

Lovestone Discovers Esthonia

(Continued from last issue)
 3. In 1925, the British government made one of its periodical Curzon-Chamberlain demands against the residence of the Comintern in Moscow and its propaganda which had "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—(pardon us, we mean the British Empire)—its territories or possessions". Zinoviev, the chairman of the Comintern, replied publicly on May 20, 1925:

"When they put forward that demand during the famine period they received from the Soviet Government the reply they deserved. Now that affairs with the 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."

Question: Why did Litvinov accede to an "insolent demand" put forward in 1933, which was contemptuously rejected by the Soviet government not merely in 1925, but in the most desperate period of its existence, the famine period, when Russia's back was to the wall and it was ready to make any reasonable concession to obtain sufficient aid from abroad to keep alive?

Ango-Russian Trade Agreement
 4. Soviet Russia of April 16, 1921 comments as follows on the Anglo-Russian Trade Agreement which had just been signed:

"In their preliminary draft the British attempted to bind the Soviet Government to 'restrain Russian citizens' from hostile action or propaganda against British institutions. This impossible demand disappears entirely from the final text. Thus the mooted question of propaganda resolves itself into a mutual agreement on the part of the British and Soviet governments respectively to refrain from conducting outside of their own borders any propaganda directly or indirectly against the institutions of the other. This condition was accepted by the Soviet Government at the outset of the negotiations."

Question: Why did the Soviets—in 1921, after the Estonian, Latvian and Polish Treaties—regard as impossible the demand that Russian Communists be restrained from carrying on anti-British capitalist propaganda, whereas it now considers quite possible the demand that not only Russian Communists but American Communists in Russia be restrained from carrying on anti-British capitalist propaganda? Why could not what Herberg calls the "conventional phrases" of a "Paragraph Four" be conceded in 1921 in England?

Reply to Lord Curzon
 5. On September 7, 1921, Lord Curzon wrote an insolent note to Russia demanding (again!) the suppression of the Comintern in Russia, complaining that government members like Lenin, Trotsky and... Stalin were actively engaged in its work of undermining the "territories and possessions" of the British Crown. Three weeks later, the Soviet Vice-Commissar of Foreign Affairs retorted:

"The Russian Government desires to take advantage of this occasion to affirm once more, as it has frequently done before, that the fact that the Third International, for perfectly obvious reasons, chose Russia as the country in which its executive committee resides—Russia being the only country that allows full liberty for the spread of Communist ideas, as well as personal liberty to Communists—and also the fact that certain members of the Russian Government, in their capacity as private individuals, belong to this executive committee are no more to be taken as a basis for declaring that the Third International and the Russian Government are identical, than the fact that the Second International, constantly in session at Brussels, and including among the members of its executive committee the Belgian minister Vandervelde, may prove the identity of the Second International with the Belgian Government."

(The author of this reply to Curzon was none other than Maxim Litvinov.)
 Question: Why, although this occurred well within the Herbergian "second period" of Soviet diplomacy, didn't Litvinov reply then as he did at Washington? Or a more pertinent question: Why didn't he reply to Roosevelt as he did to Curzon?

Chicherin on 'Propaganda'
 6. In 1925, as is known, England demanded that Russia sign an agreement similar to that signed by Litvinov in Washington. In his foreign political report to the Third Congress of the Soviet Union in May 1925, the commissar for foreign affairs, Chicherin, a diplomat if you please, declared:

"The same idea (as held by Curzon at Lausanne) is to be seen in the declaration of Chamberlain: 'Cease conducting propaganda'."
 "What is propaganda? We stand before the main question of our foreign political relations. Our govern-

Propaganda Pledge Is Defended by Stalinist Attorneys

ment is prepared to accept, and accepts all the obligations bound up with international relations. If the English government proves that we are misusing our diplomatic connections, our diplomatic rights, our diplomatic apparatus, that this or that official person violates the international obligations, then we are prepared to agree to everything demanded of us in this respect.

"If, however, we are told that all propaganda must cease in the Soviet Union, that is tantamount to demanding that the Communist party shall cease to be a Communist party. Here is a question of whether we shall continue to exist or not. It concerns the main question of our relations with the capitalist world by which we are surrounded."

"If Chamberlain says to us: 'All propaganda must cease, the Communist party shall cease to be a Communist party', then we must answer: 'Faites le citoyen Chamberlain!'—Do it, citizen Chamberlain!"

Question: When Chicherin called "propaganda" the main question of foreign Soviet relations, involving the existence of the Communist party and the republic itself, did he really mean it, or was he in reality giving the "Trotskyists and other anti-Soviet demagogues a basis of operations for their reactionary propaganda against the Soviet Union"—as Herberg so pleasantly puts it.

7. But enough for the moment. The dozens of remaining questions can safely be held back until the

Russia constituted a menace of serious proportions to the Soviets. The treaties demanded the dissolution or expulsion of these armed forces. In no sense was this a concession by Russia—it was Russia's indubitable victory.

Where is this situation duplicated in France, England or, most of all, in the United States? Are the decrepit Russian dukes and princesses the forces on American soil whose organization for the overthrow of the Soviet Russia has caused to fear? Or even the White Guard Ukrainians in this country? Preposterous! Infinitely more powerful counter-revolutionary and imperialist forces now on American soil threaten the Soviet Union! They are identical with precisely that regime which Litvinov praised so unstintingly as eminently pacific and war-abhorrent in his speech at the recent Soviet Congress! And these forces are not covered by the "reciprocal undertakings" of the Litvinov-Roosevelt pact. The Comintern is.

2. More important even than our first point, is this:
 "The masses in these small Baltic republics were then still permeated with democratic illusions, accentuated by the first whiffs of national independence they had obtained after decades and centuries of languishing under the heel of czarist tyranny. Even the tidal wave of proletarian revolution did not entirely succeed in washing away the prejudice, fear, hatred and suspicion these people felt of any "Moscow regime"—a government of "Great Russians". The bourgeois democrats of these lands, more often than not in the service of a large western power sought with all their strength to intensify these prejudices and suspicions in the minds of the masses. The latter were told that the

Once, it is mentioned as being a party to the frantic armament race; a second time, it is mentioned as one of the powers helping the Kuo Min Tang campaign against the Chinese "Red Army" AND NOWHERE ELSE!

The Japanese imperialists, the Hitler regime, British imperialism are frequently referred to and clearly condemned. BUT—The Roosevelt regime is not even mentioned.

The most important phenomenon in capitalist world politics and economics today—the vast NRA program—is not even mentioned.

America's preparation for war against Japan is not even mentioned.

The Cuban situation is not even mentioned—not by a syllable.

Here all comment is truly superfluous!

What the Comintern Manifesto Urged and What It Forgot to Urge . . .

On the very day that the Litvinov agreement was made, the Executive Committee of the Communist International issued an elaborate manifesto, urging the American workers to overthrow the capitalist government of this country," wrote Herberg in the Workers Age of December 15, 1933, in his attack upon the Left Opposition and its defense of the Stalin foreign policy.

The November 15, 1933 issue of the Communist International which has just arrived here contains the manifesto referred to. A reading of it shows that Herberg overreached himself a little!

Nowhere, literally nowhere, are the American workers "urged" to overthrow the bourgeoisie here. In fact, with two trifling exceptions, the UNITED STATES IS NOT EVEN MENTIONED IN THE WORLD MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL!

firm of Lovestone, Herberg and Hackman has replied to the ones already put.

The Treaties with the Border States
 Nevertheless — Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland!

Is it not significant that the only countries mentioned by the Lovestoneites are those which once formed part of the Russian Empire and now border directly on the Soviet republic? An honest revolutionist interested in clarifying and teaching workers—not a group of Philadelphia lawyers fawning and groveling before the Stalinist dispensers of privilege and pelf—would have put and answered the questions:

Why was the Soviet Union ready to make an agreement with the former sections of the czarist empire on her frontiers which she refused to make with any of the big imperialist powers, nearby or far-off?

Did Russia have more to fear from Latvia than from America? From what standpoint was Esthonia so much stronger than England that she was able with comparative ease to obtain something from Russia which England, with her armies, navies, industries and wealth, with her threats and ruptures, was never able to obtain? Did Russia grant such a treaty to Lithuania and refuse it to England because she hoped to get more material aid—food, credits, machinery, political prestige—from the tiny, poverty-stricken Baltic country than from wealth-bloated Britannia?

Not Ordinary Recognition Pacts
 It is not necessary to dig far to find the answer. Latvia and the other tiny Baltic lands obtained such treaties for fairly obvious reasons:

1. The treaties were not ordinary recognition pacts; they served to put an end to a state of war existing between Russia and her neighbors. During the period of hostilities, all these Baltic lands had been the arena of activities for numerous active White Guard and other counter-revolutionary armies, some of them claiming to be and all of them aiming to be "government" of the whole or part of Russia. The continued residence of these forces on territory directly adjacent to

Bolshevik regime was no different than the czarist; both were despotic Muscovite centralists whose aim was to impose their regime upon the Letts and Poles and Finns and wipe out their just-gained independence.

The Bolsheviks attached an immense even if not all-dominating significance to the slogan of self-determination of nations even to the point of separation. They never considered it, like Wilson, as a piece of clever hypocrisy, a shrewd watchword and nothing more. They alone proved that it was realizable. The Bolsheviks granted complete independence to all the former "provinces" of the czar, even if they instantly fell under the domination of reactionaries.

Bolshevik Policy on Self-Determination
 Moreover, the Bolsheviks were intent upon exerting every effort to prove in practice to these border peoples that Soviet Russia alone really guaranteed their independence, that she would not seek to impose her form of social organization upon her neighbors. The existing fear of Russia's vast size and strength in comparison with their own, was dispelled among these little nations essentially by the persistent demonstrations Russia gave of her principle of non-violation of their territorial and political integrity.

This and this alone explains why the Soviet Government was prepared, even in 1920-1921, to go to the point of giving her neighbors the assurances they received in the peace treaties cited above. What possible comparison is there between these conditions, those treaties and the relations between the U. S. A. and the U. S. R. today?

Our original views stand. There are no two ways about the question. The Litvinov-Roosevelt pact remains an index to the degree to which Stalinism has abandoned the world revolution in its deterioration to nationalism. Lovestone and Co. remain the legal toadies of Stalinism, its aspiring apologist, its most anxious champion. Alas for Stalinism—its very champion cannot fight for want of a leg to stand on!

—MAX SHACHTMAN.

Drive Starts for 'New Intern'l.'

In line with the proposed extension of activities of the Communist League of America in all fields of work, plans have been carefully laid for the early issuance of the long-awaited theoretical review of the Left Opposition. This political review, which will be issued once a month, is to be called **The New International**.

An early appearance of this magazine is more imperative than ever today because of the complete generation and collapse of the theoretical views of official Communism, namely, Stalinism; and also because of the "teachings" of opportunist politics by the Right wing (Lovestone-Brandier, et al). Only the Left Opposition during all these years has held to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. The press and literature of the Left Opposition throughout the world has carried out these basic teachings in the face of all obstacles. The monthly magazine, **The New International**, published by the Communist League of America has in mind the projection on an even higher scale than hitherto, of the study and discussion of all the fundamental problems facing the revolutionary Communist movement.

It is desirable and necessary to set out the first issue of **The New International** with the greatest speed. **The Militant** is to be transformed much further into a mass paper and the necessary theoretical material, lengthier articles and documents are to be published in the columns of **The New International**.

To our readers we wish to announce at this time the happy news that there is a mass of hitherto unpublished documents on important questions by Leon Trotsky, Christian G. Rakovsky and other prominent leaders of the Russian Opposition, and other leaders, as well as material by Lenin, Marx, Engels, and other teachers of scientific socialism. These are to appear in the columns of **The New International**, beginning with its first number. Well known writers of the movement will contribute regularly to **The New International**.

The projected **New International** will be a 32-page magazine, published monthly, to be sold at 15c per copy. The subscription price is \$1.50 per year for the United States, and \$1.75 for Canada and foreign countries. We are now endeavoring to raise a special fund to ensure an early appearance of **The New International**. We are determined to issue the magazine soon. We have no doubt that the readers of **The Militant** will want to and will give all possible support for **The New International**. Like all working-class periodicals, and especially so in the case of the Left Opposition, systematic financial support will be needed. We are counting upon immediate donations, today, for **The New International**, as well as pledges from supporters and sympathizers to be made monthly to **The New International**. More than subscriptions are needed to maintain a 32-page magazine of the kind projected by us.

Readers of **The Militant** will be apprised regularly on the progress toward **The New International** magazine.

Meanwhile subscriptions can now be sent in to **The New International**, together with donations.

Mail all donations and subscriptions for **The New International** to:
THE NEW INTERNATIONAL
 c/o Martin Abern, Business Mgr.
 Station D, P. O. Box 119,
 New York, N. Y.

Lesson of Anglo-Russian Committee
 The Leninist method of the united front and political fraternization with reformists exclude each other. Temporary practical fighting

I am informed that the I. L. P. has weakened considerably in the last period. Its membership, it is claimed, has fallen to four thousand. It is possible, even very probable, that this report is exaggerated. But the general tendency does not seem to me improbable. I will say more: the leadership of the I. L. P. bears a considerable share of responsibility for the weakening of the organization before which all the conditions opened up and—I want to hope—still open up a wide perspective.

If a worker barely awakened to political life seeks a mass organization, without distinguishing as yet either programs or tactics, he will naturally join the Labor Party. A worker disillusioned with reformism and exasperated by the betrayals of the political and trade union leaders has attempted more than once—and is partly attempting even now—to join the Communist party behind which he sees the image of the Soviet Union. But where is the worker who will join the I.L.P.? And exactly what political motives will impel him to take this step?

The Question of a Banner
 It seems to me that the leaders of the I. L. P. have as yet not given themselves a clear answer to this cardinal question. Working masses are not interested in shadings and details but in great events, clear slogans, far-seen banners. How does the matter stand with the I. L. P. about a banner? Not well. I say this with great regret. But it must be said. To suppress or embellish the facts would be rendering a poor service to your party.

The I. L. P. broke away from the Labor Party. That was correct. If the I. L. P. wanted to become the revolutionary lever it was impossible that the handle of this lever be left in the hands of through-and-through opportunists and bourgeois careerists. Complete and unconditional political and organizational independence of a revolutionary party is the first prerequisite for its success.

But while breaking away from the Labor Party it was necessary immediately to turn towards it. Of course, not to make court to its leaders, or to pay them bitter-sweet compliments, or even to suppress their criminal acts,—no, only characterless centrists, who imagine themselves revolutionaries, seek a road to the masses by accommodating themselves to the leaders, by humouring them and re-assuring them at every step of their friendship and loyalty. A policy of this sort is a road that leads down to the swamp of opportunism. One must seek a way to the reformist masses not through the favor of their leaders but against the leaders, because opportunist leaders represent not the masses but merely their backwardness, their servile instincts, finally, their confusion. But the masses have other, progressive, revolutionary traits that strive to find their political expression. The to-morrow of the masses is most clearly counterposed to their yesterday in the struggle of programs, parties, slogans and leaders. Instinctively working masses are always "for unity". But besides class instinct there is also political wisdom. Harsh experience teaches the workers that a break with reformism is the prerequisite for real unity which is possible only in revolutionary action. Political experience teaches all the better and faster, the more firmly, logically, convincingly and clearly the revolutionary party interprets the experience to the masses.

The International Question
 The causes for the eufeblement of the I. L. P. are seen with special clarity and precision when the problem is approached from the international point of view which is of decisive importance in our epoch. Having broken with the Second International, the I. L. P. approached the Third but did not join it. The I. L. P. is simply hanging in the air. Meanwhile, every thinking worker wants to belong to such a party that occupies a definite international position: in the unbreakable union with co-thinkers of other countries he sees the confirmation of the correctness of his own position. True, the I. L. P. enters the so-called London Bureau. But the chief characteristic of this Bureau consists, unfortunately, in the absence of all position. It would suffice to say that the Norwegian Workers Party, which under the leadership of the treacherous opportunist Thammal goes over more openly along the social-democratic road, belongs to this Bureau. Tramnel and Co. need the temporary alliance with the I. L. P. and with other left organizations to pacify their own Left wing and gradually to prepare for themselves the way to the Second International. Now Tramnel is approaching the harbor.

On the other side, the Socialist Workers Party of Germany (SAP) and the Independent Socialist Party of Holland (OSP) also belong to the London Bureau. Both these organizations stand on the point of view of the Fourth International. Their adherence to the Bureau re-

Letter to a Member of the Independent Labor Party

agreements with mass organizations even headed by the worst reformists are inevitable and obligatory for a revolutionary party. Lasting political alliances with reformist leaders without a definite program, without concrete duties, without the participation of the masses themselves in militant actions—are the worst type of opportunism. The Anglo-Russian committee remains for ever the classic example of such a demoralizing alliance.

One of the most important bridges to the masses are the trade unions where one can and must work without accommodating to the leaders in the least, on the contrary, struggling irreconcilably against them, openly, or under cover, depending on the circumstances. But besides the trade unions there are numberless ways of participating in the daily life of the masses—in the factory, on the street, in sport organizations, even in church and saloon, under the condition that the greatest heed be paid to what the masses feel and think, how they react to events, what they expect and what they hope for, how and why they let themselves be deceived by reformist leaders. Observing the masses constantly and most thoughtfully, the revolutionary party must not, however, adapt itself passively to them ("chvostrism"); on the contrary, it must counterpose their judgment to their prejudices.

It would be particularly wrong to ignore or minimize the importance of parliamentary work. Of course, parliament cannot transform capitalism into socialism, or improve the conditions of the proletariat in rotting capitalist society. But revolutionary work in parliament and in connection with parliament, especially in England, can be of great help in training and educating the masses. One courageous exclamation of MacGovern refreshed and stirred the workers deceived or stupefied by the pious, hypocritical, flag speeches of Lansbury, Henderson and other gentlemen of "His Majesty's opposition" of hunkeys.

Unfortunately, having become an independent party, the I. L. P. turned not towards the trade unions and the Labor party, not to the masses altogether, but to the Communist party which had during a number of years conclusively proven its bureaucratic dullness and absolute inability to approach the class. If even the German catastrophe taught these people nothing, then the doors of the Comintern should bear the same inscription as the entrance to hell: "Lasciate Ogni speranza" ("Leave all hope behind").

The I. L. P. had not freed itself by far of all the defects of the Left wing of the Labor Party (theoretical vagueness, lack of a clear program, of revolutionary methods, of a strong organization) when it has tened to take upon itself the responsibility for the incurable failings of the Comintern. It is clear that in this situation new revolutionary workers will not join the I. L. P.; sooner will many of its old members leave it, having lost patience. If dem-reformist, petty bourgeois radicals and pacifists leave the I. L. P., we can only wish them a happy journey. But it is a different matter when discontented workers quit the party.

fects merely their yesterday. We, Communists-Internationalists (Left Opposition) have considered and consider it a great mistake of our allies, the SAP and the OSP, that until now they have not broken openly and decisively with Tramnel and with the London Bureau in general. We do not doubt, however, that the hour of such a rupture is near.

The London Bureau
 What is the position of the I. L. P.? Entering the London Bureau it becomes by this very fact an ally of Tramnel, that is, essentially of the Second International. Through the SAP and the OSP it becomes a sort of an ally, or semi-ally of the Fourth International. This is not all—outside of the London Bureau the I. L. P. finds itself in a temporary alliance with the British Communist Party, that is with the Third International. Are not there somewhat too many Internationals for one party? Can the English worker make head or tail out of this confusion?

At the Paris conference the I. L. P. delegates said that they did not lose hope of attracting the Comintern to participation in the building of a broad revolutionary International. Nearly a half year elapsed since. Is it possible, that no answer came yet? How much time do the leading comrades of the I. L. P. need to understand that the Comintern is incapable of making one step forward, that it is completely ossified, that as a revolutionary party it is dead? If the I. L. P. wants to continue waiting for miracles, that is to live in hopes on the Comintern, or to remain outside of the main historic currents, its own members will inevitably lose confidence in it.

Swedish Communist Party.
 The same fate awaits the Swedish Independent Communist Party. For fear of making an error it abstains from all decision, not realizing that precisely this is the greatest error. In general, there are not a few politicians who consider expectation and evasiveness as the highest wisdom. "Do not hurry with the Fourth International, they say, now is not the time". It is not a matter of bureaucratically "proclaiming" the new International but of uninterrupted struggle for its preparation and building. "Not to hurry" means in practice to lose time. "Perhaps the new International will not be needed, perhaps a miracle will happen, perhaps..." This policy which seems to some people very realistic is the worst type of utopianism, spun out of passivity, ignorance and belief in miracles. If the Swedish Independent Party will not shake off its pseudo-realistic superstitions, it will weaken, waste away and finally be torn between three Internationals.

Events Will Confirm Our Slogans
 "But the masses—so object some pseudo-realists—are afraid of a new International as of a new split". This is absolutely natural. The masses' fear of a new party and of a new International is a reflection (one of the reflections) of the great catastrophe, the terrible defeat, the disillusionment of the masses their bewilderment, their disbelief in themselves. How long these moods will last depends mainly on the course of events but to a certain extent also on us. We do not bear any responsibility for the course of events but we answer fully for our own attitude. The advantage of the advance-guard over the masses consists therein that we illuminate theoretically the march of events and foresee its future stages. The formless, passive longing for "unity" will receive blow after blow. The rottenness of the Second and Third Internationals will be revealed at each step. The events will confirm our prognosis and our slogans. But it is necessary that we ourselves be not afraid to unfurl our banner right now.

Lassalle used to say that a revolutionary needs the "physical power of thought". Lenin liked to repeat these words, although in general he did not like Lassalle much. The physical power of thought consists in analyzing the situation and perspectives to the very end, and having come to the necessary practical conclusions, to defend them with conviction, courage, intransigence, not fearing some one else's fears, not bowing before prejudices of the masses but basing on the objective course of development.

The I. L. P. of Great Britain must place itself right now under the banner of the Fourth International, or it will disappear from the scene without leaving a trace.

L. TROTSKY.
 January 5, 1934

The New International

An Organ of Revolutionary Marxism (Published monthly by the National Committee, Communist League of America.)

Max Shachtman, Editor
 Martin Abern, Business Mgr.

Feature articles in each issue by L. D. Trotsky and other leaders of the Russian Bolsheviks... Important contributions on the major problems of the American working class and the proletarian revolution by well-known writers in the American and international labor movement... A magazine of international significance for the international labor and revolutionary Communist movement.

SUBSCRIBE TODAY!

Send in Your Subscription Today!
 Subscription Rates: \$1.50 per year in the United States; \$1.00 for seven issues; \$1.75 in Canada and other foreign countries. Single copy—15c.

Enclosed please find \$....., for which enter subscription to THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, for:
 Name
 Address
 City State

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 Swaback
 Vol. VII, No. 3 (Whole No. 297)
 SATURDAY, JANUARY 27, 1934
 Subscription rate: \$1.00 per year Foreign \$1.50 2 cents per copy