

WHO HELPS HITLER? THE CAPITALIST SECOND FRONT

A Reply to "Hitlers' Agents Exposed"

Continued from page 1.

Continued from Page 1.
enemy, the Kaiser. The German capitalists and a section of their labour lackeys accused Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht of being agents of Britain and France. John McLean and James Connolly were accused by British imperialism and a section of their labour lackeys of being agents of the Kaiser. And only recently a section of the capitalist class used the same argument against the British Communist Party at various stages in the present war.

Unfortunately for Mr. Mahon the Communist Party were prolific publicists during the "Peace with Hitler" period which the British C.P. were propagating from October 1939 to June 1940. And the same amalgam was used against the Communist Party regarding "Workers Challenge." Major Attlee who was saying: "Hitler's

papers had reported the Convention fully. It helped him in trying to persuade the Germans that this country was disunited." The Communist Party through the lawyer Pritt, spent no little money in trying to dispose of this slanderous allegation.

The difficulty of dealing with a foul and slanderous document such as Mahon's is to know where to begin. It is very simple to lie, but it is not so simple to unravel a string of lies and falsifications, each of which involves a restatement of history. Apart from the general mis-statements, there are so many secondary, but nevertheless, important forgeries, that it would take a book to explode them. On some pages almost every sentence of Mahon's pamphlet is a lie, which makes it impossible to deal with here. We will select only two of the most blatant and even stupid ones.

munist Party could have crushed fascism without formidable opposition from the Nazi thugs. But instead of fighting for a united front of the workers organisations to crush the Nazis, the Communist Party were fighting the Social Democratic workers on the streets and even voted with the Nazis against the Social Democrats.

To day, the C.P. try to convince the workers that they were for a united front with the Social Democrats in Germany, but the truth is the very opposite.

During this critical period the Communist Party "theoreticians" claimed that the main enemy of the German working class was the German Social Democratic Party and not the Fascists. Stalin had written in his first article to be published in the "Communist International" (No. 6, 1925):

leadership of the party (the German C.P.) opposed taking part in the referendum (the Nazi referendum) on the dissolution of the Prussian Landtag. A number of party news papers published leading articles opposing participation in that referendum. But when the Central Committee of the Party jointly with the Comintern arrived at the conclusion that it was necessary to take an active part in the referendum, the German comrades in the course of a few days, roused the whole party. Not a single party, except the C.P.S.U. could do that...

On several other occasions they supported the Nazis against the Social Democrats.

How they would like to forget this period of their history! What sums they would give to erase their printed word of yesterday!

In Britain, following the instructions of Moscow, the same mad policy was pursued. Pollitt today cringes before the Labour leaders in making an application for affiliation to the Labour Party. But on the Editorial page of the "Daily Worker," January 29th 1939, Pollitt directed the members of the Communist Party to smash up Labour Party meetings by means of physical violence.

capitalists and landowners in Italy and Germany and throughout Europe as agents for the exploitation of the people of Europe.

If further proof is needed of the hypocrisy and cynicism in the claim of the "democracies" that they stand for the "liberation" of Europe and the rights of its peoples to determine their own destiny, it is provided by the attitude towards Giraud. The Anglo-American imperialists in North Africa have decisively intervened in the struggle being waged between Giraud and de Gaulle for control of the French armed forces in North Africa. This should have been an "internal" question for the French themselves to decide according to ordinary capitalist diplomacy. But proclaiming their desire not to intervene in French affairs, the American imperialists dragging the British after them, intervened and forced the retention of Giraud as Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces. Not that there is much to choose between these two worthies. The masses in France associate Giraud with the Vichy regime which cynically hired itself out as a kept servant and which helped the Nazis to exploit the French people. Giraud supported Petain and kept in power the Vichyites in Algeria. Yet he is kept in power by the will of American imperialism. To the Americans he appears as a pliant tool who can be used for the ends of Wall Street. Thus the capitalists in control even today, are making certain of having the puppets they want ready to thrust into power at the expense of alienating the people of Europe.

Every worker wishes to see fascism wiped off the face of the earth once and for all. It is clear to the workers of the whole world what ghastly horror

the victory of the fascist barbarians would mean to all workers. But the victory of Anglo-American imperialism would not at all mean the destruction of fascism; it would not have much better consequences for the workers of the world than that of the Axis.

Meanwhile, Hitler by enslaving all Europe against him in a common bond of solidarity. The revolution in Germany will unite Polish, French, Czech, Dutch, Norwegian, Ukrainian and other workers taken as slave labour to Germany together with the German workers. But when the masses in Germany begin to revolt, the British capitalists will attempt to suppress them by force. At the same time that the capitalists are making these preparations, the Labour leaders and the so-called Communist Party are playing the game of the capitalists by repeating the lies and slanders against the German workers and hiding the real causes of the war, and of fascism. They act as deceivers of and traitors to the working class. They support the measures the capitalists are preparing to protect their colonial loot and profits.

It is the duty of the British workers to give class solidarity and support to the German workers. If the British workers had to take power that would sound the death-knell of Hitler and Mussolini. When the German and Italian workers move to overthrow their rulers they must receive the full support of the British working class. The best aid that the British workers can give their comrades in Europe is to continue the struggle against the ruling class in Britain. The sole solution to the problems of war and fascism are provided by the programme of the Workers' International League and the Fourth International which carries on the fight for a Socialist Britain and a Socialist United States of Europe.

Stalin's Relations with Lenin

On page 10, Mahon states: "When in 1924 Lenin's trusted comrade in arms Joseph Stalin, became the General Secretary of the Bolshevik Party, Trotsky continued the struggle." (against the Bolshevik Party).

Every time these pen prostitutes put ink on paper a blot appears! Firstly, Stalin did not become the General Secretary of the Bolshevik Party in 1924. He was made the General Secretary at the March Conference in 1921. This is not a deliberate lie on Mahon's part. He simply does not know. But such is the modern school of Stalinist "historian"!

But aside from the blunder in the above quoted passage, it also contains a few falsifications. Far from Joseph Stalin being "Lenin's trusted comrade in arms," according to Lenin's wife Krupskaya, Lenin broke off comradely relations with Stalin before he died. What is even more damning, Lenin's last letter to the Party, dated December 25th, 1923, contained the following directive:

"Comrade Stalin, having become General Secretary, has concentrated an enormous power in his hands; and I am not sure that he always knows how to use that power with sufficient caution."

In the postscript to that letter dated January 4th, 1923, Lenin added: "Stalin is too rude and this fault, entirely supportable in relations among us Communists, becomes unsupportable in the office of General Secretary... therefore, I propose to the comrades to find a way to re-

move Stalin from that position and to appoint to it another man who in all respects differs to Stalin only in superiority - namely, more patient, more loyal, more polite, more attentive to comrades, less capricious, etc."

In these few lines, Lenin drew the portrait of Stalin: a rude and disloyal bureaucrat! Let the paid Stalinist hacks prate about "Stalin, the lifelong comrade of Lenin" two decades after his death. The real Lenin shattered this falsification as his last political act. And lest Mahon and his cohorts try to earn their bread by denying the existence of Lenin's statement; Stalin himself has testified to its existence as well as its content in a speech which was printed by the Communist Party in "International Press Correspondence" of November 17th, 1927. In this published speech Stalin said:

"It is said that in the 'Testament' in question Lenin suggested to the Party Congress that it should deliberate on the question of replacing Stalin and appointing another Comrade in his place as General Secretary, this is perfectly true..."

The question must be answered: Why is it that so important a document as the last letter of Lenin to the Bolshevik Party, has been kept under lock and key and has never been published by the Stalinists? Because it expresses the official lie that Stalin was the "trusted comrade" of Lenin. It demonstrates the truth of the Trotskyist statement... at least on this particular point.

Trotsky "Forewarned" the Enemy— Stalin Gives the Lie to Mahon

The second falsification we will deal with is on the same page of Mahon's pamphlet—page 10. He writes:

"When Lenin in November wanted to fix the date for the uprising, Trotsky wanted to delay it. When the Central Committee decided the date, Trotsky announced it publicly forewarning the enemy."

The first portion of this crude lie was fabricated after the murder of Zinoviev by Stalin's gunmen. It appears for the first time in the "History of the C.P.S.U." 1939, printed in Moscow and circulated by the British CP at 1/6 a copy. On page 205 of this book, the following is stated:

"Although at this meeting Trotsky did not vote against the resolution (to fix the date for the uprising) directly, he moved an amendment which would have reduced the chances of the uprising to nought and rendered it abortive. He proposed that the uprising should not be started before the Second Congress of Soviets met, a proposal which meant delaying the uprising, divvying its date and forewarning the Provisional Government."

Already from the official historical quotation, we see that Mahon adds his own extra piece of falsification. The already fake 1939 "history" states that the proposal not to precipitate the uprising until after the Congress of Soviets met, would have resulted in the Provisional Government becoming aware of the date. But Mr. Mahon must needs go further than even the official historians and state that "Trotsky announced it publicly, forewarning the enemy."

If this statement is true, why does it appear for the first time from the pen of Mr. Mahon, who after all, is merely a second rate hack? Why have the so-called "Historians" of the C.P.S.U.—of which there have been some two dozen—not mentioned this

fact—including the 1939 edition which was personally supervised by Stalin?

However, the lie is given, not only to Mahon, but to Stalin's personally edited "history," by the master himself. In a speech by Stalin which was reprinted in the first book issued by the Stalin regime against Trotsky, entitled "Errors of Trotskyism" and published by British Communist Party in May 1925, he stated:

"These minutes (of the C.C. referred to by Mahon) destroy the legend that the C.C. was faced by a split on the question of the insurrection. It is evident from the minutes that the opponents of immediate revolt—Comrade Kamenev and Zinoviev joined the organ for the political direction of the revolt, just as those who were in favour of it... How is it to be explained that the Party escaped a split? It is to be explained by the fact that these comrades were Old Bolsheviks... because comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev were Leninists, were Bolsheviks."

Strange indeed, that Stalin does not attack Trotsky for forewarning the enemy!

Commenting on the debate on the C.C. of the Bolshevik Party regarding Lenin's proposal for insurrection in the same book, Stalin states:

"... a resolution of Comrade Lenin's as to the revolt is put to the vote. The resolution is passed with a majority of 10 against 2 votes... (Kamenev and Zinoviev)."

When Trotsky, in his book "Lessons of October" wrote a criticism of the vacillations of Kamenev and Zinoviev precisely for the action which Mahon now attributes to Trotsky, Stalin and all his paid Mahon's were mobilised in the attack against Trotsky and in defence of Kamenev and Zinoviev. As a matter of fact, Stalin was the main defender of Kamenev and Zinoviev against Lenin during this period!

Have the Stalinists Fought Fascism

The most vociferous argument of the Stalinist leadership is that they are, and always have been, the principle opponents of Fascism. This is a blatant lie which they try to ram down the throats of the workers through their powerful propaganda machine. Not only have they never adopted the revolutionary method of fighting Fascism, but on more than

one occasion they were the actual allies of fascists. And when they did range themselves against the fascists, they fought with false weapons and a false policy.

When Fascism was rising in Germany from 1928 to 1933, a correct policy on the part of the German Social Democratic Party, and particularly on the part of the German Com-

"Fascism and Social Fascism (Social Democracy) are not anti-poles, they are twins."

Flowing from this Stalinist "theory" (which was dropped from 1925 until 1928) the argument was developed that the Labour and Trade Union leaders were concealed Fascists and the organisations they controlled were concealed fascist organisations. In July 1929, the Theses of the E.C.C.I. published by the British C.P. formulated the idea of Social Fascism, as follows:

"In countries where there are strong Social Democratic Parties, fascism assumes a particular form of Social Fascism."

While Trotsky was clamouring for the Communist Party of Germany to give a lead to organise a United Front with the Social Democratic Party, to fight Hitler and prevent his coming to power, the Stalinists actively opposed a genuine united front, as did their Social Democratic counter-parts.

"It is significant" observed the "Daily Worker" less than a year before Hitler's triumph, "that Trotsky has come out in defence of a united front between the Communist and Social Democratic parties against Fascism. No more disruptive and counter-revolutionary class lead could possibly have been given at a time like the present."

"Daily Worker" May 26th 1932. Only a couple of months before Hitler was made Chancellor, Ralph Fox, who was later killed in Spain fighting in the Popular Front forces, wrote an article on the German situation in the December 1932 "Communist Review":

"Insisting all the time that Social Democracy is the chief social support of capitalism, the Party has carried on intense and unceasing struggle against the German Social Democratic Party and the new 'Independent Socialist Labour Party' as well as against right wing and Trotskyist renegades who wanted the party of the proletariat to make a united front with Social Fascism against Fascism."

Today Stalinists try to crush all this aside, and inform the workers that they repeatedly offered the Social Democracy a united front. But the statement of Piatnitski in the "Communist International" for March 15th 1932 (English edition) should put all doubts on this score aside. Attacking Comrade Trotsky for urging the united front between the Communist and Labour Parties against Nazism, he wrote:

"The Social Democrats too sometimes put forward the slogan of unity. And in this the renegade Trotsky hastens to their aid with his proposal for a 'bloc' between the Communists and the Social Democrats... How is it possible to deduce... the necessity of establishing a 'bloc' with the German Social Democrats say, for the struggle against Fascism when the Social Democrats are doing nothing but helping the Fascists?"

However, if this theory made it impossible for the Stalinists to have a united front with the Social Democrats against the Fascists, it did not prevent the Stalinists having a united front with the fascists: with the Nazis against the Social Democrats! When, in 1931, the Nazis instituted a referendum to remove from power the Social Democratic Government in the Prussia, the Stalinists united with the Nazis to oust the Labour Party. The spontaneous reaction of the German Communist rank and file as well as sections of the leadership, was to unite with the Labour Party against the Nazis. But instructions were received from Moscow to participate in the Nazi referendum. Thus, we had the spectacle of the German C.P. participating in the Nazi referendum, working side by side with the Nazis to unseat the Labour Government. And Gallacher had the dishonesty to label the Nazi referendum, a 'Red Referendum'!

The Stalinists attempt to deny that the "line" had come from Moscow. But their denials are worthless to any honest worker who wishes to study the period and read a statement which the Secretary of the then Communist International wrote in the "Guide to the XII Plenum of the E.C.C.I." published by the British C.P. through Modern Books:

"You know, for example, that the

Party had proposed united fronts with the fascists. A section of the French Y.C.L. at one stage in the Popular Front Campaign, put forward a united front proposal to the French fascist youth against the Nazis. The Italian Stalinists put forward a united front policy with one section of the Italian fascists against another, and particularly against the German fascists. In Czechoslovakia in 1939, when Hitler cynically violated the Munich agreement and marched on Prague, the masses of the workers clamoured for arms to defend themselves. Instead of giving the workers a lead to take action against the Government which was helpless in the face of the onrush of the Nazi Army, Gottwald the leader of the Stalinist party of Czechoslovakia, appeared on the balcony of the Czech Parliament together with Rasin, the leader of the Czech fascists and called upon the workers to trust General Syrovky! General Syrovky, who at that moment was negotiating to hand the city over to the Nazis!

But Stalin himself was to have a united front with Hitler. Secretly negotiating with the Nazis, the "anti-fascist" policy was thrown overboard within 24 hours. The non-aggression pact freed Hitler's hands for war, and Poland was invaded. In Moscow, Stalin was dining and drinking with the Nazi butchers just as he does today with the representatives of allied imperialism. And while Stalin was assuring the workers of Russia and Germany that this unity was "sealed in blood" and that there was now no possibility of war between the Soviet Union and Germany, Trotsky was publicly warning that Hitler would use the pact to consolidate his base in Europe, and then turn round and rend the Soviet Union.

But even after the victory of Hitler, and with the introduction of the Popular Front policy, the Communist

For three years this policy was carried out, and the Communist Party recruited many hoodlums, whose main activity was to smash up Labour meetings.

The Trotskyists were expelled from the British C.P. precisely for opposing this policy and demanding the adoption of a correct united front policy with the mass organisations of the working class, the Labour Party and the trade unions. In 1932 they were expelled without the right to state their case at the Battersea Conference. Let Pollitt, Campbell and the other fakery deny this historical fact!

Attacking Trotsky for proposing the united front against fascism, Willie Gallacher in a pamphlet entitled "Pensioners of Capitalism," 1934, wrote:

"So the Bourgeois liberal Trotsky puts forward the apparently simple, but totally un-Marxian, solution of a united front with the Social Democracy with the main object of keeping out the fascists."

From this sorry position the Stalinists swung right over to the equally false position of the "Popular Front with capitalist parties. This resulted in the "Communist" Parties subjecting the interests of the workers to those of the "non-fascist" capitalists who according to the Stalinists would carry out a genuine fight against the fascists... but only if the workers refrained from putting forward their own class policy! In practice this meant having a united front with one section of the capitalists against the workers and eventually the victory of fascism over the popular front.

From Support of British Imperialism to Justification of Hitler

The most cynical trick in the history of the British Labour movement was foisted on to the members of the C.P. on October 7th, 1939. Suffering from the hangover of the "Popular Front" line; incapable of fully understanding the implications of Stalin's pact with Hitler; the leadership of the C.P.G.B. continued to support the British ruling class—to support the war. But it took one month for the "line" to seep through from Moscow. In conjunction with the Stalinist parties in all the "democracies," the C.P.G.B. completely reversed its policy.

Pollitt and Campbell were accused of leading the Party off the rails—against the wishes of all the other members of the E.C. This fairy tale was driven home by the "declarations" which these miserable creatures signed and which were widely publicised in the party press. The atmosphere was created that the new decision was a "self arrived" at "democratic" decision on the part of the overwhelming majority of the party executive.

But the truth is very different and is easy to establish. There is not a single published document in existence written by one of the so-called "anti-war" faction preceding the manifesto of October 7th either of a public character—or written for internal party discussion opposing the pro-war line. What happened to these "intransigent" "Bolsheviks" (!!!) that they allowed two of their members—even if they were leading members, to force the party into a completely false and unprincipled line; into supporting

the war when they should have been opposing it? Either they were spineless time-servers without principle... or the statement that they "opposed" the war was a fake. There is no evidence, not a single written line that any member of the C.C. opposed the war during this period. But there is a mine of information that they supported the war in exactly the same terms as Pollitt and Campbell. Every issue of the "Daily Worker," "World's News and Views," "Challenge" and all the other C.P. controlled press carry articles from the pens of Rust, Dutt and all the other executive members supporting the war during this period. Far from the party leaders making a genuine "mistake" at the beginning of the war, the evidence all proves that they got the line from Stalin. Pollitt and Campbell were just the scapegoats!

But the new "anti-war" line, far from being a genuine revolutionary policy for the overthrow of capitalism and the defeat of Hitler, demanded peace with Hitler on Hitler's terms. The Manifesto of the C.C. of the C.P.G.B. dated October 7th 1939, formally reversed the partyline. In italics, this manifesto stated:

"The continuance of this war is not in the interests of the people of Britain, of France, of Germany. End this war before it has brought death and destruction upon millions and millions of people, before the flower of our youth is slaughtered."

With this statement we are in complete agreement.

But how to end the war and defeat the war-mongers in Britain and destroy Fascism? The "Socialist Appeal" advocated then as it does now, that the British workers should struggle for power in its own hands here and then assist the German and European workers to overthrow Nazism. Not so the Stalinist Party.

They advocated "Peace With Hitler": Of course, they tried to cover it up with left terms.

Here are a few typical quotations from the "Daily Worker" during this period.

On October 2nd the main "Daily Worker" headline read: "It is not Too Late"—Moscow view of Peace Offer to Europe. And on the following day their main headline said in regard to Hitler's peace offer:

"Opinion Grows in Favour of 'Serious Consideration'."

On the day after that so quickly had opinion grown in favour, that the Communist Party issued a special statement saying:

"We are against the continuance of the war. We demand that negotiations be immediately opened for the establishment of peace in Europe."

In answer to a questionnaire sent round by the "Daily Worker," Bernard Shaw advised:

"Cease Fire, Turn Up the Lights" and this provided the headline of the October 14 issue of the "Daily Worker." Professor Haldane agreed on the necessity for an armistice and a negotiated peace, and so also did that present redoubtable champion of "democracy" Sir Stafford Cripps. Willie Gallacher toed the line with:

"We must face up to whatever peace terms there are." And don't forget: these peace terms were Hitler's Peace terms!

On November 2nd, 1939, Molotov endorsed the Nazi policy of rapine and conquest in the following statement quoted from the "Daily Worker" of the following day:

"Today so far as the European great Powers are concerned, Germany is in the position of a State which is striving for the earliest termination of the war and for peace, while Britain and France, which but yesterday were declaiming against aggression are in favour of continuing the war and are opposed to the conclusion of peace. Roles you see are changing."

Commenting on Hitler's speech at the end of January 1940, the Editorial of the "Daily Worker" of February 1st, stated:

"Hitler repeated once again his claim that the war was thrust upon him by Britain. Against this historical fact there is no reply. Britain tempts were made to end the war, but the Soviet German peace overtures were rejected by Britain. All through these months the British and French Governments have had the power to end the war. They have chosen to extend it... War should never have been declared on September 3, there should have been negotiations and peace talks."

But the new "anti-war" line, far from being a genuine revolutionary policy for the overthrow of capitalism and the defeat of Hitler, demanded peace with Hitler on Hitler's terms. The Manifesto of the C.C. of the C.P.G.B. dated October 7th 1939, formally reversed the partyline. In italics, this manifesto stated:

"The continuance of this war is not in the interests of the people of Britain, of France, of Germany. End this war before it has brought death and destruction upon millions and millions of people, before the flower of our youth is slaughtered."

To be continued.

NEXT ISSUE WE WILL DEAL WITH THEIR SO-CALLED CRITICISMS OF OUR POLICY.