasis - A.B.)

Is it true, as is asserted here, that Trotsky sounded the tocsin at every important stage of the Chinese revolution and not post factum? If this is true to fact then Cannon-Shachtman are quite justified in pinning exclusive responsibility for the betrayal on the Stalin clique.

The first remarkable fact which immediately strikes the eye is that all speeches and documents of Trotsky printed in this above-cited volume

date from May 1927, i.e., after the main phases of the Chinese revolution. Not a scrap of evidence is shown concerning Trotsky's line during the key phases of the Chinese upheaval, including the development of the orientation to the Kuomintang in 1923, the March 1926 Chiang coup in Canton, and the April 1927 slaughter of the revolutionary masses in Shanghai.

What is the reason for this gaping space in this book on China which is supposed to show that Trotsky sounded the alarm during every important point in the revolutionary development and not after the consummation of the betrayal? A recital of the elementary facts will show the reason for this tell-tale gap in this Trotsky collection.

In 1924 when the Stalinist leadership began to work like beavers priming the pump for the Kuomintang and stumped all over China as Kuomintang recruiting agents, Trotsky issued a statement on this vital question. This statement showed Trotsky's line in clear and precise terms:

"We approve of Communist support to the Kuomintang Party in China which we are endeavoring to revolutionize." (L. Trotsky, Imprecorr., May 29, 1924. My emphasis - A.B.)

Thus, the reactionary Stalinist line of harnessing the revolutionary Chinese workers and peasants to the Kuomintang found a hearty assent from Trotsky. This line continued during all the key phases of the Chinese Revolution and was echoed by all the top Stalinist leaders. In this very volume under discussion, Trotsky in May 1927, for example, makes a reference to Karl Radek's line with whom he was then in alliance:

"Radek cannot say anything openly in the press about his line, for otherwise the party would learn that Radek's line is being confirmed by the whole course of events." ("Problems of the Chinese Revolution," L. Trotsky, p. 81. My emphasis - A.B.)

What was Radek's line at the time, which Trotsky in May 1927 stated was being confirmed by events. Here it is, in Trotsky's own words:

"Radek (together with Zinoviev) preached the subordination of the Communist Party to the Kuomintang, not only before Chiang Kai-shek's coup d'etat but even after." ("The Permanent Revolution," L. Trotsky, p. xlvii. My emphasis - A. B.)

Of course, this statement was written some years after the Chinese Revolution when Radek was no longer in bloc with Trotsky and instead was attacking him day in and day out in the Stalinist press. Thus Radek became a target of Trotsky's ire and as a consequence Radek's real line in the Chinese Revolution was accordingly laid bare before the Trotsky workers. Be that as it may, Radek's line which held to the subordination of the revolutionary Chinese workers to the Kuomintang was confirmed by the whole course of events, according to Trotsky's document of May 1927. However, there is even more direct evidence on the subject of Trotsky's line on the Kuomintang. In a letter to Shachtman in December 1930 Trotsky explicitly acknowledged that throughout the first half of 1927, that is, after Chiang's Canton coup of March 1926, after the fierce slaughter in Shanghai in April 1927, and after the butchery in Wuhan in May 1927, he did not even raise before the Russian Party and the Comintern

the question of breaking with the Kuomintang:

"! You are quite right when you point out that the Russian Opposition, as late as the first half of 1927, did not demand openly the withdrawal from the Kuomintang." (Quoted in "Problems of the Chinese Revolution," p. 19)

Thus all the evidence flatly contradicts the fable that Trotsky sounded the warning against the treacherous Stalinist policy during the important turning points of the Chinese Revolution of 1925-27. It was only after the consummation of the Stalinist betrayal that Trotsky then raised a hue and cry about the Kuomintang issue and thereby covered his own participation in foisting this counter-revolutionary Stalinist policy on the misled Chinese workers. Interestingly, this particular policy of continuing in the Kuomintang even became untenable for the Stalinist clique and in August 1927 the Chinese C.P. on orders from Stalin changed its course to putschist uprisings. In December 1927 this "uprising" policy was effected in Canton where thousands of Stalinist followers were led into a suicidal putsch long after all power had been firmly consolidated in the hands of the Chiang Kai Shek men. The Canton "insurrection" became the Stalinist cover as the hullabaloo against the policy of building the Kuomintang became Trotsky's protective device. Both alibis were designed to evade responsibility for the betrayal of the Chinese masses in 1925-27, during the development of the Chinese civil war.

*

*

*

The subordination of the C.P. of China to the Kuomintang was but one half of the story of the Chinese betrayal. The other concerns the theoretical line which formed the basis for this policy. We have already cited the Joffe-Sun Yat Sen communique which repudiated the line of permanent revolution for China and set a perspective for bourgeois rule. To befuddle the revolutionary Chinese workers the pre-1917, utopia of a two-class dictatorship was exhumed from the political graveyard by the Stalin crew and palmed off as a proletarian program for China.

In 1926 Trotsky formed a bloc with Zinoviev and Kamenev who were elbowed out of power by Stalin in one of the phases of the latter's centralization of authority. The Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev bloc had to overcome a most annoying political stumbling block. Previously, when Zinoviev and Kamenev were in bloc with Stalin, they had ganged up on Trotsky and used his theory of permanent revolution and his pre-1917 differences with Lenin over this vital principle as a talking point to frame up Trotsky. It so happened that on this important principle, Trotsky had been proven right and Lenin wrong; in 1917 in his April Theses Lenin adopted Trotsky's position on permanent revolution and liquidated his differences on this question. However, in 1926-27, to cement his bloc with Zinoviev and Kamenev, Trotsky came out publicly with a political face-saving declaration for his two new comrades-in-arms. Trotsky simply declared that Lenin ~~who~~ had been wrong on Permanent Revolution was right, and that Trotsky who was proven right on this principle was ~~w~~rong. Here is that statement which threw a veil over the previous criminal ideological work of Zinoviev and Kamenev:

"Trotsky has stated to the International that in all those questions of principle upon which he disputed with Lenin, Lenin was right — and particularly upon the question of the permanent revolution and the peasantry." (Platform of the Opposition, printed in English under the

the title, "The Real Situation in Russia," p. 180. My emphasis - A.B.)

Trotsky's bartering of his own great historical contribution as the price for a factional deal with two putrid Stalinist bandits shows the level of degeneracy he had reached in his descent from Marxist politics to the Stalinist cesspool. As a result of his deal with Zinoviev and Kamenev, permanent revolution was repudiated in the Platform of the self-styled Opposition bloc in 1927 during the most crucial phase of the Chinese Revolution .

In the document on China dated May 17, 1927 Trotsky showed how he applied his disavowal of permanent revolution for China. In this remarkable document Trotsky even went beyond the bounds of Lenin's disproven two class utopia which was formulated for the tasks of the bourgeois revolution. Trotsky now raised a call for a dictatorship of three classes; the workers, the peasantry, and the urban petty-bourgeoisie:

"The Opposition is energetically in favor of strengthening and developing the bloc with the revolutionary elements of the Kuomintang, for a compact fighting alliance of the workers with the poor population of the city and country, for the course towards the revolutionary dictatorship of the workers, peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie." ("Problems of the Chinese Revolution," L. Trotsky, p. 60. My emphasis - A. B.)

This formula was exceeded in brazenness only by the Stalin clique who added in the big bourgeoisie and raised the ante up to four classes. This was the farce made of Marxism by the Stalinist renegades. Both in the case of Trotsky, and in that of Stalin, the position of permanent revolution was thrown out of the window and the trusting Chinese masses were shackled with a counter-revolutionary policy.

Clearly, on the question of subordinating the Chinese workers and peasants under the flag of the Kuomintang, Trotsky fundamentally pursued a Stalinist policy throughout the crucial phases of the Chinese Revolution of 1925-27. Thus Trotsky stands convicted together with Stalin for the betrayal of the great Chinese revolution and stands responsible with Stalin for saddling the Chinese masses with that bloody murderer and torturer, Chiang Kai Shek. The Cannon-Shachtman pretense that the defeat of the Chinese Revolution cannot be ascribed to the line of the Trotsky-Zinoviev Opposition Bloc because it allegedly sounded the revolutionary tocsin at every important development is a shameless falsification. It is designed to evade responsibility for the participation of Trotsky in the momentous betrayal of the Chinese masses and whitewash his crooked horse deals with Zinoviev-Kamenev-Radek in that crucial period of history when the fate of the Chinese masses hung in the balance.

A.B.

April 13, 1946
