PRICE 2 CENTS

THE MILITANT

Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 126 East 16th Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class mail matter, November 28, 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.

VOLUME VI, NO. 26 [WHOLE NO. 200] NEW YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1933 PRICE 2 CENTS

THE PRICE OF RECOGNITION

Stalin's Bargain

(EDITORIAL)

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM was indubitably the victor in the negotiations which culminated with the official recognition of the Soviet Union. Diplomatic recognition by the richest and strongest country of the capitalist world and the prospects of credits to follow represent, of course, certain advantages to the workers' state. But these advantages are far outweighed by the price that has been paid for them by Stalin and Litvinov.

In return for American recognition and prospective credits the Stalinist bureaucracy has turned its back more openly and completely on the international revolution than ever before. The **de facto** liquidation of the Comintern as the organizer of world revolution is now virtually acknowledged by formal renunciation. The right even of "residence" on Soviet territory of American revolutionists or their "representatives or officals" is taken away by the formal pledge of Litvinov. At the same time American capitalism is given the unconditional right to plant nests of counter-revolutionists in the Soviet Union under religious guise. And back of the whole monstrous bargain lurks the sinister implication of a secret military understanding which would seek to put the American proletarian movement at the service of American imperialism.

That is how the latest achievement of Soviet diplomacy really stands. Let the corrupted bureaucrats of American Stalinism and the dubious "friends" of the Soviet Union cheer for the "victory" and fool the radical workers about it. There applause is always on tap, ready in advance for anything. International revolutionists have the duty to estimate the shameful and perfidious bargain at its real worth and tell the truth about it.

"Compromises" - When, and How

THE BURNING indignation of the revolutionary internationalists at the latest exploit of Stalin-Litvinov diplomacy has nothing whatever to do with opposition "in principle" to compromises by the Soviet Union in its relations with the surrounding capitalist world. We, better than any others, have understood that the Soviet Uinon needs access to the world market, that it needs credits and diplomatic relations with capitalist countries and must pay for them with corresponding "concessions"—not because it can really build "socialism in one country", but for precisely opposite reasons.

This realistic understanding of the actual needs of Soviet economy, combined with the aim of uniting the American with the Soviet workers in a bond of common interest, motivated our three-year old proposal to organize a fighting movement of the American workers under the slogans of recognition and long-term credits for the Soviet Union.

Compromises and concessions as such are not in the least involved in the Communist appraisal of the Washington agreement. **What did we get and what did we pay for it?** Does it strengthen us or weaken us in the never-ceasing struggle with the international class enemy? These are the real questions. Lenin said, at the time of the Genoa conference eleven years ago: "We go there as traders." But the diplomacy of Lenin, his compromises, his "trading", were subordinated to revolutionary politics on the international arena. They supplemented and strengthened the aggression of the Comintern. The diplomacy of Stalin-Litvinov trades off the Comintern and the international revolution and, by that, undermines the foundation of the Russian Revolution also. The difference is fundamental, and none has understood it better than the imperialists who concluded the Washington bargain for Soviet recognition.

Soviet Diplomacy in 1918 and 1933

WITH A PERVERTED cynicism possible only in people who are as lacking in allegiance to principle as in any sense of reality the miserable spokesmen for American Stalinism are beating the drums for the Washington agreement and hailing it as a proletarian victory. That is not surprising. Those who could defend the capitulation to German Fascism are capable of defending anything—and their resources in this line are not yet exhausted. True, they had to remain in hiding for several days in order to concoct an explanation of Litvinov's pledges to Roosevelt. Meanwhile the capitalist press quoted the documents and brutally pointed out the contrast between Soviet diplomacy in 1918 under Lenin and in 1933 under Stalin, between revolutionary internationalism and "socialism in one country". The contrasting documents of the regime of Lenin and the regime of Stalin show all to plainly who was the real victor in the Washington negotiations. They reveal such a frightful degeneration of Soviet diplomacy, such a fundamental departure from the line of Lenin, that the **Daily Worker** does not dare to quote them side by side.

In 1918 the Soviet Congress assembled in Moscow replied to the message of President Wilson:

"The Soviet Republic takes advantage of the message of President Wilson to express to all the peoples who have suffered from the horrors of an imperialist war its warm sympathies and its honest belief that the happy moment is not far away when the workers of all countries will throw off the yoke of capitalism and establish a socialist regime, which alone is able to bring about a just and lasting peace and to contribute to civilization and prosperity of the workers."

From that atitude "we are miles as well as years away", said the **New York Times,** in quoting the old document of Soviet diplomacy. How far we are away from it can be fully comprehended by a reading of the pledge made by Litvinoff at Washington. Point 4 of this 1933 document reads:

"4. Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group—and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group—which has as an aim the overthrow of, or bringing about by force of a change in, the political or the social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions"

If that does not mean a complete renunciation and repudiation of the Comintern, as far as the United States, "its territories and possessions", is concerned", what does it mean?

The Bourgeois Press Celebrates

IN POINT 3 of the same document the Soviet Union had already agreed to "restrain" all persons and organizations "under its direct or indirect control, including organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from it", from any revolutionary activity aimed at the U. S. government. But even that was not enough to satisfy the demands of the Wall Street bandits who, according to the **Daily Worker,** were "defeated" in the negotiations. In point 4 it is even agered to deny representatives of revolutionary parties in America the right to live in the Worker's Fatherland, and to refuse asylum to revolutionary refugees from America who remain active and unrepentent.

The full significance of this agreement is well understood by the most qualified representatives of the American ruling class. The **New York Times** remarked: "The United States receives the most complete pledge against Bolshevik propaganda that has been given by the Soviet Government". Father Edmund A. Walsh, one of the chief baiters of the Soviet Union, is quoted by the Associated Press: "The Soviet Government, through its Commissar for Foreign affairs, now pledges itself to terminate the residence of all such organizations (as the Third International) on Soviet territory". The digest of editorial opinion in the South American press, according to the **New York Times,** is "that the Soviet Union of today is different from Lenin's Soviet. The desire to conquer the world has been abandoned, writers say, holding that bland pacific methods and economic propaganda have succeeded it." So runs the whole chorus of bourgeois press comments. Have they been "deceived"? Are they, perhaps, mistaken? Let Stalin come out in the open and say so!

Was U.S. Imperialism Outwitted?

NO "CORRECTION" of this impression will be made—of this we may be sure, despite the pathetic attempts of **Daily Worker** to pass off the explicit propaganda pledge as a "routine" matter. The most rapacious of all the imperialist powers has not been "outwitted" by the clever Litvinoff, as the shamefaced apologists imply. Just as Roosevelt demanded and secured explicit **pledges,** so it can safely be assumed that he secured definite **guarantees,** that every concession in the way of credits will have strings attached to enforce the guarantees and that full payment will be exacted.

Blunt reminders of these expectations of 100% fulfillment of the pledges were not spared even while the ink was still wet on the agreement. "It goes without saying", said the **N. Y. Times,** "that public opinion in the United States will watch closely the observation of this pledge. It will not accept technical excuses for violation." Father Walsh adds: "The political success or failure of the new agreement, in my opinion, rests fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the Soviet Government, which is now under solemn covenant, openly and voluntarily arrived at, to end the Third International."

The Basis of the Retreat

SUCH A SHAMEFUL retreat of Stalinist diplomacy before the arrogant demands of American imperialism is not the result of a sudden departure in policy. It is a culminating point in a long series of mistakes and crimes which proceeded from the theory of "socialism in one country". This theory, and its practical expression in the abandonment of the international revolution, disorganizing the international proletarian vanguard and undermining the strength of the Soviet Union from within, prepared the way for the humiliating spectacle at Washington. The official repudiation of the Comintern at the behest of Wall Street was only the formal ratification of a fact already accomplished in practise. The Comintern was killed as a revolutionary force by ten years of Stalinist leadership. At Washington its murderers marked a cross over the grave.

If Stalin and Litvinoff, under pressure of American imperialism, went further than they wished to go; if they were compelled to expose their real policy before the world more clearly than ever before; if they felt constrained to make great public concessions and, very probably, still greater secret ones, expressed or implied—all this is also the outcome of the weakened position of the Soviet Union brought about by the theory and practice of Stalinism over a period of ten years.

By transforming the parties of the Comintern into mere pacifist frontier guards for the defense of the Soviet Union they robbed the parties of the Comintern of their revolutionary fighting capacities and, consequently, of their effectiveness even for the

(CONTINUED ON PAGE 4)

The "Vital" Paragraphs 3 and 4

..3. Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group—which makes claim to be the government of, or makes attempt upon the territorial intergity of, the United States, its territories, or possessions; not to form, subsidize, support or permit on its territory military organizations or groups having the aim of armed struggle against the United States its territories or possessions, and to prevent any recruiting on behalf of such organizations and groups.

4. Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group—and to prevent the activity on its terrjtory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group, which has as an aim the overthrow of, or bringing about by force of a change in, the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions.

MAXIM LITVINOFF,

Resume Trial of Scottsboro Negro Boys

In an atmosphere charged with the electricity of mob violence, with the white hooded Ku Kluxers riding every night and burning the fiery cross on the highways and hilltops, terrorizing the entire Negro population, the Southern bourbons are bringing the nine Negro boys to trial on the notorious railroading charge of the supposed rape of Ruby Bates and Virginia Price.

The facts and evidence in the famous Scottsboro case proving the innocence of the Negro boys, in which the star witness for the prosecution, Ruby Bates has vindicated the defendants, and the Supreme Court, are clear beyond a doubt. But the class laws of the lily-white south are undaunted by truth. Innocence or guilt is determined by the callousness of the palm of the hand and the color of the skin.

Preparing the Rope and Faggot

"Justice is too slow", says the barbarous ruling class which is preparing the rope and faggot for the Scottsboro boys. Samuel S. Liebowitz, the attorney retained by the International Labor Defense, through several of his employees, has circulated through Morgan County to ascertain the sentiment of the local population, and has found that the prevailing idea is to circumvent the slow processes of "justice" and apply direct action to the Negroes on trial.

Of course, this invesitgation included only the whites, the business men and their hangers-on. The Negroes have been so terrorized, that, according to press reports, they go far out of the way to avoid stating any opinion on the trial. Liebowitz and the other attorneys for the defense have an armed guard protecting them every minute of the day against threats at "Jewish lawyers from New York". Bigotry marches side by side with race hatred.

The Real Crime of the Scottsboro Boys

The ruling class of the South wants to make an object lesson of the nine Scottsboro boys. Their crime is not having raped the two women involved but of belonging

(Continued on page 4)

Maria Reese's "I Accuse"

Turn to page 3 for the damning indictment of the Stalinist course in Germany written by comrade Maria Reese, a leading member of the Communist Party of Germany and one of its outstanding public spokesmen.

The Diplomacy of Stalin and the Diplomacy of Lenin--a Contrast

M. Litvinoff and -- M. Bedacht

"The Communist Party of Russia Does Not Concern America and the Communist Party of the U. S. Does Not Concern Russia"

Individuals, even many of them at a time, can be deceived. Classes cannot. Lincoln expressed this idea in a somewhat vaguer way in his famous aphorism about how long a period of time it is possible to fool people.

The bourgeoisie is not in power outside the frontiers of the Soviet Union because it is stupid. On the contrary, the decades it has spent in ruling and oppressing the masses, have sharpened its wits to a fine point, endowed it with cunning and skill in dealing with its classic and mortal foe, the proletariat.

Far easier, as a general rule, to deceive than the bourgeoisie, is the working class. Overwhelmed and blinded by the stupendous capitalist machinery for molding its outlook, its understanding of problems and events, the proletariat advances only with the most painful difficulty towards the attainment of consciousness of its class interests and historic mission.

If for this reason alone, the responsible leadership of the working class rests its case upon clear-cut pronouncements. Ambiguity and over-complicated maneuvers are at the very best, and only under special circumstances, an auxiliary weapon, for as a rule they confuse not the enemy but the working class itself.

But when a step is taken which covers up something from the working class under the pretense of practising a "maneuver", it passes far beyond the stage where it merely creates confusion. Such a "maneuver" is the pair of statements made to the press by Maxim Litvinov and Max Bedacht on the subject of the relationships between the American and the Russian Communist Parties.

"Isn't it true that the Communist Party of the United States insists on speaking in the name of Moscow," asked the Washington representative of the socialist Forward, according to the **Daily Worker** report of the interview granted by Litvinov.

"I must profess ignorance", replied the latter. "The Communist Party of Russia does not concern America, and the Communist Party of the United States does not concern Russia."

This, writes the editor of the **Daily Worker** with a triumphant, whimper, is the correct version of the Litvinov statement to the correspondents, and not the one printed, among others, by the New York **Times,** which reproduced a balder version to the effect that the two parties had nothing to do with each other.

The difference lies essentially in the structure, and not in the significance of the Litvinov declaration, even if the cotton-strained **Daily Worker** account is accepted.

None of the bourgeois papers of any consequences has been deceived. In its commentaries on Litvinov's letters and assertions, the bourgeoisie has recognized with unconcealed gratification that the representative of the Soviet Union has not merely consented to the formula that the republic will not carry on any propaganda in the United States—a customary diplomatic assurance of no fundamental significance—but to what Russia has never consented before: not to tolerate the activities on its soil of a labor organization which has hitherto enjoyed its hospitality: the Third International.

Beginning with its first utterance on relationships with foreign, capitalist governments, in 1918, Russia has never ceased to make it clear that its government has no intention of imposing the form of its regime upon any other land, that it is prepared to undertake commitments binding it not to carry on any propaganda in other countries asking only a reciprocal engagement from the world bourgeoisie. That is one thing, and in no way out of harmony with the principles of the workers' state. A promise that it would not grant hospitality, or at least asylum, to an international labor organization whose aim is the emancipation of the world's working class—a hospitality which was not refused a similar organization (the First International) by either England or the United States in the last century—it has never before given to the capitalists, however much they tried to extract it from the Soviet leaders.

This promise has now been given by Litvinov! He gave it in the stilted, but quite unmistakable, terms of his letter to "your illustrious president" Mr. Roosevelt. Then, to assure the American bourgeoisie beyond any possibility of their fears recurring, he made it plain to the newspapermen that:

The Russian Communist Party is concerned only with Russia. The American Communist Party, if there is one ("I must profess ignorance"), is concerned only with America. The Communist International, as the general staff of the world revolution, does not exist, for it has not the victorious Russian party in its leadership, nor the absurd American party in its ranks.

Made it plain not merely to the newspapermen but also—and this is vastly more important—to the millions of workers who read the capitalist press and who have no cause for taking the People's Commissar at anything but face value. Assuming that this was intended merely as a clever maneuver against the bourgeoisie—and we have every reason not to assume this—its concrete effect could not but be an icy douche down the spinal column of the American Communist movement and whatever there is internationalist, i. e., Marxist and revolutionary, in it.

If any doubts can conceivably remain about this "trifling concession" which Stalin-Litvinov have made to the American bourgeoisie, Max Bedacht, representative of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the United States, has ruthlessly eliminated them. Exactly like Litvinov (who at least has the thin excuse that he is, after all, a government emissary), Bedacht hastened to assure the American bourgeoisie that the Third International is no longer to be feared, that it is nothing to worry about.

The New York **Times** (11-19-33), which prints Bedacht's statement, writes: "Asked aobut M. Litvinov's statement Friday evening that the

(Continued on Page 4)

ELIMINATION OF C.I. RUBBER-STAMPED

The Washington Agreement in the Light of Soviet History

A storm of controversy has broken around the recognition of the Soviet Union by the government of the United States. Watery liberals disdain to discuss the question: who was victorious in the negotiations? But the representatives of the big bourgeoisie on the one side, and the proletarian revolutionists on the other, both conscious of the fact that in every skirmish of the class war there is a victor and a vanquished, are far from unconcerned with an evaluation of the discussions between Litvinov and Roosevelt which ended in normal diplomatic relations being established between the two republics.

The Propaganda Pledge

The controversy centers around the last three articles in the communication addressed to Roosevelt by the Russian emissary on November 16, 1933. Let it be said right at the outset that with few exceptions, the whole American press in this country has correctly estimated them in their true light. The outstanding exception is the official purveyor of Stalinist apologetics, the **Daily Worker,** which, after a significant silence for days, broke out into voluminous daily explanations of the Litvinov documents.

"Every single one of these articles," writes the editor on November 21, "in some form or other, has been part of the numerous recognition pacts that the Soviet government has signed during the last ten years with the leading powers of Europe. Far from being 'concessions' forced from a reluctant Soviet Government, the Soviet Government was willing and offered to sign such articles with all capitalist countries."

The Stalinist mamelukes are deliberately lying! It is not by chance that they reproduced the articles in question without direct comment or elucidation. It is not by an oversight that they have failed to reproduce a single one of the "numerous recognition pacts" as proof that it ocntains articles similar to the ones offered the United States by Maxim Litvinov.

Before examining the articles

(Continued on Page 4)

Mass Meeting of Food Workers Acclaims Drive for General Strike

New York.—The Hotel and Restaurant Workers Union, branch of the Amalgamated Food Workers, is laying the necessary machinery to cope with any emergency that the Hotel Men's Association and the Restaurant Men's Association are trying to force through the NRA, which openly plays a scabbing role against the food workers.

On November 16, the local compliance board of the NRA ruled that the waiters' wages must be abolished and the gratuities of the public should be considered a sufficient amount of money to cover the $15.00 weekly minimum for waiters. Our Union protested vigorously against this infamous ruling and succeeded in forcing the local NRA to rescind their former decision. B. J. Field said at the NRA hearing that a great resentment exists among the restaurant workers and a strike is imminent unless the ruling were withdrawn. Flore of the A. F. of L. joined Field's statement that a strike is imminent. The secretary said further that employees have been coming to the NRA headquarters with complaints and receiving no satisfaction. Always, he said, their representatives met with a courteous reception, received a full hearing of their grievances and went away empty handed. Nothing ever was done to intervene at complaints that men were discharged for organizational activities.

He attacked the vicious tipping system which degrades the men and demanded that a minimum of $35.00 a week be given as wages to the waiters. Even the arch-reactionary Grover Whalen for the sake of appearances agreed with Secretary Field that the whole tipping system might well be done away with. Mr. Whalen made it clear that the national NRA administration decided definitely that tips should not be considered as wages.

In spite of this decision we are informed that the Hotel Men's Code was signed by the President last Friday without any public hearing which would at least give an opportunity to the labor representatives to present their viewpoint, as was done prior to the signing of other codes. This shows plainly that in the case of the food workers President Roosevelt does not apply even the legal procedure required by the NRA simply because the hotels and chain restaurants in New York City and elsewhere are owned and even operated by the banks. This proves that capitalist laws can be enforced only against workers and petty bourgeoisie, and sometimes against small industrialists. But by no means does Roosevelt dare to force the bankers to accept so-called reforms. The most ironical item of this code is the inclusion of the consideration of the tips of the waiters as wages to cover the $15.00 minimum. And this was done secretly only three days after the same NRA declared officially and reported in the leading capitalist press that tips an gratuities should not be considered as wages.

So far no union has been able

(Continued on Page 4)

FROM THE MILITANTS

Unemployed Confab in Minneapolis

Minneapolis.—A Conference on unemployment was held in Minneapolis on Sunday, Oct. 29, in the headquarters of the Central Labor Union, as recorded in a previous issue of the **Militant.** The conference got under way shortly after 2 P. M. Wm. F. Bennett, trade unionist and delegate from the 10th Ward Farmer-Labor Club, was elected temporary chairman and Karl S. Kuehn, secretary of the Volunteer Committee, was elected temporary secretary.

Comrade V. R. Dunne, regularly elected delegate from the Councils For United Labor Action, was chosen by the Volunteer Committee to make the report on Unemployment Conditions. He was allowed 30 minutes for his report which was well received by all the delegates with the exception of 8 or 10 Stalinists who represented the Communist Party and its closely sympathetic organizations. His report was a Marxian analysis of unemployment and led directly up to the resolutions which he was to present at the end of his report.

Forty-Nine Organizations Represented

The credentials committee reported 87 delegates representing 49 organizations were present and a recommendation was brought in and accepted to seat them all. A resolutions committee of 5 was elected by ballot and out of a list of about a dozen candidates the following were elected: Dunne of the C. U. L. A.; Thomson, Teachers Federation; Norris, Socialist Party; Frank, Lathers Union; Haley, 11 Ward Farmer-Labor Club. Comrade Dunne received the highest number of votes.

The resolutions committee brought in unanimous resolutions with the exception of one, and that one was quickly ironed out on the floor. The resolution on decentralization of public relief which contained objectionable phrases about self-help, was replaced by another one and was readily adopted on the floor. Several good resolutions on forced labor, unemployment insurance, a shorter work week, consumers co-operatives, etc., were also passed.

A resolution calling for the setting up of a permament committee consisting of one delegate from each organization present and one from each working class organization which may later affiliate, to be known as the Minneapolis Central Council for the Unemployed, was accepted. This resolution also called for proportional representation to be adopted as quickly as possible.

Achievements of Conference

In spite of the many bad features of the conference it can truthfully be said that it pushed the movement forward and resulted in a real victory for the ideas of the Left Opposition. When it is taken into consideration how the Volunteer Committee was loaded down with all kinds of opportunist ideas on the solution of the unemployment problem; how it was composed of people, some very energetic and sincere it is true, but who had scarcely a single idea on the kind of a program that the present objective conditions demand; how our comrades joined the Committee and patiently struggled along; and how out of this whole affair was realized a real program and the best conference on unemployment that Minneapolis has ever had, then it is clear that our method of working in the mass movement brings fruitful results. Our comrades take credit for making the report on "Unemployment Conditions" the principal issue in the conference and, by so doing, sidetracking the report on the "Co-operative Projects" and making of it a secondary issue. We were also mainly responsible for making it an all-inclusive conference with the result that it is now impossible for any other group to organize a counter-conference on the grounds that certain organizations were excluded from the first conference. In the process we have also come in contact with some excellent working class elements who have become immensely impressed by our ideas.

Work Has Only Begun

However we are aware that the building of the united front against unemployment has only begun. Much diligent work has yet to be performed before positive results will become apparent and we recognize that most of this will have to be performed by the class conscious Left wingers. Several traits characteristic of Stalinist conferences also found their way into this conference and are being carried over into the Central Council For The Unemployed. The outstanding one is the injection of issues, other than the one which the conference was called to consider. This has the immediate effect of narrowing down the forces which can be crystallized into a functioning organization and at the same time it dissipates the energy of the group by exerting it in too many directions. This is the greatest danger which the Central Council is faced with at the present time and one that our comrades are struggling against.

The Central Council is at present arranging for a huge mass meeting to be held in the Municipal Auditorium. The date is tentatively set for Dec. 10. —**CEE KAY.**

Toronto Conference on Anti-Labor Laws

Toronto.—On Sunday, Nov. 12, there took place in Toronto an Eastern Canada Conference for the repeal of the notorious anti-labor legislation section 98. The Conference Call was addressed to "all labor organizations" so the Left Opposition organizations and auxiliaries sent their delegates.

One does not feel enthused in participating in a Stalinist sponsored conference, because it is a fact that not one conference these people have organized for no matter whatever good purpose has ever shown a successful outcome.

When our delegates handed in their credentials to the committee in charge, the credentials were literally thrown back in their faces—a procedure unheard of even for Stalinist conferences. When we asked this Stalinist flunkey, who as it afterwards turned out was only anticipating orders from the higher bureaucrats, by what right he was motivating his arbitrary action of rejecting credentials which was a prerogative only of the conference, we received the reply, "You are disrupters". To argue with a hopeless bureaucrat or a fool, whatever this specimen of Stalinism represented, could serve no purpose so our delegates placed the question before the conference when the discussion of the report of the credentials committee was up.

The higher bureaucrats, whether because they feared obvious opposition from the few outside organizations present, or the effect of their actions in the labor movement, decided to back down on their flunkey's stand, and denied the whole matter. When we insisted on our statement of the facts, we were ruled out of order and called disrupters. We handed in our credentials again and this time they were accepted without a word.

Mass Meeting Speeches

A conference is, as I understand it, convened for organizations who agree on a certain purpose, as it happened in this case "The fight against Section 98" for common united front action. For all the positive value of the whole of the afternoon session, it might have been an unusually long, grand mass meeting. First one Stalinist exposed section 98 in an abbreviated speech that lasted one hour. Then an other delivered a harangue which lasted almost two hours. Although section 98 should have been exposed to the complete satisfaction for the simplest person there who might have been ignorant of what section 98 signified this was not enough. Now it was the turn for the delegates from the WIR, the F. S. U., the W. U. L., the Y. C. L's, the Unemployed Councils, the Ex-Servicemen's Leagues, etc. to deliver their exposures, which weren't completed at the end of the session.

The Rev. A. E. Smith

The morning session next day happily brought this exposure to a close after another half dozen speakers had said their word. The rest of conference session was taken up with the election of a committee of action, which Rev. A. E. Smith hoped might not suffer a premature death one week after the conference closed, as has been our experience in the past." Finance was a very important item, as was a committee to plead with the premier, which committee everybody was reminded, should include trade unionists so that the government officials could not call it "another Communist committee". Then came "one of the most important orders of business", resolutions, greetings, and the program of action, the reading of which took exactly 30 minutes, and the discussion less than five, and the farce was at an end. —**M.**

CORRECTION

An unfortunate error in our composing room caused the following section of the article by comrade Crique on the "Blight of Stalinism in Mass Work" to be omitted from the last issue of the **Militant.** It follows in logical sequence from the section of the article already in print.

* * * *

The enthusiasm of the workers was high. The following week the board of supervisors announced a new food order with a full choice within a very wide range of foods and necessities, clothes were offered and a resumption of road work was promised by the 1st of February. Steele wanted to propose a united front call by the U. C. to all unemployed organizations but found himself facing a hostile Section leadership of the Party which branded him as a "Social Fascist".

The Section Bureau ruled:

1. That the Unemployed Councils would issue a united front call demanding road work, unemployment insurance, etc.

2. That the B. B. U. should immediately withdraw from the U. C. R. A. and should affiliate with the Unemployed Councils. That the B. B. U. should immediately change its name to Hayward Unemployed Council. That if this program was not carried out Steele should be placed under discipline as a "Social Fascist" and the party units should be disciplined.

These instructions split the B. B. U. wide open. Two weeks later two organizations were weakly functioning where one had been before. The Welfare Board played its part and scared out all wavering elements by threatening to cut off their relief if they failed to withdraw from the new U. C.

The U. C. held its United Front and a comrade reported that instead of singing the Internationale they substituted, "I'm so all alone." Subsequently the united front call was started with an article in defense of Manchuria and ended with the slogan of Defend the Soviet Union. Steele was expelled as a "stool-pigeon". Now, over a year later, the Unemployed Councils still number less than 200 members.

—**F. CRIQUE.**

Evolution of the Anti-War «Fighters»

Right from the very beginning, when the World Anti-War Congress was first mooted, the Left Opposition, in all its sections, endeavored not only to expose its make-up, but to reaffirm the attitude and principles of Lenin on the question of war.

It was in order to achieve this end that the L. O. representatives entered the Congress held at Amsterdam, August 27th—29th, 1932. Not to oppose the fight against war but to seek a solution that would build up a real working-class organization, with proper Communist leadership. How necessary that task was has been abundantly stressed lately.

Professor Albert Einstein was a member of the original Committee which called the Congress. Much use has been made, by the Communist Parties identified with the Communist International, of the name of Einstein. True, it was said, he is a pacifist, but he is ready to resist the danger of a new war.

How little truth there was in this claim, and what little right the Comintern has to make use of his name in anti-war work is shown by Einstein recently. Not only has he attacked Soviet Russia; not only has he broken off his relations with the anti-war united front committee; but he has actually advocated Belgians joining the army of their country.

"I say frankly that if I were a Belgian I would not refuse military service in the present circumstances but on the contrary would accept it with wholeheartedness and with a feeling that I would be contributing to the salvation of European civilization."

Following Einstein's spectacular exit from the Anti-War Committee, on the grounds that he discovered through the pamphlet of the Labour Party that it was a Communist organization, Bertrand Russel (Earl Russel) likewise disassociates himself:

"I severed my connection with the Anti-War Movement some time ago as soon as I discovered that it was a Communist body in disguise. This had been concealed from me at first by an impressive list of non-Communist names and by the title of the organization, which as I subsequently discovered, by no means correctly represented its aims."

These defections should go a long way to enlighten all workers anxious to fight war; and the falsity of THIS type of united front against war, under the guidance of the Comintern so unably led by Stalin. Workers! Back to Lenin, and his methods!—**From the British "Red Flag".**

SUBSCRIBE TO THE MILITANT!
READ SPREAD AND SUPPORT
THE MILITANT
IT IS YOUR PAPER

LEAGUE ACTIVITIES

Debate Stalinists in St. Louis

St. Louis.—When comrade Swabeck spoke to about 100 workers in St. Louis on October 27th on the question of Fascism in Germany and the bankruptcy of the German C. P. as well as the C. I. the Left Opposition was challenged to a debate by a rabid Stalinist, C. Wynroth. Wynroth, who was one of the organizers of the Food Workers Industrial Union, was told by the writer, that he will face persecution by the party bureaucrats for discussing the German question. "You're a liar," he said, "The Party is glad to discuss anything with anybody, and I'll expose you." He stated that he would debate in the name of the Party with the L. O.

The debate was announced for November 10th. As soon as the Party officials learned of this, they mobilized all the influence they had on Wynroth so that he would not go through with the debate with the "counter-revoutionary Trotskyites". They had two "reasons". (1) The Party doesn't debate the past. If the C. P. makes a mistake, it criticizes itself, and doesn't need criticism from outside. (2) The St. Louis C. P. has no one capable to debate this question with Payer of the L. O., and the District will not send anyone from Chicago for that purpose. Wynroth waved aside these reasons. He insisted that he was going to debate and to expose the "Trotskyites" as nothing more than liars and counter-revolutionists.

On the day of the debate the Party issued a circular letter to all workers of St. Louis calling upon them to "Smash these enemies of the working cass". Headlines stated that, "Trotskyites' debate on German Fascism is a Fake" and "Communist Party does not debate with stool-pigeons". Underneath these trimmings every worker was told that C. Wynroth is not a member of the C. P., that he is a scoundrel, a misled worker, a stool-pigeon, an agent of the capitalist class just as Payer is. That Payer and Co. are paid out of the royalties from the half a million dollars which Trotsky received from the capitalist press for writing articles against the recognition of Soviet Russia by U. S. The circular ended up with "Give no comfort to these enemies of yours". Drive them out of your midst!" "Fight for the unity of the working class!"

Despite the above "warning", about 100 workers came to hear the debate, among them the Party section organizer Chauntz with about 25 Stalinist henchmen. They came over in a body, apparently to break up by force the debate, or to endeavor to get control of the hall, and make it a meeting to slander the Left Opposition. A warning was given to the Party disorganizer not to attempt to disturb the meeting, and the chairman opened the meeting by outlining the rules of the debate. Chauntz stood up, turning his eyes in all directions apparently to see if he had enough force to break up the meeting. He apparently thumbed down that idea, and asked for the floor before the debate started. He wanted to make a statement. He did, for about 15 or 20 minutes. "The C. P. will debate with everybody", were his identical words, "Republicans, Democrats, Socialists, I. W. W., but it will not debate with Trotskyites, because they are counter-revolutionary!" He called upon the workers to "honor" Soviet Russia by everyone leaving the hall. Not only did not a single worker follow the advice of Chauntz, but not even all of their 25 who came in a body! Only 17 of his bodyguard walked out. The others stayed in the hall and listened very attentively to the discussion on Germany.

The Left Opposition speaker, Payer, gave a Marxian analysis of the German situation. Wynroth exhibited his ignorance not only about Germany but about everything connected with the revolutionary movement.

In the discussion that followed Geo. Benz, candidate for Mayor on the Communist ticket in the last elections, denied that Stalin and Co. expelled Trotsky. He stated that he had made "a thoro study" of the controversial Trotsky question. Workers shook their heads in astonishment as the words rolled out of his mouth about Lenin—with a gun in his hand!—making Trotsky resign!—in 1926! And that Lenin himself had Trotsky expelled in 1927!

This is the type of Stalinists who fight "counter-revolutionary Trotskyism" in St. Louis. No wonder they do not want to debate.

«I Am With You for a New Party»

Chicago.—I have been a member of District 8, Communist Party since 1928, during which time I have participated in all the struggles engaged in by the movement. I have labored day and night in organization work among the masses. The District leaders, recognizing my willingness to work, began sending me around the State of Illinois and also in Wisconsin to address meetings and do organization work. On April 26, 1931 I was sent to Rockford, Illinois to prepare for the May 1 demonstration. Finding that the local comrades were unable to do much, I began to hold outdoor meetings that reached many hundreds of workers. Because of this activity, I was arrested. This making the eleventh time that I have been arrested for my activities in the labor movement.

This arrest brought home to me the fact that because I was not a "leader" I could be discriminated against and forgotten in jail and, when fined by the courts, the leaders would generously permit me to serve out my time. At the same time they pay the fine and take out any member of the "official" family that would happen to be arrested.

I protested against this discrimination repeatedly but could get no answer. Finally, because I was insistent they began to call me a "counter-revolutionary". The sectarianism and bureaucracy in the party has gradually caused my estrangement.

However, because I have been a firm believer in revolutionary discipline, having fought against Fascism in Italy, France and Germany, I tried to hang on to the party. Soon, though, we were expelled from the party, myself and a number of Italian comrades, because I absolutely refused to accept the sectarian policies and the bureaucracy.

I have been, now for some time, reading the **Militant** and I am in full accord with its viewpoint. I shall be one of the first Italians in America to fight for a New International and for the destruction of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

I am with you in the formation of a new revolutionary party and will bend my energies in propagandizing among the workers for this end.

Anti-Semitism in 'Progressive Miner'

Kansas City, Mo.—In the recent columns of the **Militant,** the rightward swing of the Progressive Miners Union has been analyzed by a few of our comrades who have been active in the Illinois area. Comrades Oehler and Giganti have shown us with accuracy the trend of the P. M. A., and how its leadership is following in the footsteps of the A. F. of L. by ousting the militants and trying to prove to the dear old "public" that they were "respectable."

But on the editorial page of the **Progressive Miner,** for Friday, October 27th, the reactionary character of the P. M. A. chieftains is paraded before the eyes of the rank and file of the workers in its full scope. The leaders apparently are not satisfied merely to ape their ideological brothers, the A. F. of L. fakers, but have gone into the realm of the American Hitlerite pretenders—the Silver Shirts. They are aiming to transform what appeared to be the infant prodigy of the revolutionary labor movement in America into the spearhead of reaction. Although their bid for blackguard duty is ill-timed, nevertheless the stench of castor oil, lead pipe, and bludgeon is to be found in the following editorial from the **Porgressive Miner** for October 27, 1933 entitled: "Russian Commissar To Visit America".

"There is more than passing interest in the visit of this so-called "International Salesman" Litvinoff, who is to sit down to talk about international affairs, with President Roosevelt. We read with amusement much about 'once more recognizing Russia'; 'rehabilitating a trade relation that would net America hundreds of millions of dollars'; and an 'understanding relative to the proposed position of America, should a war materialize between Japan and Russia.'

"We are also hearing much about the possibilities of Morgenthau as a likely Ambassador to the Soviet State. Not long ago we read that Barney Baruch had been having a long chat with Litvinoff and about the same time our 'unofficial President Barney' was hobnobbing with Count Karolyi while hunting around Slovenski-Nesgar.

The **Militant** can perform a great revolutionary service to the rank and file members of the P. M. A., and the entire American working class by throwing the searchlight of its vigorous criticism upon these fakers—the Progressive Miners' misleaders—the working class enemies in their full regalia. We must show the proletariat the reactionary role of the Messrs. Joe P. Goett, Edwin Bowen, C. E. Pearcy, and Wm. Keck as more than a mere trend but an organized move of the exploiters. To group Litvinoff, Morgenthau and Baruch smacks too much of the ugly methods of czarism and now of Hitler. Inoculating race hatred is still one minds of the workers is still one of the capitalist trump cards, as can be measured by the article in the **Progressive Miner.**

—**A. C.**

Down with Stalin and his clique!

Down with bureaucracy and Sectarianism.

Forward for a Revolutionary International and the World Revolution.

—**THOS. SABATINI,**
New Member of the L. O.

Fifteen Years of Democracy in the Czechoslovakian Republic

The Czechoslovakian Republic is about to celebrate its fifteenth anniversary. The foreign reader, and also the proletarian reader, is generally very poorly acquainted with this county which he very often places among the "Balkan" countries, but which, because of its location in the heart of Europe, is not without importance in the imperialist game of European politics.

The legendary personality of the good, noble soldier, Schweik, is more familiar than the problems and conflicts which stir the social life of this state. Perhaps the name of Masaryk, this type of mediocrity and professorial platitude, this oracle of the Czech petty bourgeoisie; and the name of Benes, the servile wire-puller in the service of French imperiaism in the provincial Geneva theatre are known. These two names, which the **Temps** eulogizes as the inspiration of the "most democratic regime in Central Europe", celebrating the **"Union of the three principal elements of the social life of this state of Czechs, Slovaks and Germans in one national life"** which appears to represent the quintessence of harmony, friendship and good-will.

The **Temps** forgot to add that this devout democracy, in reality, rests on systematic cultural, economic and political oppression of more than three and one-half million German workers and petty bourgeoisie, on the unscrupulous and unlimited exploitation of the "brother" Slovak people, living in uncultivated and pitiful villages, who are aware of the bloody brutality of the Czech gendarmes as the only messengers of the new liberty; that this democracy rests on the merciless tyranny exercised on Carpathian Russia, where for years one epidemic of famine has followed another and where the highest dream of the Ruthenian moujik, living in the cultural darkness of biologic misery similar to that of the moujik of Czarist Russia, consists literally in being able to eat black bread to his hearts content only once!

Add to that the "peudrik" (the police club) the daily diet of the Czech worker; the restrictions—incorporated in the Czech constitution—on freedom of assembly, of the press and the right to organize, and you have a picture of this "most democratic and liberal regime" where the most modern methods of popular deception are combined with the well-tested methods of the tyranny of the Hapsburg monarchy.

However, even this empty democracy has not been able to resist the blows of the world crisis. It is precisely at the time when **Le Temps** sings the most beautiful eulogies to Czechslovakian "liberty" that these creatures are about to bury it in silence.

Czechoslovakia, like France, has been one of the last countries drawn into the vortex of the world crisis. A series of circumstances explain this fact, without speaking of a certain equilibrium between Czechoslovakian industry and agriculture and the advantages of the colonial exploitation of the national minorities by the Czech bourgeoisie. The ruling classes had already succeeded, in the years prior to the crisis, in a wholesale deflation of wages. What was already the standard of living of the Czech worker during the rising conjuncture—what was already the standard of living of the Czech worker is classified in the 13th rank although it is among the first industrial countries of Central Europe.

At first the relatively attenuated evolution of the economic crisis in Czechoslovakia reflected itself in the relative stability of the bourgeois government. Since the autumn of 1929, the time of the last parliamentary elections, Czechoslovakian politics have been directed by a Green-Red coalition, in which several minority fractions participate.

The national pillars of this coalition are formed by two parties. Firstly, the **Czechoslovakian Republican Party** (agrarian party), a party which (while being the most reactionary) resembles the French Radical-Socialist party by its social basis and its gravity in parliamentary life. The second party is the Czechoslovakian social democracy which, despite its four years participation in the government, and thanks to the genial policy of the Stalinist leaders, has become in the last few years a force numbering almost 200,000 members, 60% of whom are worker elements. (The official membership of the C. P. is 30,000 members!)

The aggravation of the crisis was accompanied by a constant regression of the working class in its daily struggles. During the four years of economic crisis, there have been only rare strike movements of any large scope, movements which have not been able to engulf the entire working class and which were strangled in an uncompleted stage.

Without encountering the least extra-parliamentary resistance the government has been able to endow itself—about one year ago—with dictatorial powers for anti-working class economic legislation. The development of this crisis was accompanied a growing weakening of the C. P. The red trade unions have become pitiful shadows of their former selves.

It is therefore quite understandable that with the growing pressure of the ruling classes on the masses, social discontent is more and more seeking a solution from the impasse of nationalist opposition against Czech imperialism. In fact, in the last epoch, the latter found itself in serious conflict with the tendencies of the national minorities. The victory of Fascism in Germany has caused a great deal of agitation among the petty-bourgeoisie of German Bohemia. They have been vigorously suppressed by the government which went as far as the proscription of the **German Nationalist Party** and the **German National Socialist Party.**

If the Fascist movemnt—despite the rather favorable conditions for it, (the absence of a proletarian vanguard; the desperate and impossible situation of the petty bourgeoisie)—has not outgrown its swaddling clothes, this is primarily due to the scattered nationalities of the petty bourgeoisie and its Fascist factions whose interests and demands clash violently.

Only recently the Czech fascist tendency of Stirbny (an old member of Benes party) succeeded in creating an "oppositionist bloc" of extreme right Czechs-Moravians-Slovaks which would have been able to seriously threaten the parliamentary existence of the present government and lay the foundations for the further development of a larger pro-Fascist movement.

Add to that the growing activity of the Hungarian Irredenta and the strengthened demands of the Carpathian autonomists, and the desire for a struggle against the extreme right and the extreme left will be easily understood. The desire for a true democracy which would "plan the interests of classes and nationalities", the desire "for a strong and authoritative state" becomes ever more insistent.

The democrats are beginning to blast that very thing they have canonized up till now. Masaryk, who for years thundered against all the regimes which kicked over the democratic freedoms (naturally, against the dictatorship of the proletariat especially) has made a new discovery: "that the democratic regime is not incompatible with a dictatorial regime" if this dictatorship is led "by tested and capable men". A substitution of the principle of parties by the principle of "capable" people. This is the first step towards the new idol; Bonapartism.

However it would be a repetition of the inane mistakes of the Stalinists to want to dub every infringement on the classical methods of liberal democracy as Bonapartism. Before taking recourse to "pure" Bonapartism, whose foundations are unsure and which is in constant danger of overthrowal by Fascism, the bourgeoisie attempts to traverse a series of intermediary stages, in the course of which it proceeds with constant amputations on the democratic organism in order to continue to conduct its affairs with the help of the multilated democratic trunk.

In this connection the Czechoslovakian bourgeoisie has appropriately chosen its fifteenth anniversary to pass a law which makes the attempt to ward off the Fascist danger, to the detriment of the democratic system....the piecemeal elimination of democracy.

The new law gives dictatorial power to the government for two years to dissolve at any moment whatsoever any political party or any formation considered a political party—and that under conditions which—we will see—do not dissemble their Fascist inspiration. This law opens the door to the government to reduce—by annulling the mandates of the proscribed parties—to reduce the parliaments to the number necessary to insure a secure "democratic" majority.

The following are the essential points of the new law:

1. The right of proscription not only of any given party, but at the same time of all its existent or future auxiliary organizations and of all parties which attempt to replace it.

2. The given organizations instead of being dissolved, can be maintained under the control and direction of the functionaries of the state (that is to put all the mass organizations at the disposition of the state, such as the trade unions, similar to the method practised by Fascism).

3. Confiscation of all the property of their members by the state.

4. The prohibitions of all public functions and the cancellation of its electoral mandates. A corresponding reduction for the number of the constitutional majority in parliament.

5. The right of the limitation of the personal rights of the members of the proscribed organizations; confiscation and censoring of their correspondence, censoring of their telephones and telegraphs; forced residence in determined districts with the right of police surveillance (translated from the "democratic" hypocrisy into the Fascist language: **concentration camps).**

6. All persons who not only continue activity in proscribed organizations but who have any connections at all with them will be condemned. The punishment is twofold, on the one hand the penalty inflicted by the administrative authorites, without trial (up to six months in prison) and again by the tribunal by means of the law for the safeguarding of the republic, (penalty of several years).

Are not the Stalinists correct in identifying democracy and Fascism, by speaking of social-Fascism in face of the adoption of such a law by a government that contains 7 socialist ministers? In reality, this affirmation serves more than ever to mask the real responsibilities in a situation where, thanks to the shameful bankruptcy of the Stalinists, the bourgeoisie succeeds in coquetting with Fascism.... without mobilizing the petty bourgeois masses, without the least "illegal" action, by a simple parliamentary-bureaucratic maneuver.

The proscription of the entire Communist press and of several auxiliary organizations of the C. P. has met with no resistance, not the slightest from the C. P.

During the discussion, in parliament on the new law, the Communist deputies displayed the attitude of small obedient school children. It is the tactic of the old imperial socialist Smeral who has not yet forgotten the class slogan of the pre-war social democracy: **"Do not allow yourself to be provoked"!**

It is characteristic that during the discussion of the law in parliament not one word was mentioned on the subject of the C. P. The possibility of dissolving the party without any serious difficulty is a foregone conclusion for the bourgeoisie. The press speaks of "the depressed and confused attitude of the Communist deputies frightened by the severe attitude of the government."

The political bankruptcy of the C. I. brings in its wake the material destruction of its sections; after the German, Bulgarian and Austrian parties, it is now the turn of the Czech C. P. to die a shameful and lamentable death!

—**J. KELLER.**
From La Verite.

MARIA REESE ACCUSES! An Indictment of the Stalinists by a Leader of the German C.P.

(**Editorial Note: Unser Wort,** central organ of the Internationalist Communists of Germany, publishes in its last issue a sensational letter sent by Maria Reese, leading comrade of the German Communist Party, to the Central Executive Committee of the C. P. G. and the E. C. C. I. We reprint below the statement of comrade Reese and the biographical commentary of **Unser Wort.**)

* * * *

Comrade Maria Reese was one of the best known and most beloved mass speakers of the Communist Party of Germany. All her meetings used to be overfilled. She distinguished herself from the other C. P. G. speakers, by leaving aside all the empty phrases and meaningless gestures and by, instead of that, seriously and objectively polemizing against the policy of the social democracy.. In 1929, comrade Reese, at that time a member of the Reichstag, came over to the C. P. G. from the S. P. G., after realizing that the policy of the S. P. G. could not lead to socialism but rather aided Fascism. Her action aroused a great deal of attention among the working class at that time and was utilized by the C. P. G. in a big campaign against the social democracy. After the German catastrophe, when she saw that the C. P. G. had collapsed in Germany and that aid for the German proletariat could be expected only through international solidarity, comrade Reese went abroad to work for the vanquished German working class and against the Fascist dictatorship. Comrade Reese was persecuted for her activity by the police in Denmark and expelled from Sweden.

The fact that such a comrade as Maria Reese, who because of her sense of responsibility before the working class went over to the C. P. G. from the S. P. G., today makes a break with the Stalinist bureaucracy—this constitutes a heavy blow for Stalinism and a signal for the German proletariat. We are firmly convinced that the most decisive sections of the membership of the C. P. G. will go the same way as comrade Reese. All the frenzied shouting, all the lies and calumniation of the bankrupt C.P.G. and Comintern bureaucracy cannot impede this development.—**Unser Wort.).**

* * * *

For months I have been making repeated attempts to clarify my political differences with the party and the leadership of the Red Aid (I. L. D.) by means of oral and written discussion. These attempts were of no avail. My letters to Moscow have been concealed for the most part, confiscated or simply not transmitted. My discipline, which forced me to remain silent before outsiders on the internal differences, was utilized in order to slander and isolate me.

Our last discussion, in which my political accusations were not taken up, has convinced me that I cannot take back my written accusations of September 25. On the contrary, for the clarification of the matter, I must add to them and emphasize the fact that it is a matter of **fundamental political** questions now appearing in your **Committee-Politics,** which is nothing else but a consistent extension of your catastrophic policy before Hitler's seizure of power. In it is expressed a typically petty bourgeois lack of confidence in the power and mass struggle of the proletariat, which is even increased by you abroad to the point of **despising the mass movement,** linked up as it is with phrases and with a philistine overestimation of the liberal bourgeoisie, which in your view is to be substituted for the scarcity of class struggles and for the defeated Communist party.

HOW YOU FOUGHT AGAINST A MARXIST POLICY?

After **your** shameful defeat in Germany (**before** which you had disappeared into illegality, in order to preserve your precious leadership of the working class for the time after the defeat, leaving us, the army of rank and file soldiers, without a command), your **Committee-Politcs** has now completely divorced you from the mass movement, with which you, as representatives of the bureaucratic party machine, have long ago lost all contact. Through your sectarian policy of the last few years you have failed to bring about a mass movement in Germany or internationally. On the contrary, despite the revolutionization of the masses, you have weakened yourselves. In despair, you are now seeking succor in the arms of the lords and countesses, just as the social democrats did—with Bruening and Hindenburg....

Your opportunism is so incurable that you no longer can conceive that I am fighting against the **Committee-Politics, in principle.** That is why you have told your bourgeois "comrades-in-arms" that I insult them, because I have opposed your putting them up as the standard bearers of anti-Fascism, through which you deceive the working class. In one "common front" with them you have sabotaged my work for the Red Aid and for the defeated German working class. When Fascism advances in these countries, it meets with no resistance from your bourgeois "comrades-in-arms". But it is your policy that has prevented a proletarian mass movement from being created, that movement which alone can offer the necessary resistance, as I have so often and so repeatedly stressed by verbal and written protests....

I do not intend to return to the Soviet Union in order to sacrifice my revolutionary work for a life liberated from material cares. Moscow—i. e., the Comintern, not the workers—is officially convinced of the correctness of your policy because of foreign-policy considerations to which it is sacrificing the world proletariat, although it recognizes you and despises you as the abominable bankrupts you are; and Moscow is agreed to have you continue your "leadership" over the revolutionary labor movement of Germany from the coffee-house tables in Paris, while you tell the deserted German working class that you are at the front. Thus you permit yourselves very easily to hand out "brave" and provocative orders, to which later on the elite of the proletariat is sacrificed. Thus, with Muenzenberg's uncontrolable committee behind you, you can very easily play at revolution.

The dictation of the Comintern has made the C. P. G. defenseless, because it produced mental slaves, because it eliminated the democratic influence of the workers in the matter of policy and leadership of the party and because it thereby prevented a selective leadership. Whoever thinks independently, falls a victim to slander campaigns. But when a situation came, at which Moscow left you without a command, you "great" leaders remained headless and helpless. That workers' democracy which could have kept you informed about their strength and their mood of struggles; which would have enabled even you Moscow parrots to lead in such a fatal hour—you yourselves cast it aside disdainfully. You did not even begin to imagine that you could learn from the simple worker, that the worker himself gathered so many new experiences in the course of the ever sharper class struggle from which you not only could have but should have learned in order to evaluate them for the purpose of the organized struggle. For more than a year and a half there was not a single meeting of the commission for mass work to which I belonged, although I protested at least fifty times in writing and by word of mouth, because I desired the organizational construction of the united front and not only beautiful congresses, from which the workers were turned back empty-handed, because there was lacking a sensible way of building up of the united front. The experiences of the workers were not utilized for practical purposes. When they did break through the bonds of the bureaucratic brace in which they were held by S. P. G. and C. P. G., spontaneously as was the case in Brunswick, where they united, then they were once again rapidly scattered because the organizational medium was lacking. Only the press still boasted, long after the event, of the great united front success which the apparatus attributed to itself. Moscow had to be shown how well the work was being done.

In all these questions, I informed the C. E. C., but the great strategists of the C. P. G. had learned to memorize a few undigested theses, which they were busy putting through—or else all their energy was consumed in the organization of the factional struggle they conducted for little jobs. You knew all this better than I, and you know it now. **But you knew nothing whatsoever at the decisive moment.** That is the strongest proof that you never knew anything and never will.

THE OPPORTUNIST COMMITTEE-POLITICS.

I have been fighting against your Committee-Politics, because it is a crime against the working class and has nothing whatever to do with revolutionary class struggle. It is the politics of the despairing, of the defeated, of those who have lost all belief in the power of the working class. It is only an extension of the Muenzenbergian congress-comedies, at which telegrams of felicitation from Heinrich Mann or Einstein are supposed to take the place of the united front which is never achieved.

Dahlem, in his childish enthusiasm for the "struggles" of the good burghers in the democratic countries against the foreign fascisms, only keeps on looking for all kinds of sensations—and that is in fact what all the Committee-Communists are doing. They forgot completely that all these things are mere bonfires that will only leave behind them a fithy heap of ashes which the revolutionary movement of the masses—the one you are obstructing in its development by your Committee-Politics—will only have to sweep away.

You have always taken the road of least resistance and particularly at present, when it brings you an income through Muenzenberg. That is a source which imperialism will stop, when it has no use for you any longer. But by that time the Red Aid will not have been built up, through your false policy, for it is already today left almost without any means by your politics.

You do not at all wish to discuss politically about the questions of Committee-Politics and the German catastrophe. Committee-Politics permits you to live more conveniently. Besides, the line has been laid down in Moscow, and therefore is correct. Thus—without any discussion we in Germany slid right down into Fascism. But today, the workers who believed in your leadership have to pay for your irresponsibility. I have almost broken down under that strain ever since February 28. I cannot keep quiet until experience shall once again prove your policy false. There is a certain "discipline" which is a crime against the working class. To maintain silence about your Committee-Politics is just such a crime. You no longer believe in the power and in the fighting qualities of the working class. Therefore you conclude alliances with foreign lords and ladies who have as much interest in our fighting comrades as the Hitler barons.

It is not **you** who are utilizing these people, as another comrade of the Political Committee expressed himself naively. **Imperialism** is utilizing you, in order—with your active aid—to prevent the mass struggle and the revolutionary advance in its own countries. You are in this way advancing, indirectly, the Fascist development in these countries and you are thereby striking the world proletariat in the back—particularly the German and the Russian. **That is what I have been fighting against.** Only the solidarity of the world proletariat can help the German workers and defend the Soviet Union, which is threatened by nothing so much as by the current Comintern policy.

SABOTAGE AGAINST THE RED AID

You have sabotaged my work for the Red Aid from the beginning, because the Muenzenbergian Committee-treasury — which is not controlled by any workers' organization but only subordinates itself to a few of his confidantes—is much more pleasant. Thus Muenzenberg and yourselves have always been able to hide behind the excuse that Lord This or Lord That did not want this or that which is to the interest of the working class and above all—that it was not in the interest of the big business man Muenzenberg.

Thus, according to the comrades, some lord would not tolerate my speaking at a meeting called by the Committee in London at the beginning of July, because I wanted, **in one small sentence,** to mention the fact that there is an auxiliary organization in Germany whose members risk their blood and their lives, in order to be of help to the victims of Fascism, namely, the Red Aid. I then refused to speak, so as to be able to protest against this opportunist line. Copies of the protest were sent to you and to Moscow. In reality the lord did not perhaps know anything at all about this. Katz dictated for Muenzenberg and the line is: every advancement of the Red Aid must be subordinated in the interests of the Committee-treasury over which the workers have no control.

The Red Aid treasury is at least controlled by the apparatus of a workers' organization. The money does some good to the victims of Fascism in Germany. The Committee-moneys never reach them, confidential people who owe no one on account have charge of them. The Red Aid is almost without any means for its tremendous tasks. Particularly now it would have been easy to build it up and to create the means for genuine support of it. You have **consciously obstructed** this and the West European Comintern parties have gone along with you.

I came from Moscow in order to bring the Red Aid to the Front. In the interests of the Committee-treasury you have seen to it that not a single meeting was organized for this purpose for me. No method was too filthy for you to defame me among your clique. You succeeded in turning the Comintern apparatus against me in no time. Muenzenberg's agent, Katz, followed in my trail with the money collected for the German anti-Fascists, in order to sabotage my work and make it impossible.

You answered my protests finally by forbidding me to work, because I had said something against Muenzenberg and you succeeded in getting Moscow to recall me. And you infamous bankrupts really imagined that such a command could seal my lips. **Before** your latest self-exposure, before your catastrophic collapse in Germany I would have taken a party order from you and carried it out. But not **after** that.

THE INGLORIOUS CAPITULATION BEFORE HITLER.

How can you dare face me as leaders, after I have learned to know your real worth in all your wretchedness, following Hitler's seizure of power? I had to pose political perspectives before the workers at the mass meeting, but you remained deaf and dumb at Hitler's assumption of power and we did not know the least about any of your plans. I could never have believed you so irresponsible that you would surrender the working class without any defensive plan, after posing for years as its leaders and after your manifold promises to lead it in struggle.

Even if the prerequisites for a revolution were not at hand, because the social democratic leaders rejected struggle in principle and because our party had failed to win over the majority of the working class by its sectarian attitude in the question of the united front, you had no right to leave the revolutionary army in the ditch without a defensive plan. I was disquieted, like all the revolutionary workers that I met. "The party does not trust us sufficiently", "it is at least necessary to know where we stand", "we can't just simply allow ourselves to be slaughtered off", "an order must come for the whole Reich", etc., the workers said. It was not revolution, but defense that the workers were thinking about and they believed that in that the social democratic workers **could** be pulled along and thus make a revolution possibe.

The certainty that the struggle was inevitable instigated them to sacrifice their last pennies for the preparation of the resistance. You did not prevent them, although you never did have struggle in mind, as little perhaps as Braun and Severing. Now the workers must let themselves be arrested, repressed, tortured and thrown into the concentration camps, withering away one by one, due to your headlessness and helplessness.

I believed—and many of the functionaries with me—that you had some particular, illegal defense apparatus of which we were in ignorance, one which would inform us about what to do when the Fascists drew back for the final blow. You were always so boastful, but that was only for show at the mass meetings, in the papers, at the convention parades and even in the sessions of parliament. There you gloated over the fear that your wild, but never seriously meant, speeches aroused in the philistines.

And because you did not take yourselves seriously, you poor mannikins of history, therefore you also did not take Fascism seriously. But the workers knew that Fascism had to be taken seriously. If the party had had a democratic control over the apparatus, and if the latter had not been omnipotent with regard to the working masses and servile with regard to the Comintern, then such vain show-offs like yourselves would not have been in the leaderships of the party.

I tried in vain, after the entry of Hitler into the government, to find a leading comrade and to find out what sort of a perspective these suddenly silenced leaders actually had. For I had to appear before the working class. But not a one among you could be reached.

We were surrendered just like this, the workers and all of us who were not in the apparatus. Your whole preparation for illegality consisted in securing the continuity of payments of salaries to the apparatus people, the safe-maintenance of machinery, etc. It was only thus that Hitler could wreck the whole party with the stupid lie that the Communists had set fire to the Reichstag, without having to mobilize his whole army.

A victory and a defeat without a struggle. Only one lie, that it was we who had set fire to the old dump, sufficed to unmask all your boasts and qualities of leadership and to make the German working class defenseless, to leave it as a mass without ledaership.

The social democratic leaders... to be sure! If you had taken your own words seriously, you would have known that they could not fight. But you all set your "opportunistic" hopes upon them, didn't you? Then why didn't you ever say: "We can only fight, if the social democrats will make a beginning?" According to Heckert's apologetics, that would be the natural conclusion. But I am mainly complaining that you did not even prepare the defensive and that in the hour of danger you took refuge in the bushes without as much as a word, that you surrendered the workers who waited defensively for your command.

After several of us, astonished that nothing had happened; that nothing had been done for the defensive—although you knew about the plans of the Fascists; that at 10 o'clock on the morning after the night of the fire no leaflet had appeared as a reply to the accusation; that no action of resistance had been begun—after we then, without guidance and in the face of an unresisted destruction of the party, did undertake something on our own initiative to come to the aid of the deserted proletariat, what do you do? You can only heap insults on us and from your safe hiding-places, you call us indisciplined and headless. If you had had your heads on your shoulders before, then those who remained faced with responsibility to the working class and sharing its fate, would not have had to become "headless". You had reconciled yourselves beforehand to the heavy fate that was to befall the working class.

But we, who did not previously bear ourselves with that ostentatious, bureaucratic sang-froid, behind which is concealed most often great egoism; we who know that the workers want to fight but not to be sacrificed uselessly; we who saw the whole pitifulness of the disappointed masses and could not, would not wait any longer for your commands because by then we could not imagine in our dreams that you poor bankrupts would still deign to play the role of leaders again—we acted. It was not out of headlessness or in flight that I left for Denmark. I could have also gone into hiding like yourselves and I could have looked on, like you, in silence, while the working class bled defenselessly.

THE REICHSTAG FIRE AND THE SITUATION OF COM. TORGLER.

I saw that you had not prepared anything and that for the moment the only aid that could be furnished was the mobilization of the international proletariat, and clarification of why we did not set fire to the Reichstag. I was in the Reichstag on February 27 and I can explain why comrade Torgler is innocent. As a result of your headlessness and helplessness after Hitler's entry into the government due to your catastrophic failure, as a result of despair for the fate of the working class adn conscious of his innocence, he wanted to take the step toward a helpful individual action so as to prevent the worst. You, least of all, have any right to make a political complaint against him. It was because of your irresponsibility that he was chained and despite your coalition of lords and countesses he will be condemned although innocent, if the international proletariat does not prevent it.

And you sit in your Parisian cafes and criticize. You play roles and do not even appear to realize in what situation comrade Torgler is appearing before the court. You simply persecute him with your filthy gossip, achieving such brilliant results that Romain Rolland and Barbusse write in Muenzenberg's **"Gegen-Angriff"** after the first appearance of the defendants, commending Dimitroff and the Bulgarians for their bravery and not even mentioning Torgler. For shame! Even if Muenzenberg handed them the assignment, these men must have shown what an insult to Torgler their attitude meant. But that only coincides with the decision of the German C. E. C., which passed a resolution in Paris at the same time and published it in **l'Humanite,** also comending only comrade Dimitroff for his bravery. And you mean to tell me that you do not practice factional revenge? You do worse than that. You know quite well that the Fascists communicate with precision to comrade Torgler all the floods of political intrigue that issue forth from you and that they destroy him more with this means than with any of their other tortures.

It is precisely the German C. E. C. and particularly its political leadership that has all the cause to commend comrade Torgler, for never was a political defendant in a more painful situation—not because of the alleged crime, of which every one knows he is innocent—but because of the party leadership. This leadership had deserted its army and fled to the bushes without issuing a single slogan or a single word of explanation to its army, when the enemy was on the jump for the final blow.

How can comrade Torgler defend you before the workers? He was not in the German leadership like yourselves. He was only a parliamentarian and uninitiated in any of the plans, not even in any defensive plan, and believed as I did, that you could not possibly desert the proletariat in its most fateful hour. The situation became increasingly sharper, your helplessness was cloaked in a mysterious silence and in a lack of all indications as to how you evaluated the situation and as to what had to be done.

YOUR LATEST PEARLS OF WISDOM

Like the rest of us, comrade Torgler was very much concerned over this and attempted to reach leading comrades. When he finally found somebody from Tahelmann's most intimate circles, a member of the C. E. C., and asked him for advice, the brave one answered: "Well....if the workers won't fight, all the labor organizations are going to be crushed, a bloody terror is going to rage, murder and destruction of the proletariat will be on the order of the day, hunger, misery, balkanized conditions, concentration camps, war against the Soviet Union and perhaps, in the end, the decline of all culture. And you in particular—these sadistic homosexuals will hang you with joy in the market place and torment you to death in the indulgence of all their sadistic pleasures."

I shall never forget with what disdain and disgust comrade Torgler told me this and added in comment: "And these are supposed to be revolutionaries! To this end they have always boasted so, so as to have such a perspective without any plan of preventing it. And to say that of me, pfui...." And then he concluded: "One would think that he'd know something". And now comrade Torgler is actually going through all this. Do you think that your defenseless surrender of the working class has had no effect on comrade Torgler, has left no trace on him? Why didn't you heroes tell this to the workers beforehand? Why did you say that the Bruening dictatorship was open Fascism? Why did you, in saying that, prevent the workers from struggle? Why doesn't Heckert and why don't you speak of these and other sins? Do you believe that the German workers have forgotten this?

And when I met a comrade from the C. E. C. on the day of the fire and asked her for the perspective of the party, she said the same thing. So you did know what was going on, and yet you did not prepare any defensive—only defensive quarters for yourselves!

As late as February 27, Florin said helplessly when I met him in the Reichstag, where he had come for advice to comrade Torgler on the matter of postponing some trial: "If the workers won't fight ....etc." That was always the answer. But since when do leaders wait for commands from their soldiers? At the same time he also told me to retain my living quarters, perhaps we would remain deputies like in 1923. You were so helpless and headless that you were left without any perspective when the cable from Moscow failed to arrive. But the attitude of Moscow in that decisive situation shows what a catastrophe can overtake the working class, when the revolutionary movement of a country lacks independent leadership..

Full of anger, disgust and despair at so much irresponsibility and at the quiet getaway of the leadership, comrade Torgler wandered, conscious of his innocence, into the Fascist prison, driven by a sense of responsibility to the working class, whom he wanted to aid with his indivdual action. Comrade Torgler can defend the Communist party against the stupid provocative charge of burning the Reichstag, but he cannot defend the Communist party leadership before the working class. And that is the reason why you are letting loose a hinterland discussion about him which is quite worthy of your attitude before the fire—you who are vainglorious in the hinterland and make the work of other comrades impossible, finally forbid it altogether as "great leaders", because ....that might turn out to be competition to the Muenzenberg Committee-treasury in the interests of the Red Aid and because it might be of aid to the German anti-Fascists instead of Muenzenberg and yourselves.

WHAT IS NECESSARY

After the German defeat I had occasion to become acquainted with almost all the European Comintern sections. I found everywhere the self-same incapability to evaluate and utilize the political situation and its possibilities for the revolutionary movement. But all this is made up for by so much the greater intrigues. Also with regard to Moscow, which no one dares to oppose with political arguments, everyone works through intrigues, lies, the confiscation of letters, the defamation of active comrades, etc., etc.

The so-called political line is a colorful mishmash of ultra-Left adventurism and opportunism. Has it ever occurred to you that because of your catastrophic failure the Communist parties all over the world have suffered a loss of confidence among the masses? Don't you follow any election results? If such preposterous political bankrupts do not of their own will leave the arena of history, then it is time that the wrath of the workers should sweep them away. They must no longer pay any attention to them, but proceed to the creation of party forces independent of Moscow's Comintern and to the building up of a new Communist party and International which will not tolerate any omnipotent apparatus sitting enthroned above it, cut loose from the working class, but will on the other hand institute a democratic control of the workers over the apparatus and its employees.

Only thus will the working class be able to carry out its historic mission as the liberator of humanity. That will be difficult, but it is the only road, because the hope to renovate the Comintern parties no longer exists, since—after the frightful defeat in Germany, which was a defeat for the whole world proletariat—the bankrupt leadership with its disastrous policy are not compelled to abdicate. With such a leadership the revolutionary movement will only be carried to its grave for the benefit of a paid apparatus that has nothing whatever in common with the living, Bolshevik struggle.

I spurn the fleshpots of Moscow and material maintenance by your apparatus, as long I can do anything useful for the liberation of the proletariat. If you had been so great in the organization of the revolution as you are in intriguing and in political impotence, Germany would never have known Fascism.

Amsterdam, Oct. 26, 1933.

Maria Reese and the Comintern

In her open letter, published by the newspaper **Unser Wort** Maria Reese spoke the harsh and bitter truth about the party to which she belonged until very recently. The German agency of the Comintern bureaucracy understood nothing, foresaw nothing, prepared nothing. Revolutionary work it replaced by hollow phrases and boastfulness. It fooled the workers and the party year in and year out. The Central Committee fooled even its own apparatus. People who occupied responsible posts in the party like Torgler, head of the parliamentary fraction, or Maria Reese herself, deputy of the Reichstag, believed honestly to the last moment that the Central Committee had its plans, that it had prepared the necessary fighting forces, that the Comintern knew whither it was leading the German workers. With Hitler's coming to power and especially with the burning of the Reichstag by Goering's agents, the revolutionary illusions of the best elements of the party fell into dust. The Central Committee left the party to the mercy of fate without leadership, without slogans, even without explanations. Another such treachery on the part of the leaders is unknown in the history of the revolutionary struggle. It is not hard to imagine the dark despair of the betrayed masses and the frightful helplessness of the party apparatus.

An Unbearable Contrast

The emigrant activity of Muenzenberg, Heckert and Co.: false reports, lying correspondence, hollow and sham congresses intended to throw dust into the eyes, could not but appear to Maria Reese as an unbearable contrast to the inner events in Germany. Maria Reese demanded a discussion on what occured. She tried to obtain a change in the policy of masquerades to that of the revolutionary mobilization of the world proletariat against Fascism. At her every attempt she met just a blank wall. Reese then drew all the conclusions for herself: she broke with the Comintern and placed herself under the banner of the Fourth International.

After that the Stalinist bureaucracy, which has nothing more to lose politically, "expelled" Reese from the Comintern. But also into this act these bankrupts introduced all the traits of vengeful and lying impotence characteristic of them. The main accusation against com. Reese consists in the fact that she joined the camp of "counter-revolutionary Trotskyism". This estimation is not a new one! The "revolutionary" work of the Stalinists consists in systematic aid to Chiang-Kai-Shek, Pilsudski, Citrin, Wels, Hitler. According to this logic, Marxian criticism of these crimes is "counter-revolutionary" work. But this is not all. The resolution adopted in the name of the German Communist Party, that is, by a few bankrupts hiding in emigration, accuses Maria Reese of "rendering aid to the government of Hitler and thus delivering to the latter, party members and sympathizers". The awakened German proletariat will brand this base accusation on the foreheads of the accusers!

Maria Reese is "expelled" for her courageous open letter and only after the appearance of this letter, that is, after she herself broke with the Comintern. To call the bankrupts openly by the name of bankrupts is a direct duty of a true and sincere revolutionary. If Reese's letter can have any influence on the fate of the Communists persecuted by Hitler and particularly on the course of the Reichstag trial, it is only as invaluable testimony in favor of the accused. From the letter it is clear even to the blind how far removed the official party was from the thought of insurrection, from the preparation for an insurrection and consequently from such "signals" to insurrection as the Reichstag fire!

She Spoke the Truth

The Stalinist bureaucracy takes revenge for the fact that a responsible comrade who found herself until very recently in its ranks has openly and honestly spoken the truth about the leadership, the regime and the practices of the Comintern. The bureaucacy forgives cowardice, forgery, treachery and betrayals under one condition: to bring no tales out of school. For these people the laws of mutual responsibility have long replaced the laws of revolution and of Marxism. The fight for inflated personal prestige, for posts and for an assured livelihood have pushed to the background the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship. Maria Reese convinced herself of it on the tragic experience of the German proletariat. Together with her thousands and tens of thousands of betrayed revolutionaries have gone through the same experience. In jails and concentration camps they are drawing a balance from the catastrophe lived through. The letter of Maria Reese calls them to courageous revolutionary conclusions. It is the duty of every revolutionary in the whole world to publish, reprint and circulate the letter of Maria Reese in all the languages in which the exploited and the revolutionaries speak.

—L. TROTSKY.

November 10, 1933.

Notes of the Week

BACILLI CULTURES, concocted by bespectacled scientists in chemical laboratories, will serve as major ammunition in the next war. An article in a recent issue of **Weltbuehne,** published in Zurich, Switzerland by a group of exiled German intellectuals, reveals feverish activity among the bio-chemical savants as part of the general militarization of Germany by Hitler and his Nazis. The article is the work of an anonymous chemist, himself employed at this devilish task .

* * * *

The last war introduced the use of gases to poison the enemy en masse at the front. But the "enemy" was still left with sufficient human resources behind the lines. In the future, war methods are to be more effective: They will take care to rid the "enemy" of manpower in the hinterland as well. Reliable spies, equipped with the choicest of these deadly serums, will need apply only a single injection into one head of cattle to bring about the extermination of a whole metropolis, of millions of men, women and children.

* * * *

Meanwhile the war clouds are gathering, the harpies of capitalism are concocting the brew of bloody slaughter out of economic chaos and political despair. The spirit of the coming war is being nurtured with the mysterious hocus pocus of pacifist or nationalist slogans.

Who does not recall how the mystic gas of "Save the World for Democracy" poisoned the minds of hundreds of thousands whose bodies were later poisoned by Melinite and Yperite on the battle fields?

Who does not recognize today the venomous substance of that "democratic" war-cry which has brought in its wake the bloodiest and most ruthless of dictatorships in Italy, in Germany, in the Balkans, in Poland and Hungary?

* * * *

SUCH EXPERIENCES should put on his guard every thinking worker, every human being who can see further than his nose. The workers must be armed against the mental bacilli which are to do the advance work for the more tangible bacilli that threaten to destroy them by the millions.

* * * *

One such bacillus is the vapid oratory about Soviet Recognition as a step toward peace. Nothing can be more dangerous from the point of view of those whom the capitalist system exploits as profit-producing machines today and as cannon fodder tomorrow. If the Stalin bureaucrats who pose as Communist leaders of the workers join in and promote the spreading of such a poison—that only puts the stigma of betrayal upon them. The militant and wide-awake workers will not recognize the Roosevelt toasts of the **Prada** Stalinists as the voice of the Soviets. They will recognize it much rather in words, that the bosses' **New York Times** rejoices to remark, are "miles....away when we read the undertakings given by the Soviet Foreign Minister (Litvinoff)....as a condition of recognition by the United States". (Editorial, Saturday, Nov. 18.)

* * * *

Those words, the reply of Lenin's Soviet Congress in 1918 to an overture from the Roosevelt of that time, from the "idealistic" war monger Woodrow Wilson—were:

"The Soviet Republic takes advantage of the mesasge of President Wilson to express to all the people who have suffered from the horrors of imperialist war, its wam sympatihes and its honest belief that the happy moemnt is not far away when the workers of all countries will **throw off the yoke of capitalism and establish a socialist regime,** which **alone** is able to bring about a just and lasting **peace** and to contribute to the civilization and prosperity of the workers."

* * * *

The horrors of the "bacillic" imperialist war of the future—which promises to be a thousand times more terrible than the last, "poison gaseous" war—can be prevented in that same way only. This is the truth that the revolutionary workers in this country will have to pound out as a powerful defense against the advance bacilli.

—G....n.

THE MILITANT

Entered as a second class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. Under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published Weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Martin Abern James P. Cannon
Max Shachtman Maurice Spector
Arne Swabeck

Vol. VI, No. 26 (Whole No. 200)
SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1933

Subscription rate: $1.00 per year
Foreign $1.50 2 cents per copy

The Diplomacy of Lenin and the Diplomacy of Stalin-a Contrast

(Continued from page 1)

themselves, let us quote a bourgeois comment which directly contradicts the **Daily Worker** and is only typical of the reaction of the whole bourgeois press. "The bargain Mr. Roosevelt drove with Litvinov is the talk of diplomats everywhere," writes Paul Mallon, the Washington correspondent of the **Brooklyn Daily Eagle** (11-23-1933). **"Neither France nor Britain has as good an agreement with Russia as we have.** It really marks the first time Russia has ever given in to the world powers. **Our officials believe it will lead to the abandonment of the American section of the Comintern.** That means the Comintern will be advocating world revolution everywhere except in the United States. It does not matter much because that outfit has been more or less passive for several years."

Drawing the Balnce Sheet

The borugeoisie is deeply concerned with drawing up a balance sheet under what was given and what was received. The proletariat should be equally interested.

Article 3 of the Litvinov note to Roosevelt pledges the Soviet Union "Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group — which makes claim to be the government of, or makes attempts upon the territorial integrity of, the United States, its territorities or possessions; not to form, subsidize, support or permit on its territory military organizations or groups having the aim of armed struggle against the United States, its territories or possessions, and to prevent any recruiting on behalf of such organizations and groups."

Article 4 of the same note makes the significance of the Litvinov capitulation even more obvious: "Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group—and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group—which has as an aim the overthrow of, or bringing about by force of a change in, the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions."

In these undertakings, the Stalin regime pledges itself to something which it has never previously yielded to a bourgeois government:

The formal suppression or expulsion from the Soviet Union of the Third International, or any other revolutionary organization not strictly limited in its objects to Russia.

This is precisely how Roosevelt understands the two articles, this is how Litvinov really understands them, this is how the bourgeois press has universally construed them, for the simple reason that no other interpretation is conceivable.

And because this is how every Communist worker in the country has understood the terms of the recognition agreement, the **Daily Worker** has engaged in a campaign of befuddlement, deceit and falsehood which has exceeded all bounds which it has thus far reached in its polychrome career. Without the slightest attempt at analyzing the text, or of proving its absolutely untenable assertion, it dismisses the perfectly obvious with the declaration that the capitalist press

"....know that every attempt to claim that Article 4 of the Litvinov pact applies to the Communist International will meet with defeat." (11-21-1933.)

Is it possible that the editor really believes his readers to be so naive or stupid as to accept this bald affirmation as it stands, or is it merely his way of proving that he is worthy of his hire? To whom and what **does** Article 4 apply, if not to the Communist International? What "organization or group" has been formed or is now resident in the Soviet Union "having the aim of armed struggle against the United States, its territories or possessions"? What organization is engaged in activity on the territory of the Soviet Union "which has as an aim the overthrow of, or bringing about by force of a change in, the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions"?

To Whom Does It Apply?

Do these words of the pact—which we assume were written for some more serious purpose than the advancement of the consumption of paper and ink in the United States—perhaps apply to the Intourist? Or the Methodist church in Leningrad? Or the Moscow office of the General Electric Company? We permit ourselves to doubt it, however much our skepticism may perplex the editor of the **Daily Wroker** to whom it is all so clear, clearer, we have no doubt, than he is ready to write.

We ask the pardon of the reader for repeating the tragically obvious: The terms of the pact are anything but ambiguous. There is and has been one and only one "organization or group" on the territory of the Soviet Union which answers to the description: the Communist International. Litvinov has pledged the Soviet government to expel the International from its borders. And in doing so, he has given formal and, so to speak, organizational acknowledgement to a process of political liquidation of the Communist International which has been going on under Stalinist rule for ten years and which is not initiated but only crowned by the latest act of perfidy at Washington.

The pact does not only pledge Russia to the suppression of the Comintern. (We say suppression advisedly, for it is not really an expulsion. Can the seat of the Comintern be transferred to Berlin? or perhaps to Tokyo, or perhaps to ...Washington?) It means that the American Communist Party and its representatives in the Executive Committee of the Comintern, are henceforth non-grata witht he Soviet Government, and may not take up residence upon its territory. It means that a group of revolutionary Filipino nationalists striving for the independence of the Islands, driven from their land by American imperialism like the Russian revolutionists were driven from the Empire by Czarism—cannot find asylum in the fatherland of the workers of the world...For, impudent rogues that they are, they have designs "upon the territorial integrity of the United States, its territories or possessions". It means that if another Bill Haywood were to seek the hospitality of the Soviet Union, it would be granted him—if at all—only on condition that he refrain from conducting any political agitation or activity. It means leaving the American Communist Party in the lurch even more callously and openly than was done to the German Communist Party in the crucial days of Hitler's progress. It means—we cannot repeat it often enough—the suppression of the Communist International by the Stalinist regime at the demand of the American bourgeoisie.

A Lie of the Daily Worker

But such demands have been made in the past, many times, by various bourgeois governments, it is said. Yes, many times and by many governments. That is true. And, adds the **Daily Worker,** "every single one of these articles, in some form or another, has been part of the numerous recognition pacts that the Soviet government has signed during the last ten years with the leading powers of Europe." This claim we have labelled above for what it is: a lie.

What the Soviet government has signed, and what it has agreed to commit itself to since its first began relations with capitalist governments is a simple and unambiguous undertaking: that the **Soviet government** pledges itself not to carry on any "subversive propaganda" in the country with which it establishes diplomatic relations, if a reciprocal engagement is undertaken. This is quite understandable, this is correct, and warranted by the relationship of forces. It is the kind of a concession which is perfectly legitimate and required by the situation in which the Soviet republic, as a socialist state in a capitalist encirclement, finds itself. No serious revolutionist will ever lodge a complaint against such a concession, any more than he will opopse concessions to the enemy in principle. He will understand that it is given not because Russia has ceased to be revolutionary, but because the workers in the capitalist countries have not yet become revolutionary, i. e., are not yet prepard to seize power.

That is one thing. Quite a different thing is the question of the Communist International, founded as a voluntary, independent world party of Communism, with sections in every country, to which the workers of Russia and their government, from its inception, have granted hospitality and complete freedom of action. (Just as, let us add, capitalist governments have granted hospitality to the international Red Cross which has not refrained from carrying on reactionary, and even counter-revolutionary activity in other lands!) On this score, far from being "willing and offering to sign such articles" as would trade away the life of the Comintern for diplomatic recognition and credits, the Soviet government has bee nmore than "reluctant"—it has categorically rejected the demands of the world bourgeoisie.

Two Instances

Let us take two instances out of a hundred, not culled from the latest Litvinov-Stalin epoch, but from a preceding period.

In 1922, the bourgeoisie of Europe gathered in conference at Genoa, with a Russian delegation present for the first time ,headed not by a respectable Stalinist diplomat, but by Christian Rakovsky. At Genoa, the bourgeoisie of Europe put forward as a condition for admitting Russia into their commity of nations the same demand as was put by Roosevelt and accepted by M. Litvinov, alias Stalin. From the official documentary compilation "The Soviet Union and Peaec", (page 97), we extract the following section of the reply made by the Russian delegation on May 11, 1922 to the memorandum submitted by eight capitalist delegations:

"Giving new scope to this Cannes condition, the memorandum demands that Russia should 'suppress upon her territory all attempts to aid revolutionary movements in other countries'. If, however, by this formula the memorandum means to forbid the activities of political parties, or organizations of workers, teh Russian delegation cannot accept such a prohibition unless the activities in question transgress the laws of the country."

In other words: Gentlemen, we are ready to make certain concessions, but hands off the Communist International!

Three years later, on May 20, 1925, Zinoviev, speaking before the party fraction of the Third Soviet Congress of the Soviets, jeered out of court the insolent demand renewed by the bourgeoisie for the suppression of the Comintern:

"We have heard a statement made in the English press and confirmed today (although it is partly denied) to the effect that the British government is endeavoring to create a united front against the U. S. S. R. in connection with the demand for the expulsion of the Comintern from Moscow. The Executive Committee of the Communist International, as we know, is not averse to a change of headquarters under certain conditions. Indeed, what is the good of sitting all the time in Moscow? To judge by the frame of mind of the Executive Committee of the C. I., it apparently would not be averse to setting up its tent in London. But I think that in any case such a decision should be taken by the Comintern independently of the bare-faced demands of the capitalist governments. **When they put forward that demand during the famine period they received from the Soviet government the reply they deserved. Now that affairs with th Soviet government are more favorable there can be no doubt as to the reply to their insolent demand they would receive from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics if they decided to advance such."** (G. Zinoviev, "Russia's Path to Communism", page 22.)

(Recogniton by the United States, declare the Stalinist liars, has been forced by the strengthened position of the Soviet Union. For the moment, let us accept the validity of this contention. How, then, does it happen that in a situation more favorable to it, the Soviet Union is compelled not only to make an enormous, impermissible concession, but a concession such as it announced it would not make eight years ago, in 1925, and would not even make years before that, in those cruel famine days when Rusia's back was to the wall and nobdy ventured to say if it could hold out for any length of time?)

Or, if one does not want to accept as a measure of policy the attitude of the Soviets towards the Genoa and British demands, there are more than enough "purely American" precedents by which to go.

When he stepped on to American soil, Litvinov expressed the "keen sense of the privilege that is mine in being the first official representative to bring greetings to the Ameircan people from the peoples of the Soviet Union". Both Litvinov and his American bourgeois audience knew that this statement was gratuitously false. The truth is that Litvinov had a predecessor as official Soviet representative to the United States.

In April 1918, Ludwing C. A. K. Martens was appoitned, in a document signed for the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs of the Soviets by Chicherin as its representative in this country, seeking to establish normal relations with the United States. Martens was not received with the official pomp and ceremony that attended Litvinov's arrival—he was only greeted by a mass meeting of the revolutionary workers of New York wno came by the thousands to the largest available hall. He was not received by the president and the secretary of state. Quite the contrary. He was hunted and persecuted; his office was raided; he was hailed before investigation committees; he was finally deported from this country as an undesirable alien.

Like Litvinov, he also answered the question of what the Soviet government would do about the Communist International and "propaganda in the United States". But not in the same way. More exactly, in just the opposite way. In the New York socialist "Call" of May Day 1919, the representative of the Soviet government wrote:

"The attitude of the workers of the world towards the Russian workers' revolution has proved that the spirit of international solidarity of workers is not dead...**It also proved that the International is not dead. It is resurrecting in the Third International in new glory. Long live the Third International."**

In a "Statement by L. Martens, Representative of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic, Before the Sub-Committee of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate" on "Soviet government propaganda", he declared boldly:

"The government of the United States has also been a party to attacks against the Russian Soviet Government, including invasion of Russian soil without a declaration of war and aggressive action against the military forces of Soviet Russia...Being confident that the peoples of other nations were not responsible for these policies, and that they permittd these activities only because they were not acquainted with the real situation, the workers of Russia appealed to the peoples in various countries urging them to put an end to these attacks. Appeals of this nature have been defensive measures in the war imposed on Soviet Russia by outside forces....Propaganda has been carried on by the Soviet government among the armies of the foreign governments which invaded Russia." ("Soviet Russia, 2-14-1920).

Two Epochs

It becomes a little clearer why, therefore, on December 15, 1920, secretary of Labor W. W. Wilson issued an order which concluded:

"It is therefore decided that Ludwig C. A. K. Martens is an alien, a citizen of Russia, and that he etnertains a belief in and is a member of or affiliated with an organization (i. e., the Third International.—M. S.) that entertains a belief in, teaches or advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, and the Commissioner General of Immigration is directed to take the said Ludwig C. A. K. Martens into custody and deport him to Russia at the expense of the Government of the United States."

Litvinov and Martens! These are not merely two different individuals. They symbolize two different epochs. The hounded and deported Bolshevik represented the Soviet republic in the epoch of revolutionary internationalism. The feted and loudly-praised diplomat represetns the Stalinist epoch of national socialism, of capitulation, of the surrender of the world revolution and the very foundations of the Russian workers' state.

—MAX SHACHTMAN.

The Retrial of the Nine Scottsboro Boys

to a persecuted race and class. Their resort to the I. L. D. for defense is another heavy count against them. When the K. K. K. wants to murder a Negro, legally or otherwise, to keep the black population of the South under the heel of their feudal baronage, they refuse to tolerate any "interference" from "outsiders" (the workers' movement). Having been frustrated by powerful protest in their original intention to burn the Negroes in the chair, the Southern wolves are again showing their fangs—"String 'em up" is the plan —"to hell with the courts". And it is in Morgan County that the retrial of Haywood Patterson and his companions to be held, that the class-prejudiced court is to pass sentence.

In the previous trial the National Guard escorted the prisoners to the court room. But now with the atmosphere one thousand times tenser the governor of Alabama has refused the use of the National Guard in the case. An appeal over his head was made by the defense to the President but the liberal Mr. Roosevelt, who would not for a moment hesitate to send the troops against striking workers, issues a statement through his secretary saying that the "Federal Executive has not interfered and cannot interfere in any case under the jurisdiction of the courts of a sovereign state."

Tense Atmosphere of Trail

Testifying to the will of the local population for a "fair" trial—in the course of the verbal tilt between the defense and the prosecution over a change of venue—a farmer marches into the courtroom carrying a six-shooter. The press says that this harmless fellow, who was "rebuked" by the court, related that he "had brought the revolver into town to have a new sight placed on its barrel." So tense is the atmosphere and so fearful is the Southern bourgeoisie of publicity that newspaper photographers have been threatened with proceedings for contempt of court for snapping photos of trial scenes. The defense attorneys have stated that in the event of a refusal of a change of venue by the local judge they will appeal to the U. S. Supreme Court for a reversal of decision. At this writing the local judge has refused a change of venue.

Lynch Pack In Full Cry

The lynch pack is in full cry. Can the victims of the Scottsboro case be saved from legal or "extra-legal" lynching? That is the question that every class conscious worker will ask himself.

Lynching of one kind or another is certain if the sympathizers and supporters of the Scottsboro boys bank on the fair administration of justice, or hope for lynching to be avoided by means of the National Guard. One of the National Guards, quoted in the affidavits of the defense for a change of venue, made the frank assertion that if a lynch mob confronted him while guarding the defendants he would throw away his gun and let the mob take its course.

Class justice can only be fought by mass action. Plenty of time has been lost but it is not yet too late to arouse the mass movement that saved the Scottsboro boys once before.

We need not explain the significance of the Scottsboro case to the workers acquainted with it. It is a struggle of outstanding importance for workers, black and white.

Action, Action! Now—tomorrow it may be too late!

Food Union Mass Meet

(Continued from Page 1)

to find out officially the terms of the hotel code that was signed last Friday. Only the Federation of Hotel and Restaurant Guilds, which is an outright company union of mediaeval origin, was able, thanks to it's direct cooperation with the bosses, to inform the capitalist press last Wednesday that 54 hours a week was to be the minimum hours and that tips were to be considered as wages.

A special mass meeting was called and held at the new headquarters of the Hotel and Restaurant Workers Union, 915-17 Eighth Ave. on Wednesday, Novemebr 22. Various speakers spoke about the necessity of action. Comrade Gitlow said that union organization offers the opportunity for the workers to improve their conditions by resorting to the most effective weapon that organized labor can utilize, and that is the general strike. B. J. Field, the secretary, reviewed all the activities of the Union. He said that the Union had drafted its own ocde and had its representatives at the hearing of the hotel code held in Washington on September 27. The Hotel Men's Association code was rejected by the NRA. In spite of this rejection, the President signed secretly the hotel code which is much worse than the very one that they rejected.

—A. C.

LITVINOFF AND STALIN

(Continued from page 1)

Communist Party of America was not concerned with the Communist Party of Russia, and vice versa, he said: **'The American Communist Party concenrs itself with the American working class and the Russian Communist Party concerns itself with the Russian working class, so of course they don't concern themselves with each other's problems. We have our problems, they have theirs. Their problem is to build socialism we aren't as far yet. Unfortunately, we still have to defeat capitalism."**

The **Daily Worker,** which took such elaborate and unnecessary pains to correct the grammatical structure of Litvinov's statement, has not printed a correction or a different version of the **Times'** report of Bedacht's statement. We therefore have no reason to question its accuracy. . .

There was a time when a Communist—certainly one working in a country where bourgeois legality still existed—was neither ashamed nor afraid to proclaim his membership in the world party of the Third International. But that was before the Communist International was strangled by Stalinism, before the Communist parties were humiliated, debased and forced into the livery of the Soviet Foreign Office, before flunkeys and office-holders have usurped the places of revolutionists, before the world revolution was exchanged for a promised credit of half a billion American dollars.

—sn.

New Aid for Bellussi

At the time of this writing comrade Bellussi still remains confined in the Detention House of the Philadelphia Immigration Station at Goucester City, N. J. awaiting deportation to Fascist Italy.

Meanwhile efforts are being made by the American Civil Liberties Union, which has interested itself in the case, to secure the release of Bellussi and the right of voluntary departure to some country other than Italy. Roger Baldwin, the director of the A. C. L. U. has promised the full cooperation of his organization in the endeavors to save comrade Bellussi from the horrible fate that awaits him in Italy.

The privilege of voluntary departure has been granted in other cases to other class war prisoners threatened with deportation to countries under Fascist or military dictatorships.

How vital is the need for comrade Bellussi not to be sent to Italy is shown by the fact that part of the evidence on which his deportation is taking place was the discovery of an old membership card in the Communist Party of Italy in Bellussi's possession.

The penalty for membership in a Communist organization in Italy is long years in a wretched penal colony if not summary execution by a firing squad. The danger facing Bellussi in the event of his deportation to Italy is so much more sinister when one considers that not only his militant activities in the United States but his sterling revolutionary record in Italy has aroused the wrath of Mussolini and his black gangs whose beast-like vengeance against revolutionary workers is well known to militant workers.

Bellussi must and can be saved! It is the first duty of class conscious workers to prevent the deliverance of their fellow-fighters into the jaw of its worst enemies. Let us do our part. We can force the American government to alter its ominous plans for our comrades.

Bellussi must not be deported to Italy!

Shoulders to the wheel!

SPARTACUS YOUTH DANCE
Dance & Entertainment, Proceeds For New Club Headquarters
Features:
FOLK DANCES
SKITS
RED HOT JAZZ BAND
Saturday, December 2, 1933
at 126 East 16th Street
ADMISSION 15 CENTS

CHICAGO
THANKSGIVING EVE DANCE AND MOVIE
Wednesday, November 29, 8:15 p. m.
at
International Labor Center
2557 West North Ave.
Private showing of Soviet anti-religious movie:
"THE TWO THIEVES"

Stalin's Bargain

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1)

tasks of defense. The Stalinist bureaucracy relied on them less and less, held them in contempt, converted the Comintern into a fiction and increasingly shifted the axis of Soviet foreign policy to the realm of negotiations and agreements with the capitalist powers.

Every step on this slippery path—of which the signing of the Kellogg Pact, the disarmament comedies, the non-aggression pacts, the capitulatory policy at the economic conferences, were milestones—weakened and undermined the position of the Soviet Union still further in the international relation of forces with the capitalist powers. By leaving the ground of the class struggle, by disrupting the proletarian vanguard, international class ally of the Soviet Union, the Stalinist leadership was compelled to retreat before the bourgeois powers step by step. The formal renunciation of the Comintern at Washington, which flowed out of the past policy and practice, prepares the way in turn for still heavier demands and new retreats. Stalinist diplomacy, while ostensibly improving the relations of the Soviet Union with the capitalist nations is in reality isolating it in an irreconcilably hostile capitalst world and leadng it toward a fearful debacle.

The Soviet Union, thus endangered, depends upon the international movement of the revolutionary proletariat now in a direct and immediate sense. The more the Stalinist bureaucrats desert the international revolution, the more they take off the Bolshevisk mask and show their real nationalist face as they did at Washington, the clearer becomes the necessity for the reorganization of the international workers' vanguard without the Stalinist buraeucrats and against them. The capitulation to Roosevelt followed soon after the capitulation to Hitler and was partly conditioned by it. Both of these events are loud alarm signals of the need to organize the Fourth International with all possible speed. The defense of the Soviet Union from the world imperialists on the one side and the disorganizing leadership of Stalinism on the other will be one of its formest tasks.

MASS MEETING

DOES THE RECOGNITION OF RUSSIA SPELL THE END OF THE 3rd INT'L ?

SPEAKERS
ARNE SWABECK
MAX SHACHTMAN

Irving Plaza Hall
SUNDAY, DEC. 6, at 8 P. M.
IRVING PLACE and 15th STREET
ADMISSION: 15 CENTS