

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 revolutionaries or their "representatives or officials" 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 revolutionaries 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 Union 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 too 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 attitude "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 Litvinov 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 agreed 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 unrepentant.

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 Litvinov, as the shame-faced 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 practice. 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 Litvinov, 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 integrity 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 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.

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 bourgeois are bringing the nine Negro boys to trial on the notorious railroad 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 investigation 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 practicing 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 organ-

ization (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 about 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 mameukes 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 contains 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 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 a gratuities should not be considered as wages.

So far no union has been able (Continued on Page 4)