

APRIL — MAY 1940

# THE BULLETIN

OF THE LENINIST LEAGUE, U. S. A.

FOR A NEW LENINIST INTERNATIONAL

## The Chamberlain-Hitler Plan

On Hitler's "Seizure" of Norway

The L. R. W. P. Enlightens the Trotskyites

The Trotsky School of Falsification

Trotsky "Teaches" Party Discipline



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



Labor Donated

---

---

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

	<u>Page</u>
The Chamberlain-Hitler Plan by George Marlen	1
On Hitler's "Seizure" of Norway	8
The L.R.W.P. Enlightens The Trotskyites J.C. Hunter	11
THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION "Trotsky 'Teaches' Party Discipline"	23
A REPLY TO OEHLMER	26

Address Communications to:

R. R. Lenc  
P.O. Box 67  
Station D.  
New York City

## THE CHAMBERLAIN-HITLER PLAN

By George Marlen

\*

It is the elementary duty of the Marxists to point out to the workers the road ahead. Although Marxism is the only science which furnishes the correct method of understanding past, present and future developments, those who apply this science are limited by their immediate surroundings and must constantly check their analysis against unfolding reality.

Since the October Revolution the policy of the leading imperialist nations, and therefore of capitalist society as a whole, has taken on a new aspect. Prior to the successful proletarian revolution in Russia and the series of attempts to overthrow the bourgeois order in Germany, Hungary, the Baltic States and Italy, the world bourgeoisie in its external policy pursued a line primarily of battling out imperialist rivalries. No serious thought of a possible danger of the destruction of the entire capitalist system was entertained by the leaders of the imperialist nations before and even during the war of 1914-1918. The mighty October Revolution, the defeat of the imperialist intervention and of the vast White armies of Kolchak, Denikin and other bourgeois generals opened the eyes of the statesmen of the bourgeoisie. From that period on, the danger of proletarian revolution has been hanging like a nightmare over the frightened minds of the capitalists.

Soberly viewing the class struggle in its threatening final outcome, the leaders of the imperialist countries arrived at the inescapable realization that unless the conquests of the October Revolution were completely eradicated, and the international proletarian vanguard destroyed, the capitalist system was doomed. The inter-imperialist rivalries have been of necessity temporarily subordinated to the most vital problem of self-preservation. Henceforth the main line of international imperialism could become nothing else except the ever-growing determination to preserve capitalism from complete collapse and from proletarian revolution. The international imperialists, on peril of social and political extinction, have been compelled to resort to extremely strenuous efforts to avoid major encounters among themselves, and to tax their wits against the danger of a universal capitalist debacle. The only form that this imperialist line could take was an intensified concerted drive against the proletariat in general, and against the remnants of the proletarian victory in Russia in particular.

Through devious channels the French, British and German bourgeoisie, with the approval of other parties in the victory over Kaiser Germany, liquidated the treaty of Versailles which was the barrier which divided

them into sharply antagonistic camps. The German proletarian revolution, a terrible threat to European and world capitalism, was betrayed by Stalinism and other forms of opportunism, and the German masses were crushed under the iron heel of Nazism.

But a death blow to the entire present generation of the Socialist-minded proletariat, could be dealt only by the complete eradication of the socialized property established by the proletarian revolution in Russia. The reestablishment of the bourgeois order in the land of the first successful proletarian revolution would crush the international proletariat for a considerable number of years. Relieved for the time being of the immediate danger from the proletariat, the imperialists once again would take up as their chief problem the re-division of the spoils of war.

Guided by the supreme task of saving the capitalist society as a whole, and in full understanding with the British, French, Italian and American imperialists, Hitler proceeded to cut a path towards the border of Russia. Checking our analysis we find that up to this point our evaluation of the present trend of history is correct.

But here came the question of the details of the imperialist strategy. We calculated that the Nazi army would strike directly into the Soviet Union. Only now do we see that the imperialists realized that such a step would have been a crude and risky adventure on their part. The Russian masses, though directed by the Stalinist opportunists, in the eyes of the international proletariat would be defending a Communist country from the assault of the Nazi monster.

Under such conditions, Russia would clearly be a "defender nation" innocently suffering the depredations of "the mad Nazi aggressor." Such an attack on the Soviet Union could not be justified even in the eyes of hundreds of thousands of the more backward workers who are not class-conscious, to say nothing of the

Communist-minded vanguard proletarians throughout the world. Not even the pacifist, "anti-aggressor," "anti-Nazi" petty-bourgeoisie would be favorable to such an attack. The direct assault of Hitler on a "non-aggressor" Soviet Union could never be used to whoop up a crusade spirit against Stalin's Soviet Union. Plainly when we conceived of Hitler plunging directly from Poland into Russia we underrated the caution and shrewdness the imperialists exercise in their plots against the masses. This was not precisely the path chosen by the imperialists.

Nevertheless the imperialist plan to wipe out the remnants of October and partition the Soviet Union exists. And it is up to the Marxists, despite stupendous difficulty in sifting the meager information, to unravel its details, and present the picture as they see it to the workers. Applying logic to facts, we shall proceed to examine the specific features visible in the recorded events to outline what is jealously concealed by the shrewd political guides of the imperialist world.

From the day capitalism was overthrown in Russia, the world imperialists have been planning restoration of bourgeois order in that vast land. The first plan, actually put in operation, aimed at occupying the immense territory at a few powerful military strokes. The Russian masses, guided by Lenin, frustrated the direct armed efforts of the imperialists. Since then the imperialists have not limited their activity to mere rhetoric fired against the idea of revolution. On the contrary, they have been devoting not a small part of their energies to the hatching of plots to overthrow the State which emerged out of the greatest revolution of all ages. Although mutilated by the Stalinist reaction, socialized economy still stands as the living proof that the overthrow of the capitalist order in Russia and a possibility of its overthrow elsewhere are a tangible reality.

One plot after another was taking shape in the councils of the imperial-

ists, and one after another was discarded as too crude, unsuitable, risky. All the plans projected were along the line of direct military intervention. Marshal Foch and other impetuous French generals urged the renewal of the combined imperialist crusade "Against Bolshevik Russia." A Little Entente was engineered with the express aim of being used as points of departure for an assault upon the Stalin-saddled proletarian State. A more recent plan was the Anti-Comintern Pact launched by Hitler and Mussolini. Obviously it encountered serious opposition from the British, French and American imperialists who most thoroughly exercise the wisdom born of vast experience in imperialist maneuvers.

Each plan was cast aside by its sponsors. Out of wider and deeper experience, a different plan, far superior to all the previous ones, evolved in the fertile minds of the practiced imperialist schemers.

The key to the understanding of the present plan was furnished by the Finnish-Stalin war, or rather, by the Finnish-Stalin peace. The cardinal fact, which has been well obscured with a heavy smoke-screen of plausible-looking explanations, is that first, Finland had been tricked by the imperialists into rejecting Stalin's demands, was given considerable material aid to resist Stalin's invasion, and then suddenly was abandoned, was actually handed over by the imperialists to Stalin. For only a political child will imagine that one of the tiniest capitalist countries in the world blindly and defiantly elected to fight a mighty power singlehanded. Bourgeois Finland received assurance from the imperialists that they would save it from Stalin.

Armed by its powerful backers, the Finnish army scored sensational successes. At the height of these successes, had the imperialists been in earnest, they could have easily shipped huge stocks of arms and munitions, and sent tens and hundreds of thousands of "volunteers" as Mussolini had done in Spain. Abruptly, the

phenomenal fight of the Finnish army was transformed into a startling defeat. Drawing back in dismay, the Finnish bourgeoisie bowed before Stalin. The reasons offered by Chamberlain, Daladier and other imperialists for failing Finland were varied, and one was "fishier" than the other. The most absurd Arabian Nights tale was that they had a hundred thousand troops detailed to assist Finland but that the Finnish government had failed to make a public request for aid.

Accompanying this yarn was the story that for military reasons Finland could not be defended. Actually, Finland offered an excellent place for a defensive stand against Stalin's Army as was proved by the initial victories of the Finnish troops. If really aided by decisive forces from the imperialists, Finland could have stood as a bulwark which Stalin could defeat only after a prolonged and immensely costly war. Furthermore, if the military and political leaders of the bourgeoisie really thought that Finland could not be defended, they would never have pledged assistance — which they had profusely furnished prior to, and in the early days of, the Finnish war — and certainly would not have contemplated dispatching an army of a hundred thousand to perish in Finland. Another leading "reason" given for failing to come decisively to Finland's rescue was that the Norwegian and Swedish governments reportedly refused to permit the transport of Franco-British troops on the pretext that Hitler would attack the Scandinavian States. Apart from the fact that a sea route was open to the Finnish port of Petsamo during the high tide of Finnish successes, the fact remains that the imperialists, when their interests demand, disregard and violate the "neutrality" of small powers. It is worth noting that in the 1914-1918 situation the British and French actually compelled the "neutral" Norwegian government to lay minefields to prevent the passage of German submarines. (See Winston Churchill's statement in the New York Times, April 12, 1940.) And in the present situation, the lie is given to the Franco-British pretenses of res-

pecting the "neutrality" of the Scandinavian countries by the following two facts: 1) the notorious Altmark incident in which the British clearly violated Norwegian territory; 2) the British assertion that they mined Norwegian waters and thus put themselves on record as violators of "neutrality." The French and British imperialists did not avail themselves of the Petsamo route, and did not resort to violation of Scandinavian neutrality because such violation did not enter their plans in connection with Finland. Plainly, the imperialists, for a hidden reason, sacrificed Finland. Some "strange" plan was being executed by the imperialists.

The Chamberlain-Hitler plan, a clue to which has been supplied by the Finnish affair, and which has been made possible because the first Workers' State is in the grip of opportunists, can be briefly outlined as follows.

Under the cover of a mock war in the West, Hitler would proceed towards establishing a common frontier with Stalin. The German imperialists, who had cold-shouldered Stalin when they launched their Anti-Comintern Pact which contemplated a direct assault upon "Communist Russia," according to the old plan, now discarded, were to reverse their policy. The Chamberlain-Hitler plan demanded that German imperialism was to offer Stalin a pact of non-aggression. Within this Nazi bouquet was placed a powerful piece of temptation which could never have been made to a revolutionist but which was irresistible to an opportunist. The temptation was, the partition of Poland! Hitler was offering Stalin a gift, almost half of Poland. There wasn't even a stipulation that Stalin's army must join in the attack on Poland. Hitler would do the job of smashing Poland himself and the only trouble that Stalin had to take was to walk in and pocket his share. Were Stalin to refuse such a rich gift, Hitler would march into Poland anyway, and would occupy the entire country. Then Stalin would have been sitting behind his old border, his opportunist mind tormented with regret. Moreover, since Stalin's

policy of defending himself against imperialism is not and cannot be based upon rousing the world proletariat for a revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie but rather on military schemes, he would have been at a needless disadvantage in refusing an enormous section of territory which would lengthen the distance between Moscow and the imperialist forces at the frontier. Stalin was compelled to and did accept the gift. In this, his action bore out the fact, frequently pointed out by Lenin, that opportunists, willy-nilly, historically carry out the policy laid down by imperialism.

The next point in the Chamberlain-Hitler plan was the Baltic States. Whether Stalin has grasped that the war in the West is a mock war or not, really does not matter. The fact clearly stands out that since Britain is officially at "war" with Germany the Baltic is closed to the British navy. Consequently, the Baltic could now become either a Nazi or a Stalinist lake. Without question Hitler held out to Stalin the alternative: either you occupy the Baltic States, or I will. Again, Stalin would have been yielding to Hitler a valuable military advantage had he refused.

It must be recalled that in the military treaty between the British and Polish governments it was expressly stated that Britain would guarantee the integrity of Poland's territory and Poland's independence. This Treaty did not specify any particular potential aggressor. The British government obligated itself to go to war with any power that would violate the borders of Poland. Curiously enough, Stalin's invasion of Poland evoked no declaration of war from Chamberlain and his ally. Quite the contrary, there were heard imperialist voices finding some justification in Stalin's move (Lloyd George).

No less "strange" was the attitude of utter lack of perturbation or indignation exhibited by the great "democracies" when Stalin's military forces occupied the three little "democratic" Baltic States.

The Chamberlain-Hitler Plan has

been unfolding in stages before the wondering eyes of the confused and politically disoriented proletariat. The "war" of England and France against Germany has been in progress for seven months, yet there was something astoundingly "phoney" about this war. No British, French, or German cities have been bombed. In the first weeks communiquees from the "Western Front" reported that the French were seeking "contact with the enemy." Then there developed a "deadlock" explained in a thousand different false keys by the capitalist press, radio commentators, and opportunists within the ranks of the workingclass. Meanwhile the two outstanding rapacious beasts, Hitler and Stalin, have been wolfing little peaceful, unoffensive, "democratic" nations one by one.

Needless to say, had we clearly grasped the basic formula of the Chamberlain-Hitler plan we could have predicted unhesitatingly that Finland would be thrown to Stalin as a necessary sacrifice on the part of the imperialists.

What, then is the central feature of the present imperialist plan to wipe out the State which rests upon socialized property established through the overthrow of Russian capitalism? And wherein does the Chamberlain-Hitler plan differ from all the previous, direct "anti-Communist" schemes abandoned by the bourgeoisie?

Under the cover of a mock war against Hitler, with pitched battles fought mainly in the newspaper headlines, the democratic imperialists are entrusting the small bourgeois States into the temporary custody of the German capitalists. Hitler in turn, offers his "friendship" to Stalin and as a token — we work together — hands over a considerable part of the seeming loot to the power-greedy Stalin. In the case of Finland the democratic imperialists directly sacrificed this little puppet State, making sure that Stalin covers himself with infamy typical of the Japanese imperialists, the Nazis and Italian Fascists in China,

Poland and Spain, respectively.

When both bloodthirsty robbers have gorged themselves full, then the next phase of the Chamberlain-Hitler Plan is to be introduced. Naturally we do not pretend to figure out the exact form the next phase will take, but most probably it will run along the following pattern: Hitler, himself an agent of the German industrial and financial magnates, placed in power to save German capitalism from revolution, retires into the background. A gang of "moderate" Nazis comes to the fore. The "new" German government agrees to make peace on British terms. The capitalist world, particularly in democratic imperialist countries is ablaze with jubilation reminiscent of November 11, 1918, the day German imperialism actually surrendered in the real imperialist struggle of 1914-1918. Chamberlain, Churchill, Reynaud, Daladier and other directors of the war "against Hitler and his friend Stalin" are the heroes of the great occasion. The deceived masses with exulting hearts learn of the terms of peace. The "defeated" Germany disgorges its temporarily-held bloody booty. The small countries — that is, those that were gobbled up by Germany — having gone through a fiery ordeal, are re-established in their "independence." The German-occupied Poland is reconstructed as a nation under the joint supervision of the "democratic" powers and Germany, possibly with the puppet Polish government, now kept in cold storage in Paris, as its nominal head. Czechoslovakia, likewise, is set "free." German Jews receive some "rights," and Catholics get full "equality" and "protection."

But the great "war of liberation" is not yet over. Triumphant "democracy," while joyfully trumpeting that "justice" and "liberty" have been largely reestablished, points out to the thoroughly confused masses that one more, the final, effort must be made to end enslavement by aggression and to make "freedom" and "peace" durable. The "glorious" work is only half-done. Stretching from the Baltic to the Pacific and from the Arctic Ocean to the reaches of Asia Minor

there lies a huge region comprising over a sixth of the surface of the globe. This vast territory is under the blood-stained boots of Hitler's "partner," Stalin. In that immense region there are enthralled many muted, small nations, some of which Stalin jointly with Hitler grabbed in the bloody game of aggression. Is it permissible, the imperialists will argue, to leave them to their tragic fate and confine the law of retribution to Germany alone? Stalin, too, must be forced to give up the plunder. There are Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, under the heel of Stalin. There is a huge portion of Poland. There is the Ukraine with forty million people. There is Georgia, Armenia. And last but not least, there are the Russian people themselves who have to be rescued from the "tyranny of Stalin's dictatorship." The great war of "liberation," the bourgeoisie will shout, can be terminated only when the Russian bear gives up his share of the spoils of wanton aggression. Then the real war of the present historical epoch, that of world imperialism against the Stalinized proletarian State begins in full fury.

The most tragic part of this infernal scheme of the bourgeoisie is that unless the vanguard of the workers becomes conscious of the situation, the entire world proletariat in relation to the question of saving the socialized property will be completely disoriented. The Chamberlain-Hitler plan differs from all the previous plans in that the Russian masses are placed in the position, as long as they suffer Stalinist leadership, of defending Stalin's loot. And the German, British, French and other workers, instead of being led in a risky crusade "against Communism," as was called for by all previous imperialist plans, are to be aroused to march to "liberate" the small nations from the bloody clutches of Stalin.

This is the central and unique feature of the present imperialist scheme. All the old plans to organize an attack on the Soviet Union had as their leading theme a crusade "against Communism." These plans in every

instance faced a stumbling block in the shape of the danger of proletarian resistance, especially amongst the most advanced sections of the workers. A crusade "against Communism" placed the class features of the imperialists' plans in the forefront, a factor which made these plans impracticable and risky. The new scheme of the imperialists completely obscures any class features. The leading theme is no longer a crusade "against Communism." It is, under the new imperialist plan a crusade to "liberate small nations" from "Stalin the partner of Hitler." The crux of this scheme is the demagogic appeal to "national liberation," to a fight "against aggression" and to smashing the "Hitler-Stalin axis." Thus the real purpose of this plan, the destruction of the basic fruits of the October Revolution, the socialized form of property, will be buried beneath a whirlwind of demagogy about "liberation," "anti-aggression," "anti-Hitler-Stalin dictatorship." The confusion of the masses, if this plan succeeds, will be complete.

One might ask, But what if Hitler double-crosses Chamberlain and attempts to fasten securely his grip upon the small countries he has been allowed to grab? Our answer is: no doubt some of the imperialists have been fidgety about such an eventuality. Hore-Belisha, for example, manifestly insisted that an attack upon the Soviet Union be started at once. But Chamberlain, indeed a wizard among the bourgeois statesmen, understands the situation. With him it is not a question of trusting Hitler, but of realizing, as does Hitler, that if the plan is disrupted by either of the contracting parties, the only alternative is a real inter-imperialist war. Then the monstrous weight of the mighty war-engines, now standing idle on the "Western Front" will be thrown by the imperialists against one another. And as a result, the capitalist system in Europe will face the prospect of being buried under smoking ruins, with Stalin calmly contemplating the spectacle, keeping an eye peeled to behead a possible proletarian revolution by marching his army into the heart of Europe. No, the



present policy of international imperialism is Save Capitalism First. Consequently, for Hitler to double-cross Chamberlain is to commit a suicidal act for capitalism. And if Hitler was not a hundred per cent clear as to what Germany might face if it tried to play unfair, Sumner Welles must have frankly indicated the action the American bourgeoisie would take in the eventuality of a double-cross. No doubt, also, in his talk with the Nazi leaders, a talk which is shrouded in strict secrecy, Welles gave them a vivid picture of the colossal strength of the American war machine. The German bourgeoisie has no other choice except to play fair with Chamberlain, Roosevelt and other far-sighted leaders of the "democracies." In return German imperialism gets the enormous concessions and advantages, no doubt stipulated in the secret agreement concluded at Munich. After the joint imperialist army occupies Moscow, the Ukraine, the Baku oil fields, among the richest on earth, Donetsk coal fields, Ural and Siberian gold and platinum regions, then the real division of the greatest imperialist booty on record commences, with Germany getting her share. Thus Hitler's program in Mein Kampf is carried out, but in a somewhat roundabout way — if the stranglehold of opportunism on the throat of the proletariat remains unbroken.

Another, quite logical question might be asked: Suppose Stalin seeing through the entire scheme, refuses to do any more grabbing? Our answer is the same as we have given above: the iron law of history conclusively establishes that an opportunist in the final analysis inevitably carries out the policy of imperialism. Lenin mentioned this very frequently. Only a Bolshevik can oppose the policy of the imperialists. Stalin since 1921 has been a renegade from Bolshevism. In his "anti-imperialist" outlook he consciously sabotages the proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie and depends upon his huge army and the military outposts at the frontier. In his acceptance of a large portion of Poland, in his occupation of Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, his establishment

of virtual command over Finland, Stalin was guided primarily by military considerations. Even if Stalin realizes that the imperialists do not turn over their property to him without some ulterior motive in their minds, he is compelled, as an opportunist, to accept it. Else the military and material advantages, the only things which count heavily with Stalin, go not to him but to his extremely unreliable "friend" Hitler.

Stalin, a great schemer himself, might attempt devious maneuvers in order to extricate himself from the perilous situation. His old policy of dividing the imperialists, of orienting upon the British and the German bourgeois "friendship" is no longer applicable. He might take the road of lesser evil and engineer a war with one or another imperialist power to make the war revolve around the "Capitalism vs. Communism" pivot. He might strike at India in his war of "liberation." There are many and devious ways that Stalin may hit upon to attempt to disrupt the Chamberlain-Hitler plot. But not one of them will avail him. At any point the imperialists will be able to terminate their "war," have the Nazis disgorge the little countries, and immediately turn upon Stalin.

Can the Chamberlain-Hitler enterprise succeed? Absolutely and brilliantly — unless the proletariat acts. The only force capable of stopping the imperialists is the proletariat led by a Leninist leadership. Revolutionary upheavals might occur, such as in Spain, and might threaten the bourgeoisie. But with the decisive section of the workers under fairly solid control of the Stalinist political system which includes various branches and off-shoots, primarily Trotskyism and Left Trotskyism, every revolutionary rising is doomed to failure. Without a Bolshevik leadership, the fate of every revolutionary situation since the rise of Stalinism will be inevitably repeated. Germany (1923), China (1925-1927), England (1926) Austria (1934), again Germany (1930-1933), Spain (1931-1939) are only the most outstanding, most tragic reminders. In

every one of the revolutionary situations Stalinism was the decisive counter-revolutionary force within the workers' ranks, and Trotsky the chief saviour, shield and target of Stalinism.

The greatest fraud of the imperialists today is the mock war in the West. In 1914 the pseudo-Marxists of all stripes glorified the imperialist war as a war for "democracy and freedom." Today the pseudo-Bolsheviks, concealing the true nature of the imperialist policy, label this mock war a "Second imperialist war." Such is the "evaluation" offered to the workers by the Daily Worker, Socialist Appeal, Workers Age, The Fighting Worker, Revolt, Workers Anti-War Bulletin, Truth, Marxist Review, The New International and all other "Leninist" publications.

The opportunists carefully avoid even posing such a thing as a conscious plan of the world imperialists against the international proletariat. Opportunism allows the workers to live in the illusion that the bourgeois world somehow just muddles along and finally arrives at various goals. Marxists must impress upon the workers the fact that in the class struggle the factor of conscious designs plays an enormous part. The most advanced sections of each class must have a clear-cut conscious plan against the enemy class. The imperialists must operate on a well-designed scheme against the masses; the Marxists in turn must provide the workers with a conscious, revolutionary policy. It is the duty of Marxists to discover and make known

the plan of the imperialists for the destruction of the Soviet Union, for the entrenchment of world capitalism on the basis of this destruction and for crushing the workers decisively for the present period. Genuine Marxists will not be hesitant for fear of making errors in their deductions. Errors can be corrected and truth finally arrived at, but avoidance of the duty of discerning reality can never lead to a Marxist understanding.

Aided by opportunism the imperialists are putting the Chamberlain-Hitler plan into operation. Not at odds, as the opportunists paint the imperialists to be, but working in harmony, the International finance magnates are preparing to transform with the hands of the misled workers the hope for Socialism into a nightmare of intense oppression and exploitation. For the toiling masses there is only one promising avenue of escape from such horrible fate. That avenue is the re-establishment of Marxism within the proletariat. It can be achieved only through the exposure of the counter-revolutionary forces within the proletariat, the winning of the politically advanced section of the workers from the clutches of the "Comintern" and its "conditional" and unconditional supporters, Trotsky, Shachtman, Oehler, Stamm and the rest to a genuinely Marxist understanding of the situation. Only marching along this avenue can the revolutionists gather the elements for the new Bolshevik Party to lead the masses in a struggle against imperialism.

April 13, 1940

#### ON HITLER'S "SEIZURE" OF NORWAY

THE work on the article "The Chamberlain-Hitler Plan" was begun sometime prior to Hitler's invasion of Norway and was concluded on April 13, a few days after the Nazis had begun occupying the Norwegian territory.

When the Nazis opened the new

chapter of aggression, the bourgeois press and the imperialist statesmen to further confuse and blind the masses gave the impression that Hitler had committed a fatal blunder, and hinted at a catastrophe in store for the German forces in Scandinavia.

"It was a widely held view that

the Allies at last had forced Herr Hitler into a desperate gamble and that the time had come for them to strike the telling blow they had been waiting to deliver." (New York Times, April 10, 1940, p. 1.)

"I consider that Hitler's action in invading Norway and Scandinavia is as great a strategic and political error as that committed by Napoleon when he invaded Spain." (Winston Churchill, New York Times, April 12, 1940.)

On the very day that Churchill spoke, when we were still shaping our article on the Chamberlain-Hitler plan, there came down a deluge of dispatches apparently disproving our theory. Instead of Chamberlain handing Norway over to Hitler, as would be the logical conclusion from our thesis, what we had been calling the mock war in the West seemed of a sudden to have become galvanized into an actual war, for the British apparently were rapidly driving the Nazis out of Norway. The headlines shrieked: "Nazis Driven From Bergen, Trondheim; Allies Battle Enemy Ships in Skagerrak, Force Way to Oslo, Order Germans Out." (New York Times, April 11, 1940.) Churchill's further remarks were boldly reassuring. Hitler's invasion of Norway, asserted the shrewd and able spokesman of the British bourgeoisie, was rather of advantage to the "Allies." Churchill boasted:

"I must now declare to the House that we are greatly advantaged by what occurred providing we act with ~~increasing~~ and increasing vigor to turn to the utmost profit the strategic blunder into which our mortal enemy has been provoked." (Ibid.)

Heading the most powerful navy in the world, Churchill flung out the terrible-sounding threat:-- "All German ships in the Skagerrak and Kattegat will be sunk....."

No sooner said than done - in the newspaper headlines! Flashing across the front pages of the capitalist newspapers were stirring words "informing" the readers of life-and-death naval

and air battles raging in the Skagerrak, Kattegat, in the Oslo fjord, and along Norway's Atlantic coast. On the 15th of April the New York Times correspondent, Harold Callendar, announced the occupation of Narvik by the British -- a story which turned out to be a pure myth. German communications with forces in Norway were reported cut: "British Cut Nazi Sea Lines with Mines!" "Blockade tighter - Largest mine field ever laid designed to bar supplies to Norway" (New York Times, April 12, 1940).

To those who were not fully convinced of our position on the mock war in the West, it must have seemed that this position was blown to atoms once and for all by the reports on Norway.

The stark reality was different, however. The smoke of the "raging inferno" in the waters around Norway was lifted somewhat after a few days by the bourgeois press to prepare the minds of the masses for the final act. It turned out that despite Churchill's glib assurance that all German ships in the Skagerrak would be sunk, despite the colorful tales about the "largest mine field ever laid," German ships carrying troops were regularly arriving in Norway:

"A steady stream of German troops is arriving in Oslo by air, plane and ship, Captain James Murray, British vice consul at Drammen, southwest of the Norwegian capital, said today." (New York Times, April 27, 1940.)

Reports began forthcoming to the effect that the Nazis were landing heavy artillery, armored cars, and tanks, obviously brought over not by air but by the very sea controlled by the British and French navies and patrolled by the Royal Air Force.

Concerning the alleged titanic naval battle in the Skagerrak and the Kattegat, the bourgeois correspondents from nearby wireless "strange" and extremely significant remarks, such as, "If indeed there was one here."

"When the facts are known, it is safe to guess that they will show that this battle, if indeed there

was one here, was of far less magnitude than has been believed in the days since the German assault on Scandinavia.

"That is the opinion formed by neutral correspondents, among them five Americans, who today questioned Danish fishermen at Gilleleje at the southernmost point of the Kattegat, within earshot of the firing of the heavy naval guns." ("DANISH FISHERMEN DENY HEARING GUNS," New York Times, April 13, 1940.)

Pretty soon it began to leak out that the alleged "smashing victories" of the "Allies" in Norway were what was euphemistically termed exaggerations.

"Even though earlier reports from Scandinavian sources of smashing Allied victories on land now are seen to have been exaggerations, there appears to be no lack of confidence in high quarters of an eventual victory that will cripple Germany - but responsible military officers know, as they have from the first, that it will be a long, hard and dangerous campaign, in which they must expect to suffer defeats and disappointments." (New York Times, April 27, 1940.)

Furthermore, additional leakage of facts showed that the stories about "Allied victories" which were called "exaggerations" were actually out-and-out fabrications. Not only were there no victories, but there was not even a serious attempt by the Franco-British imperialists to achieve such victories. On April 25, 1940 Leland Stowe radioed his eyewitness report on the "queer" manner in which the British were "driving" the Nazis "out" of Norway.

"Here is the first and only eyewitness report and the opening chapter of the British expeditionary troops' advance in Norway north of Trondheim. It is a bitterly disillusioning and almost unbelievable story. The British force which was supposed to sweep down from Namsos consisted of one battalion of Territorials and one battalion of the King's Own Royal Light Infantry. These totaled fewer than 1,500 men.

They were dumped into Norway's deep snows and quagmires of April slush without a single anti-aircraft gun; without one squadron of supporting airplanes, without a single piece of field artillery. Ill-equipped, they were thrown into the snows and mud of 63 degrees north latitude to fight crack German regulars - most of them veterans of the Polish invasion - and to face the most destructive of modern weapons. The great majority of these young Britishers averaged only one year of military service." (New York Post, April 25, 1940.)

The "bitterly disillusioning and almost unbelievable story" was a shocking surprise only to those workers who were duped by the bourgeoisie and by the opportunists within the proletariat.

Stowe's reports created a great sensation. The British statesmen did not deny the veracity of Stowe's reports, but proceeded to cover them up as best they could. The fake "Opposition" in Parliament, jumping into the breach, put on its usual airs of taking Chamberlain to task. In the midst of this "Oppositional" noise, however, Stowe's reports were verified. The sly old fox, Lloyd George, stated concerning the British troops in Norway that "They were rushed headlong to the battle front without artillery, armored cars or tanks, and with practically no effective protection from aerial attacks." (New York Times, April 29, 1940.)

It must be borne in mind that the British bourgeoisie has two million men under arms, the French nearly double that number. Of these, virtually a handful was sent to Norway, apparently "without sufficient artillery and without adequate fighter planes, anti-aircraft guns or reinforcements."

The grim fraud was being adroitly put over, screened by a cloud of hair-raising show "battles," a burst of "explanations," consolations, bland promises, and severest "criticism."

Amidst the immense dislocation in the state structure of Europe, the

THE L.R.W.P. ENLIGHTENS  
THE TROTSKYITES

By J. C. Hunter

\*

THE DILEMMA OF THE "MASS LINERS"

I N its "Special Bulletin on the S.W.P. Convention" (April 1940), the League for a Revolutionary Workers Party holds its "mass line" in leash for a moment and addresses some remarks to what it terms the "sectarian Trotskyites" who gathered recently in New York.

The L.R.W.P. in this document chides the Trotskyites in these terms:

"A discussion of the character of the Russian state should have been the main point on the agenda of the convention — primarily around this point should the minority have organized itself! This is the question which divides the whole working class movement today." (Special Bulletin on the S.W.P. Convention, p. 3. Our emphasis.)

In the view of the L.R.W.P. we observe, the question of the character of the Russian State is "the question which divides the whole working class movement today." It would seem, therefore, that the L.R.W.P. holds this to be the central question before the whole working class movement.

Let the L.R.W.P. or any other organization, however, try to approach the whole working class movement with the question of the character of the Russian State as its spearpoint. It will soon find out that the working class movement as a whole will promptly

ly turn its back on it with the remark: We don't care a hoot about the character of the Russian State! The L.R.W.P. will discover to its astonishment that only a very tiny section of the whole working class movement is concerned with this question. That section is the vanguard of the workers, the revolutionary-minded workers. And even amongst the vanguard workers, the proletarian class character of the Russian State is in question only with a small minority, chiefly the subjectively Bolshevik, anti-Stalinist workers who are moving, like the L.R.W.P., in an ultra-Left direction.

The orientation of the L.R.W.P., however, is not at all toward these vanguard, subjectively Bolshevik workers who concern themselves with the Russian question. Recently, the L.R.W.P. formulated its orientation in very blunt terms. It conceives the problem of building a revolutionary party to be along these lines:

"The main task of the workers is to organize their own political party. Once and for all we must break completely from the racketeering Democratic and Republican parties." (Workers Anti-War Bulletin, April 1940, p. 17. Our emphasis.)

The L.R.W.P. in approaching the task of building a revolutionary party is oriented toward the workers who have not yet broken from the bourgeois parties, i.e., the tens of millions of

raw, backward workers. Otherwise, it would have said:- The workers must organize their own political party; they must break with the opportunist parties, the Stalinist, Trotskyist, Social-democratic outfits. This would have shown an orientation to the vanguard workers. The backward workers toward whom the L.R.W.P. is directly oriented are not even class-conscious, and for the most part not even trade union conscious. Any group that proposes to approach the problem of building a revolutionary party on such a "mass line" basis must orient toward elementary economic struggles of all sorts, the day-to-day concerns of the vast majority of the toilers. Such an organization cannot possibly have the Russian question as its central problem. In fact, this problem must fall entirely out of the view of such a "mass line" group.

The L.R.W.P. is plainly in a serious contradiction when on its "mass line" it superimposes the Russian question as a central point. The two approaches are utterly incompatible and, when jumbled together in the manner of the L.R.W.P., reveal a failure to digest the implications of both the "mass line" and the Russian question.

The contradiction in which the L.R.W.P. finds itself is characteristic of all the "mass liners." No matter how deeply they may bury their head in their "mass line," they must butt up against the Russian question. In this respect, the L.R.W.P. only reflects the experience of the working class in general ever since the October Revolution. The first successful proletarian revolution posed before the workers the inescapable task of concerning themselves with its fate. This historical task has been mirrored in the course of the development of the proletariat since October 1917. That course, generally, has been this:- Upon acquiring a revolutionary outlook, the workers have inevitably taken one or another definite attitude toward the Soviet Republic. The overwhelming majority of the most advanced revolutionary workers since 1917 have taken a defensist position with respect

to the first Workers' State.

The developments of capitalism itself drives millions of workers into a more or less anti-capitalist position subjectively. But no sooner do the workers break subjectively with capitalism than they are confronted with the Russian question. The "mass liners" ostensibly want the workers to sever their allegiance to capitalism. Due to the fact that history, playing a nasty trick on the "mass liners," forces the Russian question into first place in the mind of precisely the anti-capitalist workers, the "mass liners," despite their big noise about participation in "mass struggle" collide first and foremost with the Russian question. Try as they may, the "mass liners" cannot escape this dilemma.

If such organizations as the L.R.W.P., the Workers Party of Mienov-Joerger and the Revolutionary Labor Group, who have adopted the position that Russia is no longer any form of a Workers State, will candidly take account of themselves, they will have to come to this conclusion:- In spite of all their talk about "mass work," their chief stock-in-trade, indeed, the very reason for their existence is nothing else than their position on the Russian question. Obviously, with their specific positions on the Russian question as their trump card they cannot pursue a "mass line"! Two paths are open to such organizations:- either to dabble with the Russian question in one way or another and thus to fly in the face of their "mass line"; or to carry their "mass line" to its bitter end and, evading the situation created by the October Revolution in the proletarian vanguard, to address themselves to the backward sections of the working class on a purely "economist" program.

Prior to the rise of Stalinism, the problem which the workers faced in adopting a position toward the Soviet Republic was a relatively simple one. The rise of Stalinism on the political scene is what threw this entire problem into monstrous confusion and in the eyes of some advanced workers even

cast doubt on the proletarian character of the Russian economy and State. Since the rise of Stalinism, the most revolutionary workers, becoming defensist toward the proletarian economy, have been pro-Stalinist, falsely identifying the proletarian economy with Stalinism. On the other hand, some sections of the revolutionary workers, becoming subjectively anti-Stalinist, have also become hostile toward the proletarian economy. Falsely identifying the economy with Stalinism, they have denied its proletarian form, thus collapsing into ultra-Leftism. It is a profoundly significant fact that both the Stalinist and the ultra-Leftist worker identify the proletarian economy with Stalinism, each in his own way. The Stalinist and the ultra-Leftist worker are simply opposite sides of the same counterfeit coin. Pro-Stalinism and ultra-Leftism are opposite poles of the same system, Stalinist pseudo-Bolshevism.

As long as Russia has not been returned to bourgeois private capitalism and as long as Stalinism has not been destroyed by the revolutionary proletariat, there will be the "Russian question," which is really today the question of Stalinism, and, peculiarly enough, it will be the most advanced workers to whom this question will be of most concern. Much as the "mass liners" may upbraid the Leninist League for having an "anti-Stalinist orientation," they themselves are being tossed about by the Stalinist tidal wave just like the rest of the working class. The difference between the "anti-Stalinist" Leninist League and the "mass liners" is this:- the Leninist League, fully understanding the nature and historical significance of the Stalinist degeneration of the first successful proletarian revolution, faces squarely the central problem of the proletarian vanguard and orients its work on the basis that until the issue of Stalinism has been overcome by the workers there can be no revolutionary successes. The "mass liners" pretend that the problem of Stalinism can be outflanked and the proletarian revolution advanced behind the back of the central issue facing the working class.

While these considerations are the first to come to mind upon observing the incongruous spectacle of the "mass line" L.R.W.P. issuing a special document to the Trotskyites, they by no means cover the central features of the L.R.W.P.'s remarks on the Trotskyite Convention. These points have been raised only to indicate the confusion of the L.R.W.P. on the basic problem of the orientation toward the task of creating a new revolutionary party. Let us proceed, therefore, directly to the contents of the L.R.W.P.'s statement to the Trotskyite Convention.

### ULTRA-LEFTISM VERSUS MARXISM

Marxism considers bourgeois-private ownership of the means of production to be the social basis of capitalism, the sine qua non of its existence. It is an irrefutable fact that the social basis of Stalin's Soviet Union is not bourgeois-private property. Yet the ultra-Lefts in one way or another endeavor to prove that Russia is some sort of non-proletarian State. The ultra-Lefts either hold outright that Russia is a capitalist State (Mienov-Joerger) or, like the L.R.W.P., they avoid the question of defining in positive terms the class character of the Russian State. Regardless of what specific argument the ultra-Lefts use, they unanimously break with the Marxian principle that the economic structure of society, i.e., the class form of ownership of the means of production, is the social basis of the political superstructure, the State. Marxism maintains that it is the class features of the economy which determine the class nature of the State. The ultra-Lefts, turning Marxism inside out, hold that certain features of the State determine the class nature of the economy. With respect to the Stalinized Soviet Union, the ultra-Lefts proclaim that the State-ownership of the means of production established by the proletarian revolution is not what determines the class character of the State. On the contrary, say the ultra-Lefts, certain features of the State determine the class nature not only of the State itself but of the economy as well.



Ultra-Leftism holds that, since the Stalinized State is inimical to the interests of the workers, this State cannot be proletarian in class form. Moreover, add the ultra-Lefts, the economy, though the fruits of a proletarian revolution, has been so affected by the Stalinized State that, without the form of ownership as established by the proletarian revolution changing, it has lost its proletarian character. In the system of Mienov-Joerger, this is put most clearly, while in that of the L.R.W.P. the essence of this position is present, but much more vaguely.

What are the features of the Stalinized State, as opposed to those of the original State created by the October Revolution, which cause the L.R.W.P. to decide that Russia is no longer any form of a Workers' State? They are these:

"Trade unions, factory committees, soviets, workers organizations, party democracy, none of these remain. Yet these were the necessary social conditions of the Revolution of 1917, and not merely the transformation of private property into State property." (Special Bulletin on the S.W.P. Convention, pp. 5-6.)

This statement is in a way a summation of most of the ultra-Leftist confusion on the question of what constitutes the basis of a proletarian State. It is worth examining.

When it asserts that trade unions, factory committees, party democracy, soviets and so forth were the necessary social conditions of the proletarian revolution, the L.R.W.P. means that these institutions are the criteria of the existence of a Workers' State and workers economy. We see this more clearly in an earlier document in which the L.R.W.P. "explains" how the Stalinist bureaucrats "destroyed" the Workers' State and became a "ruling class."

"They abolished the right of the workers to strike or form unions of their own choosing, eliminated workers' democracy completely, prohibited the workers from forming a revolutionary party, etc. Thus the form-

er bureaucracy became a ruling class." (Workers Anti-War Bulletin, Dec. 1939, p. 20.)

It is from the angle of these institutions allegedly being the criteria of the existence of a workers economy and State that the position of the L.R.W.P. must be examined.

The first thing that occurs to one upon studying the thesis of the L.R.W.P. is that all the institutions it names as being the essence of the existence of a Workers' State can or do exist under capitalism. Trade unions, factory committees, a revolutionary party with democratic structure, the ability and even the "right" to strike, and workers organizations of all types are products of the class struggle which have their origin under capitalism. They come into existence long before there is such a thing as a Workers' State. And even soviets can exist under capitalism, as for example in Russia in 1905 and from February to October 1917. If these institutions alone be criteria of the existence of a Workers' State, then many capitalist states, and particularly Russia in the above-named periods, would have to be defined as proletarian in class character to a significant extent.

It is obvious that when the ultra-Leftist advances as the essence of a Workers' State features which exist in a capitalist state, which in fact have their origin under capitalism, he has failed to hit upon the real essence of a Workers' State. The foundation of the Workers' State is that element which does not and cannot exist under capitalism. It is that element which distinguishes the proletarian society from all other societies in history. That element is the State-ownership of the means of production brought into existence through the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the destruction of bourgeois-private property. In order for such a form of economy to make a second appearance on the historical scene, another section of the bourgeoisie will have to be overthrown, the proletariat will have to win another victory. It is this form of economy,



this fruit of a proletarian victory, this uniquely proletarian element, and not features possible under capitalism, which constitutes the essential foundation of a Workers' State. The ultra-Left cries that Stalinism has destroyed trade unions, workers democracy and the Bolshevik party, and points to this as the reason for holding that Russia is no form of a Workers' State. But by doing so, the ultra-Left merely diverts the attention of the workers from what Stalinism has not as yet destroyed, the proletarian form of economy. And this precisely is the crux of the whole problem. The ultra-Left cannot prove that the form of ownership of production in the Stalinized Soviet Union is different from that established by the proletarian overthrow of capitalism. Characteristically opportunist, the ultra-Left must advance arguments which divert attention from the crux of the problem of defining the class nature of the Russian society.

#### PETTY-BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY AND ULTRA-LEFTISM

All the arguments of the ultra-Lefts are of a nature to appeal to the democratic sentiments of the masses. In fact the heart of the whole position of the ultra-Lefts is that Workers' democracy has been crushed by Stalinism and that thereby the class nature of the Soviet Union has been changed back to capitalism or some unspecified type of "non-proletarian" society. In centering his position on the question of the Russian State around the factor of democracy, the ultra-Left is merely following a certain well-established pattern of opportunist deception. The ultra-Leftist is a petty-bourgeois democrat with a thick coat of red paint.

To the petty-bourgeois democrat, "democracy" is the all-in-all, the essence of everything beautiful in politics. We have democracy, shouts the petty-bourgeois democrat, this determines everything; don't complain to me about the existence of capitalist economy; because we have democracy, the capitalist economy is not quite what

Marxism says it is. And the petty-bourgeois "social"-democrat even proclaims that democracy will gradually transform capitalism into socialism.

To the ultra-Leftist, also, "democracy" is the all-in-all, the manna of the political life. Only, remember, the ultra-Leftist is a "Bolshevik," hence he talks about proletarian democracy. Don't annoy the ultra-Leftist with the cry that the economy of the Soviet Union was brought into existence by a proletarian revolution, that only the proletariat can lay the basis of this form of economy, that historically this economy is specifically and uniquely proletarian. The ultra-Leftist will reply:- It is not the economy which is the basic thing; there is no (proletarian) democracy in this economy; democracy is the thing that counts. No proletarian democracy, no proletarian state, argues the ultra-Left. Take the economy created by a proletarian revolution, eliminate democracy and you have, so says the ultra-Left, some form of capitalism, or some other kind of "non-proletarian" society. As the petty-bourgeois "social"-democrat believes the existence of "democracy" can ipso facto change the class character of capitalist economy, so the ultra-Leftist, a "social"-democrat in reverse gear, thinks the removal of democracy can ipso facto alter the class character of the proletarian economy. Or to put it the other way around, take the "non-proletarian" or "capitalist" economy of the Soviet Union, as the ultra-Lefts call it, superimpose proletarian democracy on it, and Presto! you have a proletarian economy and a Workers' State. Everything hinges on "democracy" in the ideology of both the petty-bourgeois democrat and the ultra-Leftist "Bolshevik." The fact that the ultra-Leftist inserts the word "proletarian" before his "democracy" does not change his petty-bourgeois character in the least. All the petty-bourgeois democrats trample on the Marxist principle that the economic structure in all societies is the factor determining the class nature of that society. In one way or another, they all wave the slogan of "democracy" to obscure the significance of this principle.

THE L.R.W.P. BORROWS A PAGE FROM THE  
A N A R C H I S T S

Anarchism conceals its petty-bourgeois democratic nature with a mask of "proletarian" ultra-Leftism. The petty-bourgeois democratic element in Anarchism takes the form of a cry for a Stateless society, or rather of a cry against all States. Raising the utopian slogan of a stateless society immediately after the proletarian revolution, anarchism attacks the proletarian State and so functions on behalf of the bourgeoisie. Marxism replies to Anarchism that, while the Stateless society is the true goal of the proletariat, such a society is a long way off. Until capitalism has been conquered the world over, a proletarian State will be necessary to combat the capitalist remnants.

The ultra-Lefts of the L.R.W.P. type employ the Anarchist rignarole in a slightly altered form. Under the guise of calling for complete workers control over the proletarian economy, the ultra-Leftists assault the economic conquests of the proletarian revolution when, as is inevitable for a long period of time, complete control does not exist. The L.R.W.P. writes:

"The new economic institutions must remain under the complete control of the workers if they are to be instruments of proletarian liberation instead of economic exploitation." (Special Bulletin on the S.W.P. Convention, p. 6. Our emphasis.)

It follows from this that, if the workers' control over the new economic institutions is not complete, then that economy cannot be considered proletarian in class character, for it becomes to one extent or another a means of "economic exploitation." Obviously, according to the L.R.W.P., when the workers have as in the Stalinized Soviet Union, no control, a proletarian form of economy and State cannot be said to exist.

It is necessary to examine this position in the light of Marxism. What basis in reality is there in the cry

of the L.R.W.P. that the proletarian economy to retain its working class form and not become an instrument of "economic exploitation" must be under the complete control of the toilers? If this position were a true one, then a proletarian economy could never come into existence. In the first phase of the proletarian dictatorship, especially immediately after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, complete control of the proletarian economy by the workers is utterly an impossibility, a utopian myth and, when raised as a slogan, an Anarchist, ultra-Leftist fraud. Between capitalism and the proletarian society, there is a material continuity which is inevitable and inescapable. Under capitalism, the toilers are shorn of power and are prevented from learning how to rule and control society. When the bourgeoisie are overthrown, the workers do not immediately become complete masters of their society. Culturally backward, due to their oppressed position under capitalism, the overwhelming majority of the toilers have the most incoherent and the most incorrect ideas on how the old, capitalist society is ruled. As to how to rule the new, proletarian society, even the Marxist leaders, the most advanced persons in this society, have only an approximate and mainly theoretical conception. In the first Soviet Republic even under Lenin's leadership, the inexperience of the workers forced them actually to employ hundreds of thousands of grasping and rapacious ex-tsarist and ex-bourgeois officials, careerists, and sometimes downright scoundrels in the economic and State institutions. A million miles removed from being able to control their economy completely, the workers were necessarily to a profound extent at the mercy of hostile class forces within Russia as well as internationally. Moreover, aside from sheer inability of the workers to control because of lack of knowledge and training, there was the factor of tremendous economic chaos and of counter-revolutionary sabotage which stood as a stone wall against complete control. All these elements will hamper the workers, to one extent or another, every time they establish a proletarian dictatorship and will

prevent them from instituting complete control over their economy for a considerable period of time after the defeat of the bourgeoisie.

Only a socialist society can have complete control over the economy. The lack of workers' control over the proletarian economy has its source in the class nature of the society they begin to destroy with the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. As long as there are any material remnants of that class society (capitalism), the workers will not have complete control over their economy. As long as capitalism has not been completely vanquished, the control of the toilers over society must be, at best partial and incomplete. ~~The~~ anarchical elements of capitalism will be in evidence in the proletarian economy until they have been utterly annihilated.

As society approaches socialism, the control of the workers over their economy will move to completion. But socialism can be completed only on an international scale. When the bourgeoisie have been overthrown in one country alone, the isolated proletarian economy is still organically bound to world capitalism. In a single country, the workers can never have complete control over their economy. When the ultra-Leftists call for complete workers control over a proletarian economy in one country, as for example Russia, they are actually calling for socialism in one country. In this respect they follow in the reactionary path of the Anarchists who, in calling for a Stateless society in one country, were also crying in a sense for socialism in one country, since the Stateless society is the socialist society.

When the myth of complete workers control in one country has been dispelled, it will be realized that the factor of workers' control cannot be the criterion of the existence of a proletarian economy and a workers' State. In one country, (and even internationally for some time), ~~workers'~~ control must be incomplete and relative. Today they have less control, tomorrow more, the next day for some reason perhaps less again, and then

more, and so on. Obviously with every fluctuation of the degree of workers' control, if we follow the ultra-Lefts, the class character of the economy and State will be shifting. Only the rankest dogmatism can result from trying to utilize the degree of workers' control as the criterion of the class character of society. Each individual will have his own criterion, 100% control, 99.9% control, 89% control, and so forth, of the existence of a proletarian economy and State. This finally must result in out-and-out indicrousness, fantasy and sophistry.

In the historical form of ownership of the means of production, Marxism has the true criterion of the class character of economy and political superstructure. This criterion is derived from the whole history of humanity, is utterly devoid of empiricism, dogmatism and personal whim. It is eminently amenable to scientific application. The State-ownership of production established by the October Revolution can be the essence only of a proletarian form of economy and the basis of some form of proletarian State. Marxism takes sharply into account the nature of the form of State, for the latter has a powerful influence on the course of the economy. That influence may be such as to result eventually in a change in the class character of the economy. Thus, the Russian Workers' State since the inception of Stalinism in 1921-1922 has been undergoing degeneration leading towards the eventual destruction of the proletarian economy and the restoration of the bourgeois order. The Stalinization of the Workers' State does not in itself constitute a change in the class form of the economy. It leads to such a change. These two things are very different, and this difference must be fully grasped in order to avoid the distortions of the ultra-Lefts.

#### THE L.R.W.P. ON TROTSKY

The various petty-bourgeois democratic (ultra-Leftist) dogmas analyzed above are the first half of the L.R.W.P.'s "advice" to the Trotskyites. The rest of the L.R.W.P.'s docu-

ment purports to enlighten the Trotskyites on the nature of Trotskyism.

The Trotskyite worker follows Trotsky primarily because of the latter's reputation as the successor of Lenin, as the chief foe of Stalinism. This reputation as an anti-Stalinist is Trotsky's political stock-in-trade. Trotsky flings at his followers a mountain of books, pamphlets, speeches and articles which seem veritably to tear Stalinism limb from limb. Trotsky carries off so realistically his pose as the inheritor of Lenin's fight against Stalinism, that the Trotskyite worker imagines himself to be engaged in a life-and-death struggle against Stalinism.

One would think that an organization like the L.R.W.P., which ostensibly is anti-Trotskyite, would have something vital to say about Trotsky's entire role in the rise of Stalinism. In the "Special Bulletin on the S.W.P. Convention," we find precisely one sentence relating to this most fundamental matter. The L.R.W.P. accuses the S.W.P. program of "Covering up the failure of Trotsky to bring the fight of the L O against Stalin into the open in the early days of the struggle in the Soviet Union." (Ibid. p. 14 Our emphasis.) Upon seeing the L.R.W.P.'s remark about some fight of Trotsky and his left "Opposition" against Stalin, one is justified in asking: What fight? What fight against Stalin did Trotsky fail to bring out into the open? If Trotsky did not bring this alleged fight against Stalin out into the open, then what system of clairvoyance, mind-reading and mental telepathy has enabled the L.R.W.P. to learn that he conducted some fight? Did the L.R.W.P. sit in on Trotsky's secret councils and perchance overhear Trotsky's hidden "fight" against Stalin? What evidence has the L.R.W.P. that Trotsky conducted any sort of fight against Stalin, closed, secret, open or otherwise?

Some day the myth about Trotsky's having waged a fight against Stalin will be cleared up before the whole working class. But it will not be the L.R.W.P. which will clarify the work-

ers, for this organization prefers to perpetuate Trotsky's pretense of having conducted some sort of Leninist battle against S t a l i n. Sooner or later it will become known to the working class that, far from having carried on a fight against Stalin and his system, Trotsky constituted himself a would-be ally of the Stalinist renegades and rendered them invaluable service in that capacity. Trotsky's treachery - not his "error," "mistake" or "failure" - will become known as the chief reason for the victory of Stalinism. Trotsky will be known for what he is - a cast-off, broken-down Stalinist bureaucrat.

In this entire document of the L.R.W.P., or in any of its documents for that matter, there is not one scrap of material which could in any way give the workers an inkling as to Trotsky's real role in the Stalinist conspiracy. The L.R.W.P. offers itself to the workers as a Marxist organization engaged in building a revolutionary party. It claims to be making a serious examination of the problem facing the working class. It even promises to do research on the Kronstadt Rebellion of 1921. But this same organization does not hesitate to address the Trotskyites without having the slightest knowledge of the development of Trotskyism, without having even attempted a serious study of Trotsky's role since 1921-22, without having made even the rudiments of a scientific analysis of the entire Stalinist structure. More, in addition to having itself added nothing to the workers' understanding of the development of Trotskyism, the L. R. W. P. ignores such facts as have been made known by others regarding Trotskyism, and persists in repeating Trotsky's fakery about the "fight" of the Left "Opposition" against Stalin.

A notable example of the L.R.W.P.'s distortions can be observed in its handling of the problem of Trotsky's support to Stalin's counter-revolutionary invasion of Finland. The L.R.W.P. asserts concerning the S.W.P.: "Its position that Russia is a Workers State forced it to support Stalin's invasion." (Ibid. p. 4.) What truth

is there in the notion that his holding that Russia is a Workers' State forces Trotsky to support Stalin's invasions? What, in general, is the relation between holding Russia to be a form of proletarian State and supporting Stalinism? Lenin, for example, considered Russia to be a Workers' State and yet did not support Stalinism in any respect whatsoever. As a matter of fact, it was Lenin who was the one who was organizing a real fight against Stalinism during the period of its origin.

The Stalin clique began to usurp power as early as 1921-1922. Stalin, as general secretary of the R.C.P., launched the creation of a huge bureaucratic machine in State and Party to serve him as his political base in his policy of self-entrenchment. As Commissar for Nationalities, Stalin organized the bureaucratization of the various independent Soviet Republics, including Georgia. The start of this Stalinist process of usurping power, of invading independent republics and bureaucratizing them was witnessed by Lenin. It was precisely against Stalinism that Lenin organized his last political struggle. The XII Party Congress of April 1923 Lenin intended to be the chief battleground on which to deliver a mortal blow at the whole Stalinist system, to carry the struggle so far as to wipe Stalin out of political existence. For the Georgian Bolsheviks, Lenin prepared voluminous documents with which to present their case before the Party Congress and save them from being overwhelmed by the Stalinist machine. In no way whatsoever did Lenin's position that Russia is a Workers' State lead him to support any aspect of Stalinist renegacy.

Trotsky in that period also considered Russia to be a Workers' State. But Trotsky supported Stalin not only in his assault on the independence of the national republics, but in every other respect in the bureaucratic drive to usurp power in the Workers' State. At the XII Party Congress Trotsky agreed to the suppression of Lenin's Georgian documents, voted for all the Stalinist resolutions and helped to

continue Stalinism as the official policy of the bureaucratized Workers' State.

Starting with the same position that Russia is a Workers' State, Lenin on the one hand, and the Stalinist opportunists, including Trotsky on the other, pursued diametrically opposite policies with respect to Stalinism. Was it then the position that Russia is a Workers' State that determined their attitude toward Stalinism? The answer is YES in Lenin's case and NO in the case of the Stalin gang and their collaborator, Trotsky. Lenin, desiring to preserve and extend the Workers' State, fought Stalinism. Trotsky, desiring to enter as a partner into the Stalinist conspiracy to usurp power, supported the Stalinist plotters.

Today, Trotsky's support to Stalin no more flows from the position that Russia is a Workers' State than it did in 1922-23. Today, Trotsky, now Stalin's ex-henchman and chief scapegoat, supports Stalin because his original participation in the Stalinist conspiracy has irrevocably attached him to Stalinism. Trotsky supports Stalin because he is a Stalinist. The revolutionary overthrow of Stalinism can occur only on the basis of a conscious understanding of its precise nature, of its whole development and method of operation. Such an understanding includes a knowledge of Trotsky's pro-Stalinist role. For his own self-protection, Trotsky must block the workers in any effort to acquire such an exact understanding and the overthrow of Stalinism which it would make possible. Even should Trotsky, for some reason which we cannot now foresee, abandon his position that Russia is a Workers' State, he would still have to support Stalinism. He might then have to do it from an ultra-Leftist direction, but he would still have the policy of covering up his criminal role in the development of Stalinism and of blocking the creation of a genuine Bolshevik movement which would annihilate Stalinism and all its supporters. in "oppositionist" disguise.

From the position that Russia is

a Workers' State, there flows only one Marxist policy:- to combat Stalinism without exception and work for its destruction so as to preserve and extend the proletarian State. The policy of supporting Stalinism originates only in one or another form of political attachment to the Stalinist system.

The distortion of the relation of the position that Russia is a Workers' State to Trotsky's support of Stalin is a product of the L.R.W.P.'s failure to have learned the real history of the development of Stalinism and the manner in which the entire Stalinist system, including Trotsky, operates. The same failure has caused it to reject Marxism on the question of the class nature of the Russian State.

With this hodge-podge of petty-bourgeois democratic, ultra-Leftist, Trotskyist opportunism, the L.R.W.P. proposes to enlighten the Trotskyite workers!

#### HOW TO PARTICIPATE IN THE CLASS STRUGGLE

In class society everybody participates in the class struggle. Even the totally "non-political" worker plays his part in the class struggle, objectively a counter-revolutionary role. The point is not merely to participate in the class struggle, but to do so in a Marxist way.

Only a genuine Bolshevik organization can pursue a revolutionary policy in the class struggle. An organization like the L.R.W.P., which holds to an opportunist political line, can pursue only a counter-revolutionary policy in all respects, objectively speaking. Regardless of whether it addresses itself to vanguard workers

(like the L.R.W.P. at the Trotskyist Convention) or whether it approaches the backward workers, opportunism functions in the interests of the bourgeoisie.

There is only one revolutionary way to participate in the class struggle today. This is to strive to break the most advanced sections of the proletarian vanguard from their opportunist misleaders, Stalinist, Trotskyist, left-Trotskyist (Oehler-Stamm) and ultra-Leftist. Workers must not allow themselves to be confused by the "mass line" noise of the opportunists. An organization like the L.R.W.P. which distorts the class character of the proletarian form of property, which directly and indirectly gives aid and comfort to Trotskyism, can utilize its "mass line" objectively only as a sugar coating for the opportunist poison it offers the workers. Can such an organization, completely at odds with Marxism, really be building a revolutionary workers party? Can its approach to this problem be the Marxist one? Its very orientation, its "mass line" approach to this problem, is opportunist. The path to a revolutionary party lies not through the backward workers who have not yet even broken with the bourgeois parties. It lies through the vanguard workers who, already subjectively anti-capitalist, are in the clutches of the pseudo-Bolsheviks, the opportunists of the Stalinist system. This system of pseudo-Bolshevism includes the ultra-Lefts of the L.R.W.P. type. It is from this system of pseudo-Bolshevism in its entirety, from its Stalinist to its ultra-Leftist pole, that the vanguard workers must break to reform their ranks in a genuine Bolshevik Party which will lead the masses in a struggle against the bourgeoisie.

April 18, 1940.

---

---

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

---

---

\* \* \* \* \*

TROTSKY "TEACHES"  
PARTY DISCIPLINE

**D**URING the hearings of the "Dewey Commission," Trotsky was questioned concerning his denial of Lenin's Testament. Trotsky alleged that DISCIPLINE TO THE PARTY motivated him to join the Stalin gang in lying about the authenticity of Lenin's Testament. The "Commissioner" Stolberg, referring to Trotsky's denial of the Testament asked Trotsky: "In other words, you did that from the point of view of Party discipline?" And Trotsky replied: "Yes." (The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 430.) It is necessary to investigate this story of Trotsky's that in denying the existence of Lenin's Testament he was impelled by his adherence to "Party discipline."

The crux of this entire matter is the question:- To whom was Trotsky being loyally disciplined when he denied the existence of Lenin's Testament? To Lenin and the workers, or to Stalin and his gang of burocratic connivers?

Lenin's Testament was intended as a blow against the disloyal General Secretary and the havoc his burocratic machinations were causing in the Workers' State. What was it that demanded of Trotsky that he deny Lenin's Testament? It was the interests of Stalin and his collaborators which demanded this service of Trotsky. Stalinism had to be protected against Lenin's Testament.

No honest worker-Bolshevik came to Trotsky and asked him to deny Lenin's Testament. The honest workers were being kept in ignorance of the Testament by Stalin and his henchmen.

It was to an honest worker that Trotsky was being disciplined. It was to Stalinism that Trotsky was so loyal. This kind of loyal discipline — loyal discipline to a pack of renegades — will be understood by every honest worker as nothing but renegacy.

The disloyal Stalin clique was by 1922 already in control of the Central Committee of the Party and of the country in general, as Trotsky himself relates:

"They became, Zinoviev and Kamen-ev — 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." (The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 77.)

Let no one imagine that Trotsky first learned about the treachery of the Stalin gang while he was in exile in Mexico. He knew about Stalinist treachery and about Lenin's line against Stalinism while Lenin was still alive. Speaking of the period at the end of 1922, Trotsky writes:

"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 burocratic transformation of the dictatorship." (My Life, p. 484.)

The danger created by the Stalinization of the Party in 1922-23 and the line of Lenin against this Staliniz-

ation was clear to Trotsky from the very beginning. Plainly, when Trotsky denied the existence of Lenin's Testament in the summer of 1925, he knew what he was doing, he understood the sinister, pro-Stalinist implications of his deceitful act.

Curiously enough, evidently forgetting his excuse of "discipline," Trotsky admitted before this same "Dewey Commission" that Lenin's line towards a genuine Bolshevik party, let alone a Stalinized party, was that one can break discipline when a question of fundamental importance is involved:

"....even in the Bolshevik Party, with its very severe discipline, Lenin first emphasized that the essence is more important than the form; that the ideas are more important than the discipline; that if it is a question of fundamental importance, we can break the vows of discipline without betraying our ideas." (The Case of Leon Trotsky, pp. 422-423. Our emphasis.)

If it is a Leninist act to break discipline with a genuine Bolshevik party when the interests of the workers require it, how can one claiming to be a Leninist offer as an excuse for any action whatever discipline to the Stalin gang of renegades!

Lenin called for a struggle against the faction of Stalin. Trotsky shielded the Stalin clique and today feeds the workers a deceptive story about "discipline."

Lenin's line against Stalinism can today be carried forward only by those who genuinely expose all whose political history compels them to offer excuses for their having shielded Stalin and having fostered the rise of Stalinism.

SEND FOR A FREE COPY OF:-

TROTSKY AND THE SUPPRESSION OF LENIN'S TESTAMENT

WHITHER SHACHTMAN

READ:-

STALIN, TROTSKY or LENIN  
by George Marlen

493 pages      Price \$1.00

READ:-

THE BULLETIN of the Leninist  
League, U.S.A.

5¢/copy      50¢/year

SEND TO:-

R. Rolene  
P.O. Box 67  
Station D.  
New York



ON HITLER'S "SEIZURE" OF NORWAY

( Continued from Page 10 )

terrified Swedish bourgeoisie perceived that for some "inexplicable" reason its neighbor, Norway, had been turned over to Hitler by the so-called Allies. The Stockholm Aftonbladet wrote:

"Those who look on the help of the Western Powers in Norway with skepticism are right. It cannot be denied that the Allied steps have an air of half-measures about them.

"The expedition has a typical COMPROMISE character. London did not take effective action but was content with a minor performance;..

"The war in Norway is a typical war of movement with changing terrain demanding initiative and mobility, that is, capacity for marching under difficult conditions and ability to adjust oneself to the most unexpected situations. This requires elite troops. But where are they? On the Western Front." (New York Times, May 3, 1940. Our capitals - G.M.)

On the so-called Western Front, the main theatre of the "Second World War," the Nazi soldiers all these months have been "fighting like hell," but not against the British and the French, however, for the "German soldiers on the Siegfried line are fighting sham battles with each other to keep in practice" (New York World Telegram, February 26, 1940. My emphasis - G.M.)

And while Norway was being sensationally invaded by the German troops, the so-called Allies were "relieving pressure" from Norway by watching the German troops on the "Western Front" peacefully working in the fields.

"On the German side of the Moselle and in an area further north along the Sauer River, large numbers of German troops were visible, some

of them working bare-backed in the fields and others patrolling the river banks." (New York Times, April 24, 1940.)

And leisurely gazing at the Nazi<sup>s</sup> energetically pushing the construction of fortifications:

"On the German side, the construction of fortifications still is under way, slicing sandy gashes in the green turf. German military trucks and trains could be seen rolling by undisturbed under easy range of the French guns." (Ibid.)

At length the imperialists began to wind up the Norwegian affair. The order was dispatched to withdraw the "Allied" troops from Norway. The withdrawal also was very "peculiar," as "peculiar" as the sudden collapse of aid to Finland, and as the entire so-called Second World War. A correspondent of the Swedish News Agency, "described the almost unbelievable manner in which he said the British withdrew. 'They are leaving in the most peculiar fashion,' he said. 'This is shown by the fact that their motorized anti-aircraft guns were covered with canvas. They were not even standing by for any possible action.' This was done in the face of continual bombing by high-flying German planes, he said." (Daily Mirror, May 4, 1940.) Two days later another dispatch threw more light on the "peculiar" nature of the British retreat. The Norwegian officers were to the last minute actually kept in the dark as to what was occurring, while those who knew most about the British withdrawal were the Nazis!

"The people who knew most about the British withdrawal were the Germans. The Norwegian officers were not told until the last minute." (James Aldridge, New York Times, May 6, 1940.)

With the bourgeois and the pseudo-Marxist press echoing every piece of deception of the bourgeois statesmen, it was easy for Chamberlain to come forward with the most spurious of all the explanations, a story to the effect that the "Allies" had to bow before what he termed the superior Nazi air force. The hollowness of this superior-air-force story is fairly obvious. Of the air fleets possessed by France, England and Germany, a mere fraction was employed by all these powers in the Norwegian tragi-farce, according to the version of the bourgeois correspondents themselves. The air force used by Hitler in Norway was a mere drop in the bucket compared to the immense air armada at the disposal of the Anglo-French imperialists who for some "mysterious" reason did not use it.

If this were not a mock war and if Hitler's air force were materially superior, then, plainly, London, Paris and other large centers in England and France would have been doomed to destruction, while the German cities would have been relatively safe. In point of fact a considerable part of the huge British air fleet has been kept flying over Germany in the last eight months, having covered 800,000 miles without dropping a bomb. The airmen, it has been explained by the imperialists, were photographing naval bases and German towns without being attacked and destroyed by Hitler's "superior" air force.

"Non-bombing raids, it is said, are justified by the results. Since the start of the war, British aircraft have made 800 day and night flights over Greater Germany and have covered 800,000 miles with only small losses. The pilots, it is said, have brought back a mass of valuable information, photographs of naval and other bases, descriptions of blackouts in the chief German towns and the best methods for approaching possible targets.

"Moreover, it is asserted, that the repeated long, successful flights have given the crews com-

plete confidence in themselves and in their machines. Flights from Britain and France to Berlin, Wilhelmshaven, Vienna and Prague are now regarded as familiar routine for dozens of pilots who thus are trained to lead raids, it is said." (New York Times, April 23, 1940.)

Acutely conscious of their interests and purpose and in complete solidarity, the imperialists rang down the curtain on another act in the Chamberlain-Hitler drama. Both Chamberlain and Hitler accomplished unbelievable military and naval feats, which, without a full understanding between themselves could never have taken place. Norway is separated from the mainland by a stretch of sea over a hundred miles wide. Yet, having no navy to speak of as compared with the combined French and British sea forces, Hitler performed a miraculous naval feat. <sup>In the presence</sup> of the powerful guns of the British navy, the mightiest sea force in the world, "Hitler has succeeded in the almost unimaginable feat of snatching a neutral nation, with a vital Atlantic coastline, virtually under the muzzles of the British naval guns" (New York Times, Editorial, May 3, 1940. My emphasis - G.M.) And Chamberlain, supposedly inferior to Hitler in air force, succeeded in the military feat of withdrawing troops unscathed under the very nose of the "superior" German air force, although the British troops admittedly lacked sufficient anti-aircraft guns and combat planes:

"Backed by the splendid courage and tenacity of the troops we have now withdrawn the whole of our forces from Andalsnes under the very noses of German airplanes without, as far as I am aware, losing a single man in this operation." (Chamberlain's statement in the House of Commons, The New York Times, May 3, 1940. My emphasis - G.M.)

The fake character of the Franco-British so-called "defense" of Norway

has aroused suspicions and questioning in several quarters. What is in reality a fraud is posed by the bourgeois newspapers as a "mystery":

"To many observers it remains a mystery how the British, whose fleet had been carefully watching Norwegian territorial waters for weeks, could have let a large German expeditionary force slip through and seize the five principal seaports of Norway as bases of operation against Britain, especially since Prime Minister Chamberlain said this week that the British Government had been expecting such a stroke since February." (New York Times, May 5, 1940.)

Indeed, how is it that although the British government expected in February that Hitler might strike at Norway, the Nazis were able to transport a large expeditionary force right through the British blockade, mine fields, etc. It's a "mystery"!

The cardinal fact in the "mystery" of Hitler's "seizure" of Norway is this: Norway was intentionally given to Hitler by the Franco-British imperialists. The handful of raw, practically unarmed troops which were flung into Norway by the Franco-British imperialists, and even the few more experienced and better equipped troops sent later, were thrown into the muzzles of the German guns simply as a camouflage of the handing over of Norway to Hitler. This entrusting of Norway to Hitler's rule falls in line with the handing over of Czechoslovakia and Poland to Hitler by his Franco-British imperialist colleagues.

Naturally, while questions may be asked and "queer" facts pointed out, only genuine Marxism will give the true answer to this "mystery" of Norway. The opportunists within the proletariat assist the imperialists to conceal the truth. They assure the workers that Chamberlain and Hitler are sinking their teeth into each other's throats in a "Second Imperialist War." Every vital fact is hidden by the opportunists. Every move by the imperialists and by Stalin is misinterpreted, distorted and obscured.

• The Chamberlain-Hitler plan, an imperialist scheme which can now be traced to the earliest stages of its development, is not obvious to the advanced workers only because of the pseudo-Bolshevik fakers within the proletarian ranks. The imperialists move cautiously. They have learned that "anti-Communist" propaganda to arouse the masses against the Stalin-tormented proletarian State is of little value. They must have Stalin perform sheer and incontrovertible deeds of barbarism, as in Finland. And such deeds will soon be forthcoming in the Hitler-Stalin partitioning of Scandinavia around the Bothnian Gulf, and of other territorial points between Hitler and Stalin. There will be more "snatching" of small countries by Hitler; more "gifts" from Hitler to the Stalinist bandit gang.

History can be understood not only from commission but also from omission of certain acts by the men moulding it. There will be no "snatching" of Belgium! Hitler's crossing into Belgium would constitute a gross breach of faith, a stupid disruption of the brilliant plan, a threat to France and England. The resultant raging inter-imperialist inferno, in comparison with which 1914-1918 would pale into significance, would lead in a very brief time to a complete collapse of the capitalist economic and political fabric of Germany and probably of entire bourgeois Europe. There will be no Nazi invasion of Belgium!

The Chamberlain-Hitler plan to tear down the last remains of the Great October Revolution and imperialistically parcel out the vast territories of the Stalinized Soviet Union will be carried out with dead certainty — if the class-conscious proletarian vanguard is not awakened from its terrible trance. Without a revolutionary party, the international workingclass today is like a ship without compass and rudder, without captain and sailors — a ship that has been ~~drifted~~ drifted by pirates.

Only by casting off the mesmerizing opportunist leeches, the Stalinist, Trotskyist, Lovestoneite and Left-Trot-

skyite big and little bureaucrats can the proletarian vanguard lift its head, politically and organizationally, and leading the world toiling masses against all the Hitlers and

Chamberlains, establish an international union of Leninist Soviet States as a transition bridge toward the Socialist Society.

G.M.

May 6, 1940

A REPLY TO OEHLER

OEHLER recently blossomed forth with a specific attack upon the concept that the so-called war in the West is a fake resorted to by the bourgeoisie in its scheme to attack and divide the Soviet Union. He says:

"Our ultra-left "theoreticians", having looked at 6 months of "quiet" warfare have suddenly blossomed out with a new set of theories and like the studious study-circle gentlemen they are, they have brought forth "facts and figures" to "prove" their point. It seems that imperialism is no longer capable of waging a war. Some of them have even stated that THE PRESENT WAR IS A PURE FARCE TO FOOL THE WORKERS (LITERALLY) AND PREPARE FOR AN INVASION OF THE SOVIET UNION. Among the "proofs" listed is the fact that the war costs today are many times greater than in the last war; it takes as much as 10 men in the factory system in the rear to keep one man at the front supplied with the necessary ammunitions, food, etc., whereas it took only one man in the last war to do the same thing." (International News, May, 1940, p.5. Our capitals.)

As far as we are aware, the Leninist League is the only organization within the proletariat which maintains that the so-called war in the West is a bourgeois sham designed to cover up the imperialist plot to wipe out the remnants of the October Revolution. If the above statement of Oehler's is

supposed to be an attack upon the Leninist League's position, then obviously it is a gross misrepresentation. In the first place we did not wait for "6 months of quiet warfare" but stated at the very beginning of the so-called second imperialist war that it was a "mock war in the west" (See "WHY THE MOCK WAR IN THE WEST," In Defense of Bolshevism, September 1939.) Secondly, we have never listed as a "proof" that "the war costs today are many times greater than in the last war." We do not hold to any such "statistical" nonsense. Our reason for stating that the "war" in the West is not a real war is political:- the prime purpose of the world bourgeoisie today is to re-entrench capitalism internationally by capturing and dividing up the territories and wealth of the decaying workers state.

If Oehler has in mind some other tendency or organization than the Leninist League which may hold to the fantastic and foolish "statistical" notions indicated in the above quotation, then in the interests of clarity and of honest polemics it is Oehler's duty to name such group or tendency.

When a Marxist undertakes polemics, he calls things and people by their right names.

May 6, 1940