

THE BULLETIN

OF THE LENINIST LEAGUE, U. S. A.

FOR A NEW LENINIST INTERNATIONAL

Will Stalin and Trotsky Succeed ?

By GEORGE MARLEN

Stamm's Unity Maneuvers

By D. S.

The Trotskyists Make a "Discovery"

By J. C. HUNTER

Mienov and Joerger Rub Alladin's Lamp

By A. B.

The Trotsky School of Falsification



THE LENINIST LEAGUE, U. S. A.
P. O. BOX 67, STATION D NEW YORK



Labor Donated

HX1
W6B8
v.3-4

Vol. III, No. 1 - Jan. 1940

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

	Page
WILL STALIN AND TROTSKY SUCCEED ?	1
by George Marlen	
SHACHTMAN'S VOTE	10
by D. S.	
STAMM'S UNITY MANEUVERS	11
by D. S.	
THE TROTSKYITES MAKE A "DISCOVERY"	18
by J. C. Hunter	
Mienov and Joerger Rub Alladin's Lamp	22
by Arthur Burke	
THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION	
Blind Faith Instead of Marxian Thinking	23
Shachtman As An Historian	24

NOTE: Vol. II, 1939, December
number was omitted

WILL STALIN AND TROTSKY SUCCEED?

By George Marlen

To a politically shallow mind Stalin's military action against Finland is merely an expansionist grab not unlike one perpetrated by imperialists. Historically, the Stalin-Finnish war represents the beginning of the armed clash between the decaying system of privately-owned economy extant in the entire capitalist world and the decaying socialized economy of the bureaucratized Workers State.

The present situation which brings to a head the deepest economic antagonism within the present epoch has grown out of the following preparatory stages:

- A) The formation of the first Workers State in 1917 through the revolutionary overthrow of the Russian capitalist state.
- B) The political stifling of the European proletariat by Social Democracy in 1918-1921 with the resultant deliverance of the bourgeois States and the stabilization of the capitalist system.
- C) The Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev conspiracy in 1921-1922; the formation of the Trio-Trotsky Bloc; the shunting of the Soviet State upon the rails of opportunist degeneration and the conscious and deliberate Stalinist-engineered destruction of the German October in 1923.
- D) The centralizing bureaucratic power of Stalin through the elimination of partners in the plot of bureaucratic usurpation; Trotsky's political collaboration with Stalin under the guise of

loyal opposition; the continuous consciously-conceived betrayal by the Stalinist political system (Stalin-Trotsky-Lovestone-Left-Trotskyites) of the world proletariat and the uninterrupted growth of Fascist reaction.

E) The scrapping of the Versailles Treaty by world imperialism and its substitution with the Munich policy the establishment of the mock war in the West serving as a cover for the mobilization of the masses to attack the rotting Workers State.

In a large measure the partial unfolding of the Stalin-Finnish war was facilitated by Stalin's stiff-necked attitude with respect to the clever bourgeois maneuver such as mediation offer by Roosevelt, by the League of Nations and the appeal of the French bourgeoisie. Despite openings available to negotiate with the Finnish bourgeoisie, Stalin recklessly plunged into a war with them. The entire international bourgeoisie, directly and indirectly, has seized upon this invasion of Finland as a pretext to organize the beginnings of a war against the bureaucratized Workers State. By his adventure in Finland, Stalin gave the imperialists their much-needed opportunity to create a "crusade" spirit against the Soviet Union.

Among the primary characteristics of the entire Stalinist political system are deception, perversion, double-dealing, corruption and crime covered with the mask of Bolshevism. In the field of economy the Soviet Union un-

der the lawless mismanagement of the Stalinist burcrats developed a faulty industry, enormously outstripped in volume, strength and efficacy by the industry of the capitalist world. The inference is clear. If matters remain as they are, with the Russian and the rest of the Bolshevik-minded international proletariat in the grip of the Stalinist system of counter-revolution, than the armed contest will be confined to the military action. Un-

der such conditions the victory of imperialism over the Stalin-suffocated Workers State is assured. The imperative historical requirement for the achievement of proletarian victory over its class enemy, the bourgeoisie, is the freeing of the vanguard from the deadly clutches of the Stalinist political system. This can be brought about only through the Leninist ideological and organizational rearming of the proletariat.

TROTSKYISM THE CHIEF PROP OF THE STALINIST REACTION

In an effort to perpetuate the mental chaos within the advanced section of the proletariat, the Stalinist burcrats have furthered the fraud that Stalin through skillful diplomatic maneuver has stopped Hitler's advance to the East and caused the German imperialists to come to grips with the French and British imperialists. Though in different words, and with much "anti-Stalinist" declamation, the Trotskyite leaders in essence support the central political feature of this Stalinist fraud. They assure the workers that Stalin is in a real alliance with Hitler, and in the West there rages an imperialist war as real in character as that of 1914-1918. The Trotskyite leaders, understanding reality quite well, play safe. In the very midst of their persistent repetition of the "Second World War" deception, the Trotskyite leaders, with practical judgment, prepare an avenue of retreat. They throw out hints about the coming all-imperialist offensive against the rotting Workers State, but at the same time they continue with their cock-and-bull story of a real war between Hitler and Chamberlain.

But in actuality the British and the German imperialists are at peace with each other! And few people know it as well as Trotsky and his mentally quick and discerning Cannons and Schachtmans. These men, pretending to follow Lenin, thoroughly familiar with Lenin's teachings, know that an imperialist war is a conflict of trusts and monopolies led by financial kings,

heads of powerful banking houses. Finance capital at war! — this is the substance of inter-imperialist armed contest. And this is precisely NOT the case in the present relations among the British, French and German bankers. The bourgeois press on occasion does blurt out some facts of tremendous import and significance. While keeping alive the general humbug about Britain and Germany being at war, the New York Times in the November 20, 1939 issue makes the following astounding revelation:

"...However, war or no war, the banks of England and France, as well as those of the neutral European nations, have made their financial peace with Germany, and the New York banks, as one banker expressed it, 'are left out in the cold.'"

The Trotskyite Bolshevik-Leninists" undoubtedly read the bourgeois press. They peruse even the Hawaii Sentinel, let alone the New York Times. But their standing policy is to conceal the facts, even though these facts might be inadvertently disclosed by the bourgeoisie itself. In the light of the fact that the British banks are at peace with the German financial houses, all talk about the British and German empires being "at war" is purest bourgeois bosh, while the story that this is a "Second World War" and "an imperialist war for world domination" is a Stalinist-Trotskyite-Lovestoneite fraud. The

British, French and German financiers are doing business and the American bankers are anxious to get their share of the undoubtedly lucrative deals with Nazi Germany.

"...a committee of New York bankers headed by Harvey D. Gibson, chairman of the Manufacturers Trust Company, is negotiating by cable in an effort to reach a new agreement whereby Germany will resume ~~interest~~ payments. British, Netherland, Swiss, French and Belgian banks involved in the Standstill credits to Germany ended the old agreement on Sept. 3, but since then have concluded new arrangements." (New York Times, Nov. 20, 1939. My emphasis-G.M.)

In another issue of that paper there appears the significant information that the Bank of England is making loans on German collateral!

"Since the outbreak of war the British banking creditors, although prevented by law from dealing directly with the enemy, have obtained financial relief from the Bank of England itself by presenting their German collateral for loans. The Bank of England, unlike the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, views this collateral as good and is willing to grant loans, charging interest at rates of 5 to 6 per cent." (New York Times, Nov. 22, 1939.)

A remarkable corroboration of the fact that the "Allied" and German bankers, industrialists and munition magnates are at peace can be gleaned from a Paris dispatch:

"One of the paradoxes of war is that the great German industrial center in the Saar Basin and the equally important French one in Lorraine continue to produce armaments, although they are easy targets for long-range guns and aerial bombs." (New York Post, Dec. 28, 1939)

It is interesting that the financial and industrial heads on both sides of the Rhine are so clear and positive that they are not warring up-

on one another, that no effort is made to black out the important industrial district. Were France and Germany actually at war, such "negligence" would have made these easy targets completely exposed to aerial night raids, with the enemy planes perfectly invisible in the blackness of the sky. Obviously the imperialists know what they are about:

"While nightly blackouts prevail in other parts of Germany and France, in their industrial districts no effort is made to cover up the red blaze of smelter fires shooting up in the sky." (Ibid.)

The buzzing Trotskyite hypocrites either pass these tell-tale information data in complete silence or distort the true meaning of facts. The cold-blooded reality is concealed by a flurry of noisy phrases. The international bankers meanwhile coin a handsome profit out of their financial transactions with the "enemy." Under such conditions the apologizing for the conspicuous quiet on the "Western Front" with the story that it is rather an economic than a military conflict is clearly seen as a deceptive device to conceal the bankers' peace in Europe. What sort of an economic war is it! In what way does Britain strangle Germany when the British, French, Belgian and other bankers furnish the Nazis with financial means to meet the generally difficult situation!

The sea "warfare" which alone is visible, is of an extremely peculiar character. There is a "strange" order of the British Admiralty to British armed merchantmen to refrain from attacking German ships and to use the guns only for defense against submarine attacks (N.Y. Times, Nov. 28, 1939) which defense is impossible after the ship is blown up by a torpedo. There is the "queer" attitude on the part of the colossal British sea power towards the 20,000,000-dollar liner, the Bremen, The Bremen sailing from New York "miraculously" eluded the British Navy as well as the French fleet and reached Murmansk safely. The whole world, including the British Admiralty, knew

that the Bremen was at Murmansk, an enormous distance from Germany. But the Bremen made the long trip down the Norwegian coast. Certainly Britannia is still ruling the narrow waters between the British Isles and Scandinavia. One would suppose that the efficient British naval patrols would have easily detected such a highly visible object as that huge vessel of over 51,000 tons, the flagship of the German merchant fleet. But no. The Bremen again "eluded" the British navy. It was sighted by a British submarine within torpedo range. But the British did not attack the Nazi's luxury liner. The explanation is that they were "prevented" from doing so by "international law" which "forbids" sinking of ships without warning — the bourgeois law for which the imperialist bourgeoisie itself, when necessary, shows little respect. These are mysterious ways of a "strange war" in the eyes even of some bourgeois writers:

"Hindsight is sometimes helpful in interpreting the mysterious diplomatic maneuvering in these uncertain times, but yesterday's announcement that a British submarine failed to sink the Bremen and the latest announcement that British planes roared harmlessly over German naval bases last night do not help much in understanding the way this strange war is developing."
(New York Times, Dec. 14, 1939.)

The Bremen episode aroused widespread suspicion. It was successfully dispelled by the scuttling of the Graf Spee and Columbus.

The Stalinist-Trotskyite fakery in presenting the cover-war in the West as a "Second World War" must be exposed and the actual situation must be made clear and definite to the workers. There is no real war between the British and the German bankers and industrialists. The world bourgeoisie has very skillfully arranged a mock war in the West to serve as a means to confuse and blind the workers to the rapidly developing assault upon the Stalinized Workers State. Without this cloak of a "war against Hitlerism" the imperialists would have hardly

been able to mobilize the proletariat. The greatest assistance to the imperialists in this scheme has been rendered by the opportunists — not only by the Social Democrats but especially by all the pseudo-Bolsheviks who dread to speak the truth to the masses.

Before the attack upon Russian unfolds to titanic proportions the imperialists must keep their armies geared up, lest the war spirit of the soldiers becomes worn out by inertia. So the General Staffs keep up patrol activity which, were it actual war, would have been of no strategic value or significance. A distant allusion to this method of keeping up the war psychology among the soldiers is contained in a Paris dispatch to the New York Times, December 7, 1939, which after a reference to the "minor German raids," states:

"It is surmised now that one purpose of such raids is to keep the troops 'war-minded.' The explanation is plausible, since how to occupy men in prolonged military inactivity presents a grave problem. It is all too easy to fall into a routine detrimental to vigor and initiative."

In our epoch declaration of war does not necessarily mean military struggle. Indeed, the only war that is not being prosecuted today is this declared "war."

The bourgeois correspondents continue making slips: "That 'state of war' continues, but it can scarcely be said that the war has begun" (The New York Times, Dec. 4, 1939).

The bourgeois correspondents admit it's a "queer" war — this "Second World War" of the Stalinists, Trotskyites, Oehlerites, Starnmites, Mienovites and other misleaders. Trotskyites, Oehlerites as well as everybody else, gather their information primarily from the bourgeois correspondents. The opportunist fabrications about the terrifying aspect of the imperialist giants straining their war machines in the effort to crush each other do not seem to tally with the news from the

"Western Front." The only powerful foe that the British face, reports Harold Denny, is — boredom!

"This queer war is now entering its fourth month and the British Army in France is face to face with the only formidable enemy it has yet encountered — boredom."

So while the opportunists divide and confuse the minds of the workers with an "imperialist war" in the West, the bourgeoisie of all imperialist States, under the cover of that war, rushes at feverish pace the final preparations for rooting out socialized property in Russia and eradicating all the living memories of the first successful revolution against a great imperialist power. That the entire set-up is an imperialist scheme to fall upon Russia one can observe between the lines in the capitalist newspapers:

"It begins to look more than ever as if the war will not be fought on the Western Front, but that sooner or later an Eastern Front will have become a reality." (New York Times, Dec. 3, 1939.)

There is a "tight blockade" around the Baltic. Hitler blockades England, and Chamberlain blockades Germany, but despite all these "blockades" military supplies to Finland flow in an ever-widening stream — both from "democratic" imperialists and from the Fascists and the Nazis. A dispatch to the New York Post, December 7, 1939 from Helsinki reveals an unofficial statement that "German shipments of war materials to Finland has not ceased." In fact, "material resources are flowing to Finland, it was said in well-informed quarters, from all over Europe." Such is the character of the imperialist "blockades"!

Despite Britain's "War" with so formidable a power as Germany, "Finnish arms contracts are being given priority treatment by British producers" (New York Times, December 7, 1939).

Mussolini rushed air squadrons to Finland, to fight Hitler's "ally" Stalin. General Hermann Goering's nephew

joins the Finnish army (The N.Y. Times Dec. 9, 1939). From Hungary comes the news that Hitler sends to Finland not only guns but also soldiers!

"Germany is sending both volunteer soldiers and anti-tank guns to Finland it was reported here today in official circles." (N.Y. Times, Dec. 9, 1939.)

Through the interlinking of circumstances, the collisions of the bureaucratized Workers State and world bourgeoisie is temporarily centering in Finland. Reality exposes the Trotskyite deceitful talk of Hitler being really allied with Stalin as well as the Chamberlain-Hitler-Daladier cover-war in the West. Here the British and the Nazis are closely cooperating against the rotting proletarian State. But what are facts to the treacherous misleaders and betrayers of the working class! The Finnish war is the pivot around which all the social and political interests of modern society will be gathering for a decisive struggle. History may record the last chapter of the degenerated Workers State and a frightful victory of world imperialism, or a resurgence of proletarian revolution through a Leninist offensive against Stalinism and all other opportunism which stand guard over capitalist society. But the Trotskyite bureaucrats hide the true import of the war in Finland, just as they distort the meaning of the "war" in the West. Despite the British-German bankers' peace, the Trotskyite "Bolshevik-Leninists" insist that the picture in the West represents a "Second World War"; while the genuine war in Finland is merely described as an incident in the "war."

"The invasion of Finland by the Red Army is an INCIDENT in the Second World War which is now only in its tentative and initial stages of development." (Socialist Appeal, Dec. 9, 1939. My capitals - G.M.)

In an effort to distort the reality of the present situation, the Trotskyite leaders pose as an incident what is really the central feature.

But the monstrous pro-Stalinist

treachery of Trotskyism, itself a branch of the complex Stalinist system, is contained in the policy it lays down for the revolutionary workers.

Even were the Soviet Union led by Lenin, the revolutionary workers, both inside and outside the proletarian State, would have given him support only in a genuinely proletarian democratic way, which can be no other than conditional support, with the workers retaining their fullest right and duty of criticism with respect to Lenin and the other leaders of the Soviet Union. Lenin himself would have been the first one to oppose a policy which demands from adherents unconditional support. Unconditional support spells lawless bureaucratism and blind, slavish allegiance, not class-conscious, truly revolutionary-democratic mutual relations between the masses and their leaders. Unconditional support is repugnant to the very spirit of Bolshevism. Sincere revolutionists will never advocate nor will they consent to receive unconditional support. As to conditional support, it should be given only to tried and trusted leaders. To the opportunist betrayers of the proletariat true revolutionists give no support. Stalinism is the blackest counter-revolutionary force within the Russian and international proletariat. In 1922, observing signs of Stalin's dishonesty, Lenin warned that with Stalin a compromise is excluded even on a correct line. In the 18 years of its existence, Stalinism has wrought terrific havoc and destruction among the workers and has been consciously wading in blood and crime. In the task of defending the bureaucratized Workers State to advocate any form of support to Stalinism is criminal and counter-revolutionary. Such a policy of "defending" the Soviet Union is a steel chain which firmly binds the workers to the Soviet bureaucracy and prevents the Leninist fight against the Stalinist cancer.

Trotskyism is foisting upon the subjectively anti-Stalinist Russian workers the policy of unconditional support to Stalin, camouflaging it with catchwords such as "Soviet patriotism" and "defense of the Soviet Union":

"For the Fourth Internationalists: in the Soviet Union Soviet patriotism — the main enemy is world imperialism. UNCONDITIONAL defense of the Soviet Union against the capitalist world." (Socialist Appeal, December 9, 1939. My emphasis - G.M.)

The implication is clear. But one of the chief characteristics of the Trotskyist branch of the Stalinist political system is its double-faced line. The purely pro-Stalinist chain is immediately overspread with a thick layer of anti-Stalinist veneer.

"IRRECONCILABLE struggle for the overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy, which betrays the world proletariat and undermines the defense of the Soviet Union." (Ibid. My emphasis - G.M.)

Every plausible-looking lie is composed of two parts, the kernel of deceit and the outer shell of truth. Every trap has its camouflage. Trotsky and his gang of lieutenants may spout the "Reddest" anti-Stalinist phrases and hypocritically foam at their mouths, but their dual political line is in essence the paralyzing line of support to the Stalinist bureaucracy.

It must be borne in mind that the Russian workers under the leadership of Lenin defeated the world bourgeoisie during the civil war and imperialist intervention not so much through military as through political struggle. The military struggle, merely a part of the political struggle, is completely subordinated to the latter. The axis of a correct policy is revolutionary class-struggle, merciless fight against opportunism, and not "Unconditional defense of the Soviet Union." The reactionary Stalinist bureaucracy places its fight against the imperialists upon a military axis exclusively. Politically it prevents the workers from fighting the imperialists. From a military point of view there can be absolutely no question as to the tragic outcome of the contest between the Stalinized Workers State, impoverished, predominantly peasant, and the highly developed, rich and powerful imperialist States. In the light of a sober

understanding of the situation, it becomes obvious towards what dreadful abyss the Stalinist bureaucracy is dragging the Russian and international proletariat. To any realistically-minded revolutionary worker there cannot be a particle of doubt that the prerequisite for saving the remnants of October is the overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy. If this bureaucracy continue to saddle the Soviet Union and opportunism continue to lock the arms of the international proletariat, the victory of imperialism is assured.

It is to be hoped that the Russian workers do not view with unconcern the momentous fact that the economic foundation upon which the Stalinized Russian army bases itself is different, is the direct opposite from and is anathema to that economic foundation upon which rests the imperialist army. That foundation — socialized property — represents one of the most important conquests of the proletarian revolution. This socialized property is controlled and distorted by a usurping, greedy, thoroughly counter-revolutionary bureaucracy headed by Stalin. The extremely difficult problem here is how to get rid of the cancerous bureaucratic growth on the sick body of socialized property, without killing that body. For the Russian workers to follow the "advice" of some "Marxists" to work for the defeat of the Stalinized "Red Army" would be facilitating the speediest reestablishment of bourgeois private property. The formula "Revolutionary defeatism," correct in a war among States based upon capitalist private ownership of industry, would be suicidal lunacy in a war of a State whose form of property represents the basic achievement of proletarian revolution against all other States whose form of property represents victorious counter-revolution. Against ultra-Leftist, counter-revolutionary defeatism and against Stalinism — this is the only path for the Russian masses towards establishment of a healthy proletarian State. While advocating resistance to the imperialist armies, the revolutionary workers teach and explain to the proletariat what the sacrifices of the Russian toilers are futile under Stal-

inism. Either through Stalinist sell-out or imperialist victory, or both, the last vestiges of October conquests will be wiped out. Only the destruction of the criminal Stalinist bureaucracy and reestablishment of Leninism can transform the bureaucratic-imperialist war into a revolutionary war against capitalism and open a possibility of victory.

The first step in this direction would be the overthrow of the Stalinist gang, immediately followed by the proletarian-democratic elections to a Soviet Congress which would propose cessation of the armed conflict in Finland. Under such change the imperialists would at once be put on the spot and the sympathy of the masses would lean towards Russia as in the days of Lenin.

But Trotsky's line for the Russian workers is the very opposite. By way of example of what he would do were he in the Soviet Union, Trotsky advocates to "postpone" the overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy until the Workers State, undermined, mismanaged, enfeebled and betrayed by Stalinism secures "victory" over the mighty imperialist armies:

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

Thus Trotsky, by implication, deludes the workers with the false hope that victory by the Stalin-suffocated proletarian State over the world bourgeoisie can be secured without a Leninist leadership. Trotsky clearly indicates that his program is collaboration with the arch-betrayer Stalin. Trotsky makes it explicit in his reply to Goldman, as recorded in "The Case of Leon Trotsky," page 292:

"Goldman: Then your answer is that you are willing to collaborate with Stalin in defending the Soviet Union against the capitalist enemies?

"Trotsky: Absolutely."

Trotsky's underling, James P. Cannon, with his customary brutal cynicism, declares that the workers must reject the line of the overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy as a prerequisite for the victory of the Russian proletariat:

"Our motion calls for unconditional defense of the Soviet Union against imperialist attack. What does that mean? It simply means that you defend the Soviet Union and its nationalized property against external attacks of imperialist armies or against internal attempts at capitalist restoration, without putting as a prior condition the overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy. Any other kind of defense negates the whole position under present circumstances." (Internal Bulletin, Volume II, No. 3, "Speech on the Russian Question," by James P. Cannon, p. 8. My emphasis - G.M.)

Yet, this is the crux of the entire matter. Under Stalinist "leadership" which politically works for capitalism, the final debacle is absolutely certain. Prior to the overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy in Russia the victory of the Russian masses over the world imperialists is impossible. Trotsky, as we see, is fulfilling his promise to collaborate with Stalin — "Absolutely"!

The monstrous feature in the Trotskyist game is the fact that Trotsky and his Cannons don't have to have explained to them that victory of the Russian workers over the imperialist armies can be secured only through the overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy. They know it!

"The Russian workers, passionately attached to the Soviet Union which they created with their flesh and blood, and determined to defend it against any and all imperialists, must come to recognize that ONLY the overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy can guarantee the defeat of the imperialist armies." (Socialist Appeal, December 30, 1939. My emphasis - G.M.)

And yet, on the other hand, Cannon excludes the overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy as a PRIOR condition to the defense — naturally the real defense — of the Soviet Union.

Such is Trotskyite duplicity. Working smoothly and, so far, quite effectively, the Trotskyite leaders invariably employ correct formulations to camouflage their pro-Stalinist traps. Will the revolutionary workers permit Stalin and Trotsky to bring another, perhaps the worst, tragedy upon the toiling masses?

If the Russian workers follow Trotsky's treacherous line they will be drowned in a sea of their own blood, as were the Spanish toilers, who instead of weeding out, supported Stalinism. No revolutionary worker should forget that in the Spanish tragedy Trotskyism urged "critical" support to the Stalin-directed Stalinist-Social-democratic political guillotine, called the People's Front Government!

To support Stalin — with "criticism" — is the fundamental consciously-devised policy Trotsky has been pursuing since Stalin broke with him in 1923. Serving as a lightning-rod for Stalinism, Trotsky has been collecting around himself the best anti-Stalinist workers, has been attaching them to the Stalinist system by means of his double-faced political line, dooming them to political desolation and physical extinction. Trotsky himself is forever tied to Stalinism because he participated in the original bureaucratic conspiracy of entrenching in position of power during Lenin's illness. Without exposure of Trotsky's role in creating and keeping alive the Stalinist monster, without the political destruction of Trotsky the Leninist rearming of the Russian and world proletariat is impossible of achievement.

Exposure of Trotsky! who in the face of Lenin's line to remove Stalin took the anti-Leninist position "I am against removing Stalin" (Leon Trotsky, MY LIFE, p. 486). Exposure of Trotsky! who, while well informed that Stalin was corrupting the party with buroc-

ratism and was bribing adventurers and careerists in the Comintern, assured the workers that "Our party - the best Party. It is the teacher of other parties in the Communist International" (Leon Trotsky at the VII All-Ukrainian Party Conference). Exposure of Trotsky! who, instead of confirming Eastman's revelation of Lenin's Testament in which Lenin spoke of the need of removing Stalin, shielded Stalin in the following dishonest manner: "Comrade Lenin HAS NOT LEFT ANY 'WILL' All talk with regard to a concealed or mutilated 'will' is nothing but a DESPICABLE LIE.....There is no sincere worker who will believe in the picture painted by Eastman." (L. Trotsky, Inprecorr, Sept. 3, 1925, pp.105, 106. My emphasis - G.M.)

Exposure of Trotsky - who aided Stalin to tie the German workers to the Stalinist "Communist" Party by his policy "All eyes to the Communist Party" and thus contributed to the betrayal of the German workers to Hitler.

Exposure of Trotsky -- who pictures the Chamberlain-Hitler cover-war in the West as a real imperialist war

among great bourgeois powers, and who, to divert the workers' minds from learning the whole damning truth about the bureaucratic degeneration of the first Workers State, drugs their consciousness with reformist opiates such as the Ham-and-Egg plan and the Ludlow Referendum.

Exposure of Trotsky --who preaches to the Russian workers unconditional support to the deadly Stalinist counter-revolution "until victory is assured" and thus politically works with Stalin, writing in the blood of the deceived and betrayed toilers of the Soviet Union and of other countries finis to what remains of the greatest proletarian conquests in world's history.

There is no hope in the present era of the Stalinist conspiracy except in the freeing of the advanced workers from the constricting grip of the counter-revolutionary Stalinist system which includes the Trotskyist "Fourth International" which is the political knot of the Stalinist noose on the neck of the Soviet Union and the international proletariat.

Dec. 30, 1939

A MODEST DEMAND TO WALL STREET'S CONGRESS

"We have got to demand that Congress enact our program, and not Roosevelt's." (Socialist Appeal, Dec. 30, 1939. Our emphasis -L.L.)

HOW TO

"EXPROPRIATE THE SIXTY FAMILIES"

"Take that money from the Sixty Families, and put it to work. If the Sixty Families whine too much about it, leave them a few million apiece so they won't run out of caviar." (Socialist Appeal, Dec. 30, 1939. Our emphasis - L.L.)

SHACHTMAN'S VOTE

By D.S.

FOLLOWING the recent New York City election in which the Trotskyites participated, campaigning for Max Shachtman as a first choice candidate and the American Labor Party candidates as second choice, the results were reported in the Socialist Appeal:

"Shachtman's ballots were distributed after the first choice votes were counted, the second choices on his ballots going practically all to Salvatore Ninfo, American Labor Party candidate, who polled 40,000 first choice votes." (Socialist Appeal, Nov. 17 1939, p. 1. My emphasis. - D.S.)

Unfortunately for the Trotskyites, the bourgeoisie, for their own information, published in The New York Times of November 18, 1939 a listing of the second choice distributions. These figures conflict with what the Trotskyites reported to the workers who read the Appeal. The report of the Appeal is an attempt to make these workers believe that the campaign of the Socialist Workers Party was in matter of fact successful, for did they not instruct their followers to vote for the American Labor Party candidates. The truth of the matter is that the workers who voted for Shachtman simultaneously gave their second choice votes to the out-and-out representatives of American imperialism.

One single block of 544 of Shachtman's second choice votes was cast for Cohen of the Democratic Party. Other second choice distributions of Shachtman's ballots went to Deering (D) 114 votes, Keegan (D) 45, Kinsley (D) 41, a total of 744 for the Democrats alone, which is more than twice the vote polled by Ninfo out of Shachtman's second choice

votes. Ninfo, who according to the Trotskyite tally, received "practically all," received only 307 votes out of the total 1879 second choice votes cast. Cohen of the Democratic polling almost twice as many as Ninfo. And besides the Democratic Party-Shachtman vote, the candidate of the Republican-Fusion—non-Partisan bourgeois gang got the support of some of Shachtman's "Trotskyites," receiving 57 votes. Bigg of the Independents received 303 Trotskyite votes, almost tying Ninfo, and others unlisted politically polled 48 votes. Even the concealed Stalinist Quill received 145 Shachtman's votes. The declared Stalinist, Begun, polled 5 of Shachtman's votes. The other A.L.P. candidate, Rubinstein, polled 270 of Shachtman's votes.

Instead of "practically all" of the second choice Shachtman votes going to Ninfo, as the Trotskyite leaders assured their followers, the actual tabulation shows that Ninfo received only 16% of total second choice Shachtman votes. Even with Rubinstein's, also of the A.L.P., the combined second-choice Trotskyite vote for the A.L.P. is still only 31%, far from being "practically all." The practically all of Shachtman's vote was given to the extent of 61% to the undiluted representatives of Wall Street.

After giving the workers the fairy tale about the Shachtman vote, the Socialist Appeal informs its readers that

"The final count has not yet been completed. A full story on the elections will appear in the next issue." (Ibid.)

We looked at the next issue. The S.W.P. "grand skam" in The Bronx is

(Cont'd on p. 21.)

STAMM'S UNITY MANEUVERS

By D. S.

THE Central Committee of the Revolutionary Workers League (Revolt), on Sept. 16, 1939, states in a call for unity among various specific organizations a basis of one point, i.e., a fight against imperialist war. On the question of imperialist war and the need of building a revolutionary party, there is, it states, fundamental agreement among most groups and certain individuals.

That such agreement exists there is no doubt. The political character of such an agreement, however, is quite another matter.

A series of points of agreement all connected with the question of war is offered which would be the basis on which these groups and individuals would unite: that the war is imperialist; that the workers must transform the imperialist war into civil war; that no support to U.S. imperialism be given; that the imperialist war aims be exposed and the working class aroused to opposition and hatred of them; that a struggle against the imperialist policy of national unity is necessary; that the attacks on the standard of living of the working class be resisted by independent working class action; that the strategy of revolutionary defeatism be adopted; that the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship is necessary; and finally, that it is necessary to construct a new revolutionary party.

The points in themselves seem revolutionary and Leninist in character. But the historical period of 1914 has passed. It is not sufficient to shout from the housetops that one is opposed to an imperialist war, that he is for dictatorship of the proletariat and that he will practice revolutionary defeatism.

Before 1914 there were those who

declared themselves as being unconditionally opposed to imperialist war, who at Basle declared that such a war would lead to a proletarian revolution against the imperialists which they would support. But when that war and that revolution became an actuality, then they showed their true colors and supported their bourgeoisie.

What pseudo-revolutionary organization cannot declare itself to be in agreement with the words about fighting imperialist war which Revolt pours out?

Stalinism, using ultra-Rightist and ultra-Leftist lines to betray one revolutionary situation after another, during its Leftist zigzag can and does shout revolution much redder and louder than Revolt. At such ultra-Left moments the Stalinist "revolutionism" knows no bounds. It fights the police, it damns imperialism and imperialist war - it quotes Marx's and Lenin's speeches and writings. Its "fight" against capitalism is limitless: it creates "Soviets" in China, organizes hunger marches in the United States, leads putschist attacks on government buildings in Spain, and "builds Socialism" in Russia. What, indeed, could be more "revolutionary"!

And when the new Leftist line which Stalinism is now well into has reached full bloom, the Stalinists again will come out with ultra-Revolutionary slogans and their cry "Down With Imperialist War" which has already been spouted by the Dimitrovs, will drown out all the Revolts.

Stalinism, turning from a Rightist to a new Leftist line is beginning again to speak in terms of "abolition of capitalist slavery." Up to 1939, says Stalinism.

".....it was impossible, because

of the absence of the necessary prerequisites, to place the abolition of capitalist slavery on the order of the day, now, to the extent that the crisis, evoked by the war grows deeper, this task will face the workingclass with ever-growing acuteness." ("The War and the Working Class of the Capitalist Countries," by Dimitrov, Daily Worker, November 4, 1939. My emphasis - D.S.)

To revolutionary-minded Stalinist workers who read but who do not understand Stalinism, who do not know that the revolution which has been rotten ripe on the order of the day for so many years has been betrayed primarily by Stalinism, this is a call to proletarian revolution. And to an unenlightened worker who may happen to read Revolt and see also a call to proletarian revolution, the only difference will be that Dimitrov represents the October Revolution whereas Revolt appears to be a little "quibbler." But no matter how much such workers desire revolution, they will not learn from Dimitrov or Revolt why all the revolutions since 1923 have been defeated. And further, since Dimitrov has the first successful proletarian October Revolution as a pedestal, he is considered by millions of workers to be the true revolutionist and the follower of Lenin as Dimitrov himself states it:

"The present exceptionally serious situation demands of the Communists that they do not give way at all to repression and persecution, but come forward resolutely and courageously against the war, against the bourgeoisie of their own country, that they act in the way Lenin taught, in the way taught now by the great wise leader of the working people, Comrade Stalin." (Ibid., p. 3. My emphasis - D.S.)

This is the method of all the opportunists in misleading the workers. Stalin is palmed off as the "greatest disciple of Lenin," Trotsky is the "greatest living Marxist"; Caballero is the "Spanish Lenin." And so each opportunist concealing his own decep-

tion, cloaks himself with Leninist phrases, but all opportunists in common conceal the real Leninism of the present period, the line which Lenin was forced to drop through illness — the fight against the Stalinist conspiracy. This is the crux of the situation for the workingclass today, not abstract Leninist positions which any opportunist can repeat. The true Leninist line of the present day — the destruction of Stalinism through the exposure of the criminal conspiracy and of all its ramifications up to now — the opportunists bury in unison. From Stalinism down to Revolt, all the opportunists conceal this true Leninist line of today. Their postulation of a "fight against imperialist war" as their basis of "unity" is a camouflage of the fact that by preventing the exposure and destruction of the principle opportunist force of the present historical epoch, Stalinism, they make a real fight against imperialism impossible. Prior to the destruction of the whole Stalinist-led structure of opportunism no successful action against the bourgeoisie can be accomplished.

All the opportunists will be singing the same "Leninist" songs in a chorus, but the real Leninism of today, the exposure of the development of the bureaucracy distorting the Workers State, the conspiracy of Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, and Trotsky's collaboration with them, the exposure of the method through which Stalinism betrays the world revolution, will be a melody from which they will all refrain.

As to Revolt's call for the building of a revolutionary party, many of the opportunists reply that they themselves represent the revolutionary party, therefore why build another one. Especially Stalinism drums the illusion into the workers' mind that the Communist Party of Stalin is the party of the Bolsheviks, of Lenin and of the October Revolution.

Every class-conscious worker remembers and cherishes the October Revolution. His hope is to accomplish the October Revolution against his own bourgeoisie. To a large section of

the proletarian vanguard these "representatives" of Bolshevism are those who, it believes will show it the true way out of the war. Unless these vanguard workers come to understand that these people who pretend to him to be Leninists are in reality strangling the October Revolution, no revolutionary party can be built.

And more than that. The vanguard workers must learn that all the pseudo-Bolsheviks, like Revolt, who prevent the exposure of Stalinism by giving the workers a false picture of it and by trying as far as possible to divert their attention from it, are part and parcel of the Stalinist system, historically speaking. As long as the workers cling to the traps set up by the various Revolts, Stalinism will stand and will be able to perpetuate its treachery.

On paper, Trotsky, too could accept all of Revolt's proposals for unity. But Trotsky would nevertheless continue concealing his own role in the development of the Stalinist bureaucracy, his policy of collaborating with the Stalin gang in hopes of remaining a part of the party bureaucracy. Trotsky cannot tell of his collaboration with Stalin at the first Stalinist C.I. Congress, the Fourth Congress. Without committing political suicide, Trotsky cannot tell the workers the truth, that he with Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamehev and the rest of the Stalinist clique, conspired against, and deceived Lenin. However, on paper, Trotsky can accept all of Revolt's abstract Leninist positions for fighting war. As a matter of fact, that is Trotsky's stock-in-trade. He pretends that he is the Leninist, as opposed to Stalin and Stamm.

As to building a new revolutionary party, Trotsky already has a "Fourth International," fundamentally standing on the same basis as Revolt: the concealing of the real nature of the present epoch, the epoch of Stalinist-Trotskyist treachery.

Revolt writes as though nothing has occurred since 1922-1923, as though the first Workers State neg-

er existed had never been bureaucratically distorted. Yet this is the decisive question today. The beginning of the destruction of the capitalist society in 1917 and the first step in the development of the new society which has been strangled by Stalinism is the chief problem of the proletariat today. To those who see this as the prime question facing the workingclass, the task is to explain this, first to the proletarian vanguard which has been ensnared by the opportunists. Unless the workers know that Stalin, Trotsky and the entire leadership of the Russian Revolution betrayed Lenin and his cause in their sabotage of the struggle against the Stalinist degeneration of the Russian Communist Party, no revolutionary party can be built, and the opportunists who betray the workers cannot be exposed. Revolt which helps Stalin and Trotsky conceal this chief problem of the workingclass today, which fights tooth and nail to prevent the workers from even seeing the problem cannot create a genuine revolutionary party. Revolt will continue to play the game of appearing to be Leninism, of being in opposition to Stalinism, Trotskyism and other opportunists, while in reality concealing and protecting them.

Leninism today is not the abstract Leninist and Marxist positions to which every pseudo-Leninist can agree on paper and in words. Leninism today is the carrying through of the Leninist fight against the bureaucratic development of the first Workers State engineered by Stalin, Zinoviev, and Kamehev and joined in by Trotsky.

Any individual or group which shuns that fight is standing, not on Lenin's line, but on the side of those fighting Leninism.

HOW OPPORTUNISM DISTORTS HISTORY

History offers another opportunist unity move — the August Bloc. Characteristically enough, Lenin defined the proponents of the August Bloc as "liquidators" — actually their slogan of unity meant the liquidation of the Bolshevik Party and Bolshevik ideas. Lenin mercilessly attacked and denounced the August (1912) Bloc which in reality was a Bloc against Lenin. Trotsky, formally disregarding political positions and differences, but nevertheless adopting a distinct anti-Leninist position, attempted to unite into one party the Bolshevik and various Centrist, anti-Leninist organizations. The often vitriolic struggles of Trotsky and the August Bloc against Lenin are now an outstanding historical event in the development of the Bolshevik Party.

Under no circumstances would Lenin unite or negotiate with the August Bloc. But as the events first of the war and then ^{the} February Revolution moved many of the Centrists, including Trotsky, to the Left, they found themselves standing upon the political positions of the Bolsheviks. What actually occurred was that Trotsky and his group dropped their former Menshevism and joined Lenin and the Bolsheviks. From all indications there were no longer any major political differences between people like Trotsky and the Bolsheviks. But the outstanding agreement between them was in their attitude towards all the other political parties whom both the Bolsheviks and the Mezhrainstai (Trotsky's group) condemned as counter-revolutionary.

Revolt, attempting to use this unity of the Mezhrainstai and the Bolsheviks as an example in the history of the revolutionary party, completely distorts and conceals the determined struggle which Lenin carried on against the "conciliators" and the August Bloc. Revolt describes as a justification of its own call for unity the eventual joining of Lenin by Trotsky:

"This is not the first time that revolutionists have confronted the problem of unity. The Central Committee believes the experience of

the past can help us today. It considers the unity of the Bolsheviks WITH Trotsky's organization in 1917 a case in point." (Revolt, October 28, 1939. Our emphasis.)

To speak of "the unity of the Bolsheviks with Trotsky's organization" is a subtle distortion. The fact of the matter is that there was not a mutual uniting of the Bolsheviks with Trotsky's organization, but that Trotsky by his action, renounced his previous opposition to Bolshevism and joined Lenin. What resulted from this "unity" was not a new party, a different party from that which Lenin had previously; what resulted was an increase in membership and leadership of the Bolshevik Party, based on Lenin's line. Certainly this is not what Revolt proposes, since it is willing to reunite with Oehler from whom it only recently split and with whom it has the same differences it had when that split took place. Trotsky by his action, stated that he had been incorrect in the struggle against Lenin, admitted the correctness of Lenin's line as against the error of Trotsky's previous Left Menshevism. The inclusion of Trotsky into the ranks of the Bolsheviks presupposed the ending of his fight against Lenin and the Bolsheviks, his political agreement with them. Had Trotsky in any sense retained some of his old "August Bloc" attitude or his Left Centrist position on revolutionary defeatism, Lenin and the Bolsheviks would never have admitted him into the Party. He had to break completely with his past opportunist attitude towards the other opportunists within the Russian movement.

Stamm offers no such basis of unity. Stamm and the rest of the organizations to whom he offers unity can all retain their various opportunisms and this does not prevent Stamm from uniting with them. On the contrary, it forms the basis of such an unprincipled unity. Here ideas are not sifted and cleared, but muddled. One who holds that Russia is no longer a Workers State is asked to unite with one who believes it is; one who be-

believes that Trotsky ceased being a Marxist in 1934 is asked to unite with one who believes he gave up Marxism in 1927. Stamm is even ready to discuss unity with a group like the S. U. P. which is against proletarian dictatorship. This does not resemble in any measure the acceptance of Lenin's positions by Trotsky which Revolt offers as its case in point of unity.

Stamm cites what he calls the "unity of the Bolsheviks with Trotsky's organization" as a case in point, but Stamm completely obscures the real point involved. That point is the relentless struggle of Lenin against Trotsky's attempt to "unite" everyone into a large opportunist potpourri, and the abandonment by Trotsky of his false conciliationist position and his joining the Bolsheviks on the Bolshevik platform.

In order to cause the reader to slur over the comparison of the August

Bloc with Stamm's own call for unity, Revolt attempts to tone down a bitter struggle of 14 years between Trotsky and Lenin. Trotsky's entire Menshevist past and the struggle waged by Lenin are put down merely as a matter of Trotsky's attempting to "conciliate Bolshevism and Menshevism." Since Revolt has placed itself in the position of the August Bloc by attempting to "conciliate" various forms of opportunism and liquidate the struggle against the opportunists, it must conceal the real basis of the conflict between the "liquidators" and the Bolsheviks-- which was unity of the "liquidators" on an unprincipled basis for a struggle against Bolshevism.

Stamm's Central Committee most certainly "believes the experience of the past can help us today." However, it has helped itself to the past of the August Bloc and not to that of Leninism.

OPPORTUNISM PROTECTS OPPORTUNISM

Stamm's history within the labor movement may not be a very long one, but with every step it becomes a blacker one. Concealing his reactionary unity call with Leninist phrases, Revolt exposes its own opportunism when it mentions or discusses other opportunist organizations. It cannot be said that Stamm does not know what Social Democracy is. In his refusal to enter the Socialist Party with the Trotskyites, Stamm more than once gave Leninist analyses of Social Democracy. He agreed that since 1914 Social Democracy has been a prop and defender of the bourgeoisie. Opportunism in protecting itself and other opportunists would like the workers to forget what role has been played by Social Democracy -- during the World War, during the October Revolution and only yesterday's Betrayal in Spain. And many workers have forgotten. They have forgotten because Stalinism, in its ultra-Left and ultra-Right zigzags had utilized Social Democracy, sometimes by collaboration, sometimes as a scape-goat, always concealing the true

role of Social Democracy as an arm of the imperialists in the proletarian camp. Trotsky, together with Stalin has also distorted the real nature of Social Democracy: he supported the Stalinist coalition with Social Democracy in Germany in 1923; in 1933 he misled the workers into believing that a united front between the criminal Social Democracy and treacherous Stalinism could save the German proletariat; in France he proclaimed the need of a Stalinist-Social Democratic government, i.e., of a death-trap for the workers; the Trotskyites spread the lie in regard to Spain "With the Socialist Party ready to struggle (Sic!), the fight against fascism was enormously facilitated...."; and finally Trotsky deceived the workers into believing in the possibility of Social Democracy breaking with the bourgeois State. In 1935 the Trotskyites joined Social Democracy as a culmination of their treachery up to that point.

Stamm joins the distortions and treacheries of Stalinism and Trotsky-

ism by suddenly "forgetting" what Social Democracy is and what its role is. With one sweep he throws overboard everything Marxism-Leninism ever said about Social-Democracy and what he himself stated in relation to the Trotskyites entering Social Democracy. For some "mysterious" reason Social Democracy is no longer a known quantity to Revolt and Stamm. In the event of war they know that Lewis-Green, Stalinism will support the imperialist war—out Social Democracy? — they do not know.

"What stand the Socialist Party and the Trotskyite and similar organizations will take when the country goes to war we do not know. In their reaction to the present situation they do not project the perspective of revolution. They do not advance a revolutionary policy for fighting U.S. imperialist war plans." (Revolt, Sept. 16, 1939. My emphasis—DS)

This is only an additional indication of how politically rotten the Revolt group is. Leninism has established through its experience what position Social Democracy will take when its bourgeoisie faces crises of war. It adopts the same position it has in peace time — protector of bourgeois rule. This has become a principle for Leninists which Stamm knows well. True Leninists have no doubts about Social Democracy's position. It is only pseudo-Leninists, ignoramuses, or purest fakers who spread doubts about the position of Social Democracy in time of war — or peace.

THE REVOLUTIONARY BASIS FOR UNITY

Unprincipled unity on the basis of abstract Leninist positions which are intermingled with very concrete anti-Leninism is an instrument in the hands of the opportunists to obscure the real political problem facing the workingclass today, the problem of the degeneration of the first Workers State. Unless the workingclass draws the correct conclusion from the Stalinist distortion of the beginnings of a new society, it cannot march forward.

All the opportunists from Stamm

The other opportunist force mentioned by Revolt which it protects as well as Social Democracy, is Trotskyism. Revolt "does not know" either what position the Trotskyites will take. Yet according to Revolt itself, the Trotskyites hold pacifist positions.

"The Trotskyite Socialist Appeal calls for pacifist measures." (Ibid. My emphasis — D.S.)

Although Social Democracy and Trotskyism are certainly not to be dumped into one pot, one being the agent of imperialism, the other the protector and scapegoat of the Stalinist bureaucracy, if one can state that a group during peace time holds pacifist positions, what doubt is there as to its position in time of war. What are Revolt's Leninist phrases and words but a way of concealing its non-Leninism. Revolt, by pretending it is in the dark as to the part Trotskyism and Social Democracy will play in war conceals and distorts a fundamental Leninist position — "pacifists in peace chauvinists in war."

Such is the lip-service which Revolt pays to Leninism — and thus the opportunists protect one another. On the decisive question of one's attitude towards opportunism, Revolt shows its own opportunism in all its nakedness. It reveals itself as a protector of opportunism and counter-revolution.

to Stamm blind the workers as to the truth of how the first proletarian State became warped into its present Stalinist form. They all befog their followers' minds with "mass line" economic problems, reformist and petty-bourgeois slogans and programs. When any one of them touches on the vital political questions of the degeneration of the first successful proletarian revolution and the role of Stalin, Trotsky and the rest of the October leadership participating in this degeneration they do so to distort and

conceal their own and other's participation in the crimes of Stalinism.

It is no accident that Revolt's unity call, out of approximately seven columns, devotes about five-and-a-half to abstract analysis of capitalist economic decay, W.P.A. strikes, cost of living, Lewis-Green, and mentions not a word about the causes of the degeneration of the first state which the workers were successful in establishing. It makes no analysis of the reason for the defeats of other sections of the proletariat. The opportunists all utilize the class struggle on the economic front, the trade unions, strikes, unemployment movements, to divert the proletariat from the political struggle for its emancipation. To the opportunists this "mass line" becomes the method of concealing their opportunism. They paralyze the political discrimination of the advanced worker.

The opportunists mislead the workers into believing that on the economic field they are honestly attempting to better the economic conditions of the workers. A revolutionary party with its entire apparatus, turning to exposure of the agents of imperialism and opportunism within the workingclass, uses the economic field as a means of further exposing opportunism to the misled workers. But if the orientation is not towards exposure but toward "competition" with the opportunists, the worker will continue to follow his misleaders since they are still revolutionists in his eyes.

Revolt writes for backward workers. Its position as well as that of The Fighting Worker, the L. R. W. P., Marxist Workers League and others is to try to go out to the broad masses and in competition with Stalinism and Social Democracy, Trotskyism, Lovestonism teach the workers Marxism and Leninism . explain the capitalist society to them. Thus the five-and-a-half column "denunciation" by Revolt of the capitalist system in general. But the workingclass, when objective conditions bring it to its feet, in enormous numbers adopts the fundamental positions of Leninism almost over-

night -- not because of its backwardness as Revolt would have us believe-- but precisely because the workingclass is politically mature. It almost immediately puts on the order of the day the overthrow of their bourgeoisie, the proletarian revolution. In a revolutionary crisis millions of workers rapidly move to what in their mind represents Bolshevism. In 1917 they moved to true Bolshevism in the space of a few months. Since 1922, however, in moving to what they believe is Bolshevism, they have mistaken Stalinism as the Bolshevik force.

It is only due to the hold which opportunism has on the proletariat that defeat after defeat of proletarian revolution is possible. It is opportunism which when the workingclass begins to move to the Left misleads the proletariat and allows bourgeois rule again. to stabilize itself. Marxist and Leninist phrases are used just in order to lasso the Leninist attitudes which the workers develop. The need is exposure of the betraying nature of the lackeys of imperialism within the workingclass, and the lackeys of Stalinism, and all those who conceal or distort their counter-revolutionary character. The need is to expose their roots to the workers, to expose their use of Leninism and Marxism to conceal their crimes, not to try "outshout" them in the use of Marxist terminology and Leninist slogans.

The American bourgeois system has as yet not reached the stage where workers are driven by the millions to the position of revolution. Such a collapse did develop in several European countries and in China. The revolutionary party can be built only on the basis of knowing why millions of advanced workers in Europe and China were butchered, thrown into concentration camps, and one after the other handed over to the bourgeoisie. If the huge mass of American workers, as the German, French, Spanish, Chinese, continue to believe that Stalinism represents the October Revolution and therefore the American proletarian revolution, it too will meet defeat at the hand of the bourgeoisie. The

(continued on next page)

THE TROTSKYITES MAKE A "DISCOVERY"

By J. C. Hunter

THE Trotskyites have published a "discovery" they made recently. Now, at long last, they have learned, so they allege, the real reason for Stalin's betrayal of the Spanish toilers. It would seem that Stalin "abandoned" the fight against fascism in Spain "in the early spring of this year" because he was fishing for an alliance with Hitler:

"Was it a coincidence that, as Stalin was coming to terms with Hitler, Stalin's hirelings were abandoning the fight against fascism in Spain? We did not then know the facts about the secret agreement with Hitler, although we then predicted a pact between them." (Editorial, "Why Catalonia Fell," Socialist Appeal, Oct. 31, 1939, p. 4.)

The Trotskyites have taken up the tune that Spain was "abandoned" by Stalin because he was in the process of forming an alliance with Hitler.

But while Spain was in the actual process of being betrayed - not "abandoned," for "abandoned" implies that at one time Stalin really fought against fascism in Spain - the Trotskyites were saying that this sell-out was caused by Stalin's desire for an

alliance with the "democratic" imperialists of France and England:

"The fact is that Stalin, seeking an alliance with France and England, sought to demonstrate his usefulness and reliability to the 'democratic' capitalists by relieving them of the fear of social revolution in Spain." (Felix Morrow, Socialist Appeal, Feb. 4, 1939.)

At that time the Trotskyites were telling the workers that the then Rightist zigzag of the Stalinern in Spain was due to Stalin's "friendship" with France and England. Now, however, having launched the story that the present Leftist "Comintern" zigzag is due to Stalin's "friendship" with Hitler, the Trotskyite bureaucrats backtrack their tale and apply it to Stalin's betrayal in Spain. It goes without saying that they offer no repudiation or even qualification of their original line on Spain. Like the Stalinist bureaucrats, the Trotskyite leaders take a chance on their followers being afflicted with a short memory.

It must be noted that, regardless of which "explanation" of the Trotskyites we accept, the "alliance" with France and England or the "alliance"

Stamm's Unity Maneuvers
(Cont'd from p.17)

American workers must be aware of Stalinism as pretending to be the same force which overthrew the Russian bourgeoisie. They must be warned of the role Trotsky played in building the Stalinist bureaucratic distortion, otherwise, becoming disillusioned with Stalinism, they will turn to Trotsky

who is presented by Stalin and Trotsky and the bourgeoisie as Stalin's opposition. All the opportunists will be betraying the October Revolution and proletarian dictatorship, and all will be concealing their own and each other's particular participating in the betrayals of the proletariat.

with Germany Stalin carried out the same "Comintern" line in Spain, an ultra-Right maneuver. In other words, the "Comintern" line was actually independent of the foreign policy of Stalin and his gang. Regardless of whether he fished for an "alliance" with "democratic" France and England (Trotskyite "explanation" Number One) or whether he angled for a "friendship" with fascist Germany (Trotskyite "explanation" Number Two), the "Comintern" had the same line, a Rightist zigzag which involved tricking the masses into supporting bourgeois-democracy. What, then, becomes of the Trotskyite story of the dependence of the line of Stalin's "Comintern" on his foreign policy? Obviously, the whole business crashes to the ground. From whatever angle we view it, the new "explanation," reveals the fraudulent character of the Trotskyite story of the dependence of the "Comintern" line on Stalin's foreign policy.

What is behind all this Trotskyite twisting and turning? Why is it that the Trotskyites in one breath spread the yarn that Stalin sold out the Spanish workers because of his "friendship" with France and England and in the next breath say it was because of his "friendship" with Hitler?

The actual, fundamental fact is that Stalin betrayed the Spanish workers for neither "reason" alleged by the Trotskyite bureaucrats. Stalin helped the bourgeoisie crush the Spanish toilers in 1936-1939 for the same reason that he assisted the French capitalists in this same period, the German in 1933, the Chinese in 1925-1927, the British in 1926, the German in 1923. To put it more generally, Stalin aided the Spanish capitalists in 1936-1939 for the identical reason for which ever since 1922 he has worked with the international bourgeoisie to crush the toilers all over the world. Stalin's primary interest is self-protection, to preserve the power he bureaucratically usurped in the first Workers State. Stalin faces two threats: one, the international bourgeoisie, and the other, the international proletariat. For this usurped power Stalin fights along two lines: one,

by means of attempted "friendship" with the various imperialist camps, and the other, by consistently maneuvering to stamp out every effort by any section of the proletariat to liberate itself from capitalist - and Stalinist - bondage. The Stalinist betrayals in Germany in 1923 and 1933, in England in 1926, in China in 1927 and in France and Spain in 1936-1939 are landmarks in Stalin's fight to preserve his personal power and the counter-revolutionary bureaucracy on which it rests.

Trotskyism operates to prevent the workers from understanding and destroying Stalinism. Like Stalin, Trotsky's primary aim is self-protection. Due to Trotsky's complicity in the original Stalinist conspiracy, his effort to establish a partnership-in-crime with the Stalinist Troika, Trotsky has had since 1922 the desperate need to frustrate any move of the workers' part that might lead them to a genuine understanding of the whole story of Stalinism. Hence, Trotsky, adapting his system of deception to each specific situation, in recent years concocted the story of the dependence of the "Comintern" zigzag on Stalin's foreign policy. This makes it look as if Stalinism's treachery is somehow a relatively recent phenomenon. It distracts the workers' attention from the consistent line of Stalinist betrayals going back to 1922, and so worked to nip in the bud any tendency on the workers' part to uncover the real origin and history of the Stalinist conspiracy. Trotsky's participation in that conspiracy thus can remain forever concealed.

In connection with Trotsky's fable of the dependence of the Stalinist's zigzag on Stalin's foreign policy, there arise some interesting questions. Trotskyism on the one hand tells the workers that Stalin sold out the Spanish workers for the sake of his "friendship" with the French and British imperialists and, on the other hand for his "friendship" with Hitler. For the moment we may disregard this glaring contradiction and concentrate on the "explanation" that the Spanish toilers were betrayed by Stalin because of his desired "friendship"

with this or that gang of imperialists. The questions that arise are these: Why did Stalin betray and crush the Russian workers and why does he continue to do so to this day? Why did Stalin in 1922 in the Soviet Republic enter a path so counter-revolutionary that by the time of the XII Congress of the Russian Communist Party in March-April 1923 Lenin was already preparing to annihilate him?

"Lenin was now preparing not only to remove Stalin from his post of general secretary, but to disqualify him before the party as well. On the question of the monopoly of foreign trade, on the national question, on the question of the regime in the party, of the worker-peasant inspection, and of the commission of control, he was systematically preparing to deliver at the Twelfth congress a crushing blow at Stalin as personifying bureaucracy, the mutual shielding among officials, arbitrary rule and general rudeness." (Leon Trotsky, "My Life," pgs. 480-1.)

Did Stalin have some foreign policy in 1922-1923 for the sake of which he engaged in a veritable tornado of bureaucratic machinations aimed at enslaving the Soviet masses? Is there any connection between the Stalinist counter-revolution in Russia in 1922-1923 and its subsequent developments throughout the world up to the present day?

Yes, there is such a connection, and it is precisely this connection which Trotsky ~~is~~ assiduously endeavors to conceal.

Stalin crushed the Russian, Ukrainian, Georgian, German, Spanish, Chinese, French, English, American, Indian, Japanese, Italian - the entire international proletariat --- for one and only reason. Stalinism originated in a conspiracy on the part of a section of the leadership of the Russian Communist Party to entrench itself permanently in power. To carry out this criminal aim, these renegades had to undermine all efforts of the entire international proletariat to liberate itself from every sort of oppres-

sion and initiate a march toward the Socialist society. It was for this reason, and only for this reason, that by March 1923 Stalin had perpetrated bureaucratic machinations so criminal and flagrant that Lenin, observing them, prepared to wipe him out of political existence. Not some foreign policy, but a battle for personal, autocratic, permanent power motivated Stalin and his allies to enter the path of conscious counter-revolution in 1922, a path from which to this day they have never deviated by so much as a hair.

Throughout his writings, Trotsky reveals that he understood Stalin and his gang perfectly from the start of the Stalinist conspiracy and that Lenin's line against Stalin also was clear to him. Writing of the period of the XII Party Congress in 1923, Trotsky states:

"Lenin's intentions now were quite clear to me; by taking the example of Stalin's policy he wanted to expose to the party, and ruthlessly, the danger of the bureaucratic transformation of the dictatorship." (Leon Trotsky, "My Life," p. 484.)

Stalinism was no mystery to Trotsky from any angle; nor was Leninism, for that matter. Yet, in his effort to get in with the Stalin clique and share power with them, Trotsky opposed Lenin's line of destroying Stalinism and for many years gave it open and direct support. Opposition to the removal of Stalin from the post of general secretary, assistance to Stalin in concealing Lenin's Testament and other anti-Stalinist documents, palming off of the criminal Stalinist clique as honest revolutionaries, egging on of the workers to support Stalin's International flunkies, the Fosters, Cachens and Thaelmanns, crushing of any tendency in the directing of creating a new international --- this was the Trotskyist line in the epoch of the Stalinist conspiracy. Today, as ever, preventing the workers from understanding the real story of Stalinism, Trotsky dangles before them the fairy tale of the dependence of the Stalinist line on Stalin's foreign policy.

That the "Comintern" line, as always since 1922, is part and parcel of Stalin's need to crush the international proletariat if he is to preserve his usurped power, Trotsky consistently hides. If the workers accept Trotsky's story of the "C.I." line growing out of Stalin's foreign policy, they naturally will ask no questions about the earlier and more obvious support Trotsky gave to Stalin. Not knowing of Stalin's consciously counter-revolutionary role since 1922, Trotsky's support to Stalin will not be seen in its actual criminal light. The present day is already far removed from the origin of the Stalinist conspiracy in 1922. Trotsky's story of the dependence of the "Comintern" line on Stalin's foreign policy will never impel any worker to investigate the past of Stalinism and of Trotskyism. Hence, the real source of the "Comintern" line in Stalin's plot to usurp power

in the first Workers State will never become known to the Trotskyite - and Stalinist - workers. And consequently, Trotsky's participation in that plot will likewise remain hidden.

These are the reasons for the Trotskyite fabrications about the "Comintern" line originating in Stalin's foreign policy. For self-protection, Trotsky must conceal the total picture of Stalinism. Now and then, as in the case of the "discovery" about Spain, the Trotskyites get into a fantastic contradiction. This is unavoidable, for regardless of the specific content of the deception they feed the workers at any moment, it is always out of keeping with reality. Even the best prevaricators must necessarily become involved in self-contradiction, not because of bad memory, but because their fabrications are inherently incapable of consistency.

December 10, 1939.

SCHACHTMAN'S VOTE

(Cont'd from p. 10)

not even mentioned. Need we say, subsequent issues likewise "forgot" it.

What did the Trotskyites claim a vote for the S.W.P. would mean?

"Thousands of votes for the anti-war party in the elections will mean to the war-mongers that there are that many people who are supporting the most radical and determined opposition — a revolutionary opposition — to the war."
(Socialist Appeal, Nov. 7, 1939.)

If the Trotskyite leaders were honest, they would have made an objective analysis of the vote for Schachtman. Such an analysis would have shown that

61% of the voters for Schachtman actually stood with one foot in the Wall Street war camp. Instead of presenting this reality to their followers, the Trotskyite leaders spread the illusion that the vote for the S.W.P. was a solid anti-war vote, they concocted a fairy tale about "practically" "all" of Schachtman's second choice ballots going to Ninfo and they falsely promised to make an analysis of the whole business.

There is but this to add: by various devices the Trotskyites concealed the fact that even the vote going to the A.L.P. went to "labor" agents of Wall Street imperialism.

D. S.
November 1939.

MIENOV AND JOERGER RUB ALLADIN'S LAMP

By Arthur Burke

A RECENTLY issued leaflet marks the debut of a new organization, the "Workers Party." The leaflet bears some comment since it already indicates the nature and aims of the "new organization." Headed with an electrifying title, "STOP MASS MURDER!", it goes on to state:

"With the lifting of the embargo on the sale of arms to the warring powers, the Roosevelt government has become the main partner in the mass slaughter of millions of European workers. Billions of profits await the Du Ponts, Morgans, Rockefellers and all the other capitalists who benefit from the war of England and France against Germany." (My emphasis - A.B.)

After three months of the present "war for redivision of the world," Daladier listed the French losses "in Army, Navy and Air Force to November 30th were 1,434." This even forced Daladier to comment on the strange contrast this offered to the development of the World War in 1914 during the same period of time:

"The form of this war has surprised the country. Why lament it? By December, 1914, we had 450,000 men killed. We had lost the battle for the frontier and, although we won the Battle of the Marne, a large part of our country was under the heel of the invader.

"Our total killed up to Nov. 30 has been 1,434." (The New York Times, Dec. 23, 1939. My emphasis - A.B.)

As to the British casualties, the official figure of killed is 2,511, with the losses at the Western Front totalling THREE (3) soldiers dead! (New York Post, December 26, 1939.)

One must bear in mind that "Nearly seven million men, equipped with the most modern machinery of war, face each other in Western Europe." (The New York Times, Dec. 27, 1939.)

Our characterization of the "war" as a camouflage which masks the drive of all imperialism against the bureaucratized Worker's State has been fully confirmed by the events in Europe. However, Trotskyist confusionists and ultra-Left muddleheads discovering that reality belies their characterization of the mock-war as a bona-fide inter-imperialist conflict have to invent the facts out of whole cloth. Thus, the "mass slaughter of millions of European workers."

There are other whoppers on the leaflet, such as naming the Stalinists "Communazi," but none exceed the flights of fancy contained in the closing headlines: "Auspices - Workers Party." There is a basic historical difference between a group and a party. A group, consisting of a few dozen persons at the most, can be nothing else than a disseminator of political propaganda among the most advanced workers. Now, a party signifies a sizable organization which has numerical and material means to conduct real mass work in industry, in trade unions, fraternal and cultural organizations, etc., on a national scale, in its preparation for the conquest of power.

The self-designation "party" by this handful of Left-Trotskyites and ultra-Lefts is an expression of its "mass" line. It thus indicates a rejection of the ideologico-political struggle against the existent opportunist organizations which is the only realistic means possible to first clearing the road for the building of the nucleus for the future Marxist party.

(Cont'd on bottom of p.23)

The TROTSKY SCHOOL of FALSIFICATION

BLIND FAITH INSTEAD OF MARXIAN THINKING

THE Trotskyist leaders have always emphasized that critical revolutionary thinking is a basic characteristic of their organization in contrast to the slavish submission practiced in the Stalinist Comintern. In answering the anti-Bolshevist, Left-Social Democrat Pivert, Trotsky writes:

"In complete contradiction with reality, Pivert depicts the regime in the Fourth International as a regime of monolithism and blind submission." (New International, October 1939, p. 297. Our emphasis.)

Trotsky implies that the political process in his "Fourth International" as one of critical thinking and

MIENOV AND JOERGER RUB ALLADIN'S LAMP
(Cont'd from p. 22)

The Mienov-Joerger "Workers Party" is built on a distortion of reality. New distortions will constantly be added to cover the original one. Of course this is the old path to conscious and systematic fakery.

Incidentally, it is amusing to note that the headquarters of the new "Worker's Party" is - a Brooklyn Post Office Box!

intelligent support to the leaders. Incautiously, Trotsky's "joke" is exploded by the Trotskyite bureaucrats themselves in their internal discussions. Schachtman by a slip of the tongue recently revealed:

"At the plenum the majority presented for a vote the document of Comrade Trotsky which had arrived only a few hours earlier. There could not have been an opportunity for any comrade to reflect on this document. Some of them had not even a chance to read it. Moreover, it was physically impossible for anybody to have read it in full for the simple reason - that one page of the manuscript was accidentally lost in transit. Nevertheless, read or unread, studied or unstudied, complete or incomplete, the document was presented for a vote and finally adopted by the majority on the grounds, as one comrade expressed, OF FAITH IN THE CORRECTNESS OF COMRADE TROTSKY'S POSITION." (Internal Bulletin, Socialist Workers Party, Vol. No. 3, Nov. 14, Our emphasis and capitals.)

This gullible and uncritical faith in the infallibility of a "greatest living Bolshevik" is the essence of the tragedy of the Trotskyite as well as the Stalinist worker.

A. B.

December 29, 1939

SCHACHTMAN AS AN "HISTORIAN"

By R. Rogers

MAX SCHACHTMAN writes in the New International of January 1938:

"In 1923, when the German revolution was expected, the Soviet Republic stood at attention to aid it. The harbor of Petrograd was filled with grain ships ready to sail for Stettin so that the German Soviet Republic would not be starved out by the Entente. Representatives of the Comintern and the Russian Party were active on German soil, preparing for the uprising as best they could under the leadership of Brandler and Zinoviev." (Page 11, My emphasis - R.R.)

How much truth is there in the story that in 1923 the representatives of the Comintern and Russian Communist Party were doing their best to bring the impending German revolution to a successful conclusion? Writing fifteen years after the events, Schachtman paints a favorable picture of the sort of leadership the Comintern and Russian Communist Party gave the German workers. An investigation of earlier writings of Schachtman and the Trotskyites reveals that the situation was not quite as inspiring — to the workers — as Schachtman in 1938 would have his readers believe. Let us see what Schachtman really knows about the German revolution of 1923.

First, Schachtman, who without doubt read THE CASE OF LEON TROTSKY, which was published in 1937, before Schachtman made the statement in the New International, knows that Zinoviev, Kamenev with Stalin created the Triumvirate, which in 1922 became the directing body of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party and of the entire country:

"They became, Zinoviev, Kamenev — with Stalin they created the so-called "Troika," or Triumvirate, which was the directing body of the Central Committee of the Party and of the country during the period from the end of 1922 to 1925." (L. Trotsky, "The Case of Leon Trotsky," p. 77.)

Stalin, a bureaucratic conniver, represented to Lenin the bureaucratic undermining of the proletarian dictatorship, and Lenin planned to annihilate Stalin to preserve the proletarian dictatorship. Schachtman as editor of Trotsky's works is surely familiar with the fact.

Schachtman also knows that Stalin was transferring his treacherous methods to the Communist International, Schachtman is well acquainted with Stalin's letter to his henchmen Zinoviev, Bukharin, for he himself quotes it in his work "Ten Years of the Left Opposition."

"Should the Communists (at the given stage) strive to seize power without the social democrats, are they mature enough for that? that, in my opinion is the question. When we seized power, we had in Russia such reserves as (a) peace, (b) the land to the peasants, (c) the support of the great majority of the working class, (d) the sympathy of the peasantry. The German Communists at this moment have nothing of the sort. Of course, they have the Soviet nation as their neighbor which we did not have, but what can we offer them at the present moment? (my emphasis - R.R.) Of course the fascists are not asleep but it is to our interest that they attack

first; that will rally the entire working class around the Communists In my opinion the Germans must be curbed and not spurred on." (Emphasis in the Original. Quoted by Max Schachtman in "Ten Years of the Left Opposition," p. 20, and by Leon Trotsky, "The Third International After Lenin," p. 322.)

It must be pointed out here that Schachtman wrote his Ten Years in 1933, long before he wrote the article in the New International in January 1938.

Trotsky knew far back in 1923, in advance, that the leadership of the German Communist Party was a pack of putrid flunkys and that the German revolution was doomed to failure. And Schachtman certainly knew it when he wrote "Ten Years of the Left Opposition," for he quotes Trotsky in that work:

"Comrade Trotsky before leaving the session of the Central Committee (September 1923 Plenum), made a speech which profoundly disturbed all the members of the Central Committee and in which he alleged that the leadership of the German Communist Party was worthless and that the Central Committee of the German Communist Party was permeated with fatalism, sleepy-headedness, etc. Comrade Trotsky then declared that the German revolution was doomed to failure." (Max Schachtman, "Ten Years of the Left Opposition," p. 20. Also quoted by Trotsky in "The Third International After Lenin," p. 94. My emphasis - R.R.)

As to the "leadership of the Comintern," let Schachtman speak:

"The policy pursued by the party leaders in Germany was not peculiar to Brandler and Thalheimer. It was derived from the leadership of the Communist International and the Russian Communist Party. . . . (M. Schachtman, "Ten Years of the L.," p. 19.)

In so far as Schachtman's statement that "The harbor of Petrograd was filled with grain ships ready to sail

for Stettin so that the German Soviet Republic would not be starved out by the Entente" is concerned, the fact is that grain was sold by the Stalinist government to the German bourgeois government which was bankrupt politically and economically. This grain was part of the regular grain shipment from Russia to Germany which took place to a vast extent in 1923:

"Germany, as is known, is the largest purchaser of our rye. The commercial representatives of the U.S.S.R. in Berlin sold in 1923 over seventy million poods of grain, a considerable part of it having been bought at the instruction of the German Government." (Report of Torgpred of U.S.S.R. in Germany, Stomoniakov, Pravda, Jan. 3, 1924.)

Whether or not Schachtman is aware of this specific point we do not know, though as an "historian" he pretends to enlighten the workers. But there is no doubt that Trotsky, a student of the economic institutions of the Soviet Republic in 1923, is entirely aware of it. Nevertheless, Trotsky acquiescing in the Schachtmanite whitewashing of the Stalinist treachery of 1923, lets the distortions of his American flunkoy stand to becloud the mind of the workers.

To sum up: from the documentary evidence produced by Schachtman and Trotsky themselves we see that Schachtman in 1938 knew the following facts: that Zinoviev, Kamenev and Stalin were at the head of the bureaucratized party, the Soviet Union and the Comintern; that Lenin prepared for a struggle to remove and annihilate Stalin and his tendency and save the proletariat from the frightful degeneration of the first Workers State, and to advance the international revolution; that the Trio, Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev were transferring their treacherous methods from the Soviet Union to the international arena, in this instance to Germany, to prevent the extension of the revolution and to preserve for themselves the bureaucratic hegemony in the Soviet Union; that the German leadership was worthless, was dragging the revolution to destruction; and

that the disastrous policies pursued by the leaders in Germany were derived from the leadership of the Russian Communist Party which bureaucratically dominated the Communist International.

WHY SCHACHTMAN DISTORTS HISTORY

The question naturally arises Why does Schachtman distort the facts about the German Revolution of 1923? Schachtman knows much more than it would seem on the surface. He unquestionably knows of the infamous role played by Trotsky in the revolution of 1923. He knows that only a few weeks after making the speech within the four walls of the Stalinist Plenum of September 1923, where he attacked the German leadership, Trotsky, addressing a meeting of the metal workers of the Moscow District, and knowing that the German revolution was doomed to failure, painted an entirely different picture, supporting the Stalin gang and their stooges in Germany -

"The question is: this party is still young. Will she find in herself the will to effect a revolution, and will she be able to do so? In this respect circumstances favor the working class of Germany. They are ready for the struggle, and in order to act they must know that at their head stands a party READY TO LEAD THEM FROM STRUGGLE TO STRUGGLE AND TO FINAL VICTORY." (Izvestia, Oct. 21, 1923, also in the Worker, U.S.A., Dec. 1, 1923. My caps.- R.R.)

Schachtman has full knowledge of all these facts. Therein arises the Trotskyite's need to make it look as somehow the Stalinist leadership in 1923 made honest preparations for the victory of the German Revolution in 1923. By shielding Trotsky he also shields Stalin and conceals the truth about the Stalinist degeneration of the Soviet Union and the Communist International.

Trotskyism operates in a complex way. On the one hand, Trotsky and his henchmen raised a great racket against Stalinism which for the most part consisted of palming off the Stalin gang as honest though mistaken revolutionaries. This "attack" on Stalinism,

false to the core because it conceals the conscious counter-revolution of which Stalinism has always consisted, since its origin in 1921-1922, makes it seem that Trotsky is fighting Stalinism tooth and nail. In the course of this deceptive "attack", Trotskyism let slip many damaging facts about Stalinism. We have presented above a few in connection with the German Revolution of 1923. All of this serves Trotsky as a false front of "anti-Stalinism."

On the other hand, since Trotsky is part and parcel of the Stalinist degeneration by virtue of his direct participation in the original Stalinist conspiracy, Trotskyism acts to white-wash the early stages of Stalinism as much as possible. This accounts for Schachtman's fraudulent description of the 1923 affair in Germany which we have quoted from the New International of 1938. Naturally, this tactic has to be suited to the specific situation. With respect to the immediate present, it would manifestly be impossible for Trotskyism to give open and direct support to Stalinism. In regard to the present, Trotskyism has to assist Stalinism in an "indirect," "critical" fashion. But the past offers many opportunities for the Trotskyite bureaucrats to throw in a boast here and there for Stalinism. If the 1923 situation in Germany is being dealt with, naturally the Trotskyite leaders can with reasonable safety add another layer of white-wash on the Stalinist betrayal of the masses.

Such support to Stalinism's earlier phases is all the more profitable to Trotsky because the further one goes back to the origin of the Stalinist conspiracy in 1921-29 the more open and direct is Trotsky's participation in it found to be. In October 1923, for example, when the German events occurred, Trotsky was working directly in cahoots with the Stalin clique. If the Trotskyites can make it appear that not even Stalin and his gang were guilty of deliberate crime, why naturally Trotsky, their ally, is perfectly safe. It is for these reasons that Trotsky's flunkie, Schachtman, whitewashes the treachery of the Stalin gang in Germany in 1923.