

Published Twice-Weekly by the
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASSN.
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-5447

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months. Foreign: \$3.00 per year; \$1.50 for six months. Single copies: 3 cents per copy in the United States; 5 cents per copy in foreign countries. Single copies: 3 cents.

Bronx and Manhattan subscriptions are: \$1.50 for six months; \$3.00 for one year.
"Registered as second class matter September 29, 1932, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879."

Editor: MAX SHACHTMAN
Associate Editor: EMANUEL GARRETT
General Manager: MARTIN ABERN
Assistant Manager: SHERMAN STANLEY

FIGHT WITH THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY FOR:

1. A job and a decent living for every worker.
2. Open the idle factories—operate them under workers' control.
3. A Twenty-Billion dollar Federal public works and housing program.
4. Thirty-thirty! \$30-weekly minimum wage—30-hour weekly maximum for all workers on all jobs.
5. Thirty dollar weekly old-age and disability pension.
6. Expropriate the Sixty Families.
7. All war funds to the unemployed.
8. A people's referendum on any and all wars.
9. No secret diplomacy.
10. An independent Labor Party.
11. Workers' Defense Guards against vigilantes and Fascist attacks.
12. Full social, political and economic equality for the Negro people.

ALP Cliques Promote War Propaganda

(Continued from Page 1)

or of any political party is the place for a bitter attack on Germany and Russia, both nations with which the United States is still at peace." Another ALP candidate, for municipal court judge, Allan Goodwin, deploras "a controversial foreign issue which has no place in the party's resolutions."

In a word, both of the contending camps in the ALP are conducting themselves in thoroughly unprincipled fashion, blurring the issues, hiding the facts. Neither one wants to conduct the fight on the ground on which it really stands.

Why? Because neither one dares admit the truth. The truth is that each side is a war-mongering partisan of one of the contending imperialist camps. Each side attempts to pose as a lover of peace, but each side is actually for the victory of one of the contending imperialist camps. The ALP leaders are partisans of Anglo-French imperialism and of Roosevelt's proposals to begin aligning America with that camp. The Stalinists are partisans of the Hitler-Stalin bloc. The antagonisms of the two warring camps in Europe are reflected in this fight in the ALP; each side serves one of the camps. In the face of the widespread anti-war sentiment, however, neither dares admit its real aim. Hence the deliberately spread confusion.

The Real Facts

However, no smoke screen can conceal the real facts. No amount of shouting against the deservedly-hated Stalinists can conceal the real meaning of the ALP resolution of October 4. Its criticism of the Hitler-Stalin pact is a democratic-imperialist criticism and has nothing in common with a working class critique of the reactionary role of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

As long as Stalin adhered to the democratic-imperialist camp, the ALP leaders slept cheek by jowl with the Stalinists in the ALP and the unions; none of Stalin's crimes of his "democratic" period—the Moscow trials, the purges and massacres, the betrayal of the Spanish revolution, the smashing of the great movement of the French proletariat, and in America the undermining of the militancy of the labor movement in the service of Roosevelt, etc., etc.—all these crimes the ALP leaders either supported, condoned or passed over lightly. They lived at peace and in collaboration with the Stalinists through all these terrible events.

Only now do they break with the Stalinists. And why? Have the ALP leaders perhaps repented of their reactionary position on all the great events of these years? Not at all. They remain grooved in that reactionary course. Their sole grievance against the Stalinists is that Stalin has deserted the camp of Anglo-French imperialism for the camp of German imperialism.

No smoke screen can conceal from the workers of America the fundamental motivation of the ALP resolution. It identifies itself with "the cause of the Western democracies that are fighting for the preservation of those democratic values and liberties which we in this country treasure so dearly," and goes so far as to say that "the great majority of the American people have looked forward to the day when the remaining democracies on the European continent would find the strength to resist the brazen ag-

gression of Hitlerism." This is war-mongering in the most literal sense of the term. From it logically follows the endorsement of Roosevelt's proposals for lifting the embargo to aid Anglo-French imperialism. From it logically follows any and all other steps to aid Anglo-French imperialism, including American entry into the war. The resolution hypocritically refrains from going the whole hog only because the anti-war sentiments of the masses are too well-known to the ALP bureaucrats. They follow, instead, the Roosevelt tactic of taking, step by step, actions which will, in the end, lead America into the war.

We need mention here only in passing how deliberately false is the rose-colored picture of the "democracies" painted in the ALP resolution. That Britain and France are the greatest slaveholding empires in the world, subjecting the masses of Africa and Asia to an even lower living standard than bestial fascism has been able to impose at home upon the German and Italian workers; that only in the "mother countries" is there even a semblance of democracy; that Anglo-French imperialism facilitated the victory of Hitler and preferred it to a socialist revolution in Germany, etc.—of all this there is not a hint in the idyllic picture of the "democracies" painted by the cynical bureaucrats of the ALP.

«Left Wing» Cover

At the October 4 city conference at which the fight was precipitated, a "left wing" cover for the ALP bureaucrats was provided by the Norman Thomas Socialists and Lovestoneites present. Two or three of them took the floor to make a point or two in differentiating themselves from the more flagrantly war-mongering aspects of the official resolution, but not one of them exposed the dishonest strategy of the ALP bureaucrats—and they voted for the resolution. "Subscribing to and reaffirming" the war-mongering resolution has been put as an ultimatum to all ALP candidates. Two members of the Socialist Party, Harry W. Laidler and Frank Crosswaith, are ALP candidates. The press reports that Crosswaith "expressed unqualified approval for the resolution." Neither the Socialist Party nor the Independent Labor League (Lovestoneites) has yet expressed itself officially; we await their official statements and will comment on them. Their strategy is, however, made clear by their shameful conduct at the city conference: whatever their perfunctory reservations, they are going along with the ALP bureaucrats, as they voted with them on October 4.

Can one conceivably justify this course on the ground of opposition to Stalinism? To attempt to do so is utterly dishonest. By this course the Stalinists are aided, not crushed. It enables the Stalinists to pose as fighters against "war incitement." Quill is able to appeal to the Irish-American workers, Ford to the Negro workers, who know what their brothers endure under British imperialism. The Stalinists are everywhere losing ground because, with a sure instinct however inarticulate, the masses consider the Hitler-Stalin alliance a betrayal of the world working class. Precisely at this point the ALP provides the Stalinists with a rallying-point. Saying as little as possible about their support of the Hitler axis and as much as possible about the ALP leaders' support of the Anglo-French axis, the Stalinists are able to hold part of their shattered ranks together on this issue. The ALP leaders have done for the Stalinists what they could not do for themselves: provided them with a good issue. Once again we are taught an important lesson: the struggle against Stalinism cannot be conducted by the equally-corrupt reformist labor bureaucracy, and their Social-Democratic, Socialist or Lovestoneite servitors.

There Is a Third Camp

The war-mongering position of the ALP leaders is NOT a lesser evil than the war-mongering position of the Stalinists. Just as we refuse to make any basic distinctions between the camp of Chamberlain and that of Hitler, so we refuse to make any distinction between the war camp of Antonini-Rose and that of Quill-Stalin. Neither represents the interests of the working class. Both lead to war and the decimation and destruction of the working class.

The genuine anti-war sentiments of the masses in the New York needle trades cannot find its expression through either the ALP bureaucrats or through the Stalinists. If those anti-war sentiments are not to be perverted—to Hitler's service by the Stalinists, to Chamberlain's service by Rose and Antonini—the anti-war forces in the unions must express themselves independently of either of the two cliques. Neither the "left wing" apologies for the ALP bureaucrats nor the pseudo-radical phraseology now employed by the Stalinists should hide this basic fact: neither of the warring cliques speaks for peace. In every union affiliated to the ALP the workers should begin discussing, not merely the pro-war positions now contending for control, but the THIRD position: the anti-war position which represents the present and future interests of the working class. The third camp—the camp of the genuine fighters against war, against all imperialisms—is the only camp worth supporting and fighting for.

Once Before Red Army Marched Into Poland--But It Was Different

Under the Command of Tukhachevsky the Red Army of Lenin's Day Marched to Spread the World Revolution— Unlike Today When Stalin Marches to the Aid of Reaction

(Continued from Page 1)

through the cancerous growth of Stalinism; the bewilderment of the world proletariat today. "Could Europe back up this Socialist movement, which the march on Warsaw constituted, with a revolution in the West?" This was the question posed by Tukhachevsky, planning the strategy of the Red Army for its coming victories. Trotsky alone of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party had grave doubts. His knowledge of Poland and its long tortuous history of domination from the outside convinced him that the political consciousness of the Polish masses was not yet developed to a sufficiently high degree to participate in a "revolution from without!"

SAW MASSES RALLYING TO THE REVOLUTION

The ardor of Tukhachevsky, however, saw no bounds. "Events say 'Yes,'" he replied to his own question. "The German workers manifested open opposition to the Entente. They sent back railway-wagons filled with arms and food which France had sent to Poland's aid; they refused to unload the British and French ships sent to Danzig with arms and munitions; they caused accidents on railways, etc."

"From East Prussia came hundreds and thousands of volunteers, who formed a German rifle brigade under the banner of the Red Army. In England, the working classes were also in the grip of a very active revolutionary movement."

The spectre of world revolution haunted Europe! Field Marshal von Blomberg expressed the views of the German General Staff when he wrote a preface to the German edition of Pilsudski's memoirs. "The Russo-Polish war is not merely a matter of interest of soldiers. Its result has a universal historical significance. Its importance for Germany can hardly be overestimated, for in this war something more than Polish national liberty, and the continued existence of the Polish Republic was at stake. In its final aspect it was a question whether the Bolshevik Revolution should penetrate further into Europe and thus impose its rule on Germany as well as other countries. In the Germany of 1920 many of the preliminary conditions essential for such a revolution existed."

ADVANCES TO THE VERY GATES OF WARSAW

Tukhachevsky began his offensive with 80,000 soldiers and a reserve of 68,000 for whom there was inadequate equipment. The Red Armies on the southwestern front were directed by Yegorov, with Stalin as the representative of the Revolutionary Council of War. Tukhachevsky's plea for a united command had been turned down by the Council because of the antagonism existing between the two commanders. Voroshilov, incidentally, was commissar of Budenny's cavalry, which was part of the southwestern forces.

The Red Army hurled forward with invincible force under the leadership of Tukhachevsky. Vilna fell on July 14.

B'KLYN ANTI-WAR RALLY SUCCESSFUL

Last Friday night in Brownsville, Max Shachtman addressed an overflowing audience of two hundred and fifty workers who flocked eagerly to hear the anti-war message of the Socialist Workers Party. "The war about which we have spoken so long has finally begun," declared comrade Shachtman. "All of the hideous antagonisms of capitalist society are exposed to the naked eye. The workers now realize that bourgeois democracy gave us, from the last war, fascism, unemployment, hunger and finally another orgy of blood. How will this war end? If the 'democracies' win again they will bestow upon the world the conditions under which we have lived for the past twenty-one years. If the fascists win the world will sink to a system of barbaric oppression. We, the revolutionists of the Fourth International will shout, and the workers of all nations with us, 'No—thank you!' Only the struggle of the world proletariat against all oppression can free us from the mass murder of war and from the brutality of fascism!"

Grodno on the 19th. Brest-Litovsk was taken on August 1st; Pilsudski gave a graphic description of the advance of the Red Army in his memoirs. "One day they were only about 20 kilometers away from Warsaw and its environs, i.e., only a normal day's march. This unceasing, wormlike advance of a huge enemy hoard, which went on for weeks, with spasmodic interruptions here and there, gave us the impression of something irresistible rolling up like some terrible thunderclouds that brooked no opposition."

Perhaps the Red Army would make the "revolution from without?" Perhaps the German Spartacists and the Russian Bolsheviks would join hands in a Soviet Poland, and the banner of world revolution spread like wild fire over the plains and cities of Europe. Revolutionists throughout the world thrilled at news of every advance of the Red Army. Restless workers impatiently awaited the signal for the greater class struggles ahead. The Red Army of Lenin and Trotsky was on the march!

ALLIES RUSH TO PILSUDSKI'S DEFENSE

Alarmed at the Red Army advances, the Allies rushed French artillery in decisive quantities with French officers to the aid of Warsaw. Meanwhile, Pilsudski had planned a counter-stroke to stem the tide. He deliberately withdrew vital divisions from the southwestern front and concentrated his main forces against Tukhachevsky. This was partly foreseen by the Red commander and was guarded against by a plan for the Red armies in the southwest to strike on Lublin and prevent the Polish offensive.

Tukhachevsky finally had obtained an agreement from the Revolutionary Council of War to subordinate the armies in the southwest to his command. His orders were intended to bring a concentration of the Red troops against Pilsudski's masses might. Yegorov, prompted by Stalin, refused to obey orders and Budenny's cavalry with Voroshilov's approval kept going towards Lwow, instead of northward. Exactly what Pilsudski had hoped would happen. Day after day of critical fighting in the western front brought no action from Stalin or his cohorts.

BLUNDERS ARE COSTLY AND FATAL

Burning with ambition for a military victory to offset Tukhachevsky's successes, the commanders on the southwestern front instead marched towards Lwow. For five days the cavalry of Budenny hurled itself against the strongly entrenched Polish infantry at Lwow while Pilsudski was making headway in his offensive against Tukhachevsky. When it was too late and his forces were weakened, Budenny and Voroshilov turned towards Lublin.

Tukhachevsky was forced to order a retreat, under the blows of Pilsudski's concentrated forces and the treachery of the Stalin-Yegorov-Voroshilov bloc, and the Red Army fell back to a point which marked the boundary between Poland and Soviet Russia until a few weeks ago.

For years Stalin and his cohorts did not even make an attempt to defend themselves from the open charges that Tukhachevsky hurled at them. Only when Russian history was being rewritten to suit the needs of the Stalin bureaucracy

was a defense attempted. Of course Trotsky was made the scapegoat. He had participated in drawing up the campaign with Tukhachevsky, and the whole conception was "erroneous," declared the creator of the Moscow frame-ups!

STALIN ADDS A NEW CHAPTER TO HIS CRIMES

Eric Wollenberg, in his book, "The Red Army", summarized the Polish campaign as follows. "The march on Warsaw was unable to bring about a revolution in Central Europe because of the fact that centuries of oppression at the hands of the Great Russians had left the Polish proletariat not yet sufficiently mature for revolution, coincided with the military blunders associated with the name of Stalin, Voroshilov and Yegorov."

Viewed in historical perspective, one can well understand how infinitely more difficult has become the task of the Polish and world proletariat to make the revolution when the same Stalin orders the Red Army to march again into Poland, not to spread the doctrine of world revolution, but to assure domination for the counter-revolutionary Stalinist bureaucracy. Stalin must add to his long list of crimes, including his first treachery in Poland, the present invasion of Poland.

AF.L. CONVENTION BALKS AT THIRD TERM FOR F.D.R.

CINCINNATI, Ohio—The A.F.L. convention refused to endorse President Roosevelt for a third term or give a blanket endorsement of his policies. It turned down a minority resolution presented by the Connecticut State Federation of Labor on this issue.

The resolutions committee in non-concurring with the Connecticut delegates' proposals pointed out that "the resolution does not distinguish between Congressional and administrative action, neither does it distinguish between actions of the administration and of the bureaus, boards and commissions."

Among other legislation sponsored by the New Deal which the AFL opposed was the law to destroy prevailing wages which Congress passed, and the first reorganization bill.

AVAILABLE

There are still some copies of UNSER WORT, No. 97-98, available. Featured is a polemic by Walter Held with the Institute for Social Research, entitled: "Critical Theory Without Revolutionary Practice?" There is an excellent commentary on "The Pact of the Three," by L. A. which is of particular interest at this time in view of the predictions made which have since been confirmed. The series of documents on the Spanish Revolution is continued. The new issue, dealing with the outbreak of war, will appear shortly. Order at once in writing from:
LABOR BOOK SHOP
116 University Place
New York, N. Y.
(12 copies \$1.20)

JUST OUT!!

"Why Negroes Should Oppose the War"
By J. R. Johnson

A message that affects the life of every Negro!
ORDER NOW!

Price—5c per copy. Bundle rates—10 to 50—3c per copy. 50 or more—2½c per copy.

SPECIAL RATES TO ORGANIZATIONS

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place, N.Y.C.

Don't forget to register from October 9-14 to vote for Max Shachtman and George Lyman Paine for N. Y. Councilmen.

Their Government
By James Burnham

Not the least remarkable phase of the just concluded Panama conference and the Declaration which issued out of it is the minor attention which the whole matter has received in the general press. I have not found a single newspaper which gave its main headline to the Declaration. Indeed, very few even put the news from Panama on the front page. Why such modesty?

The explanation is simple enough: The publicists for United States imperialism—which means all of the bourgeois and most of the labor press—have got to keep the attention of the people focussed on the crimes of foreign bullies, and off the doings of the bully at home. Otherwise the people might begin to understand the real aims of the war into which Roosevelt is so democratically herding us.

Editorial hands are raised in horror when Germany and the Soviet Union conquer by arms or subjugate by diplomacy a few fifth and tenth rate countries. But the editors are most discreetly silent while United States imperialism utilizes the first weeks of the war to cinch up control over two entire continents.

What Washington Wants

The first of the minimum war aims of United States imperialism is domination of the Americas. Such domination involves control over trade, capital investments and raw materials in the American nations to an extent that will reduce the share of other powers to a negligible fraction, and will assure that this residue does not interfere with the subordination of American economy as a whole to the needs of the metropolis.

Such economic domination demands, in turn, control over the foreign policy of all the American nations. But control over foreign policy necessitates, also, a decisive measure of control over internal policy. At the very least, the United States must be sure that the various governments are "friendly" to itself, oriented toward Washington. This means that the United States must prevent these governments from being, as many have been in the past, tools of one of the rival powers (notably Great Britain); and prevent even more stringently the rise of popular, anti-imperialist revolutionary movements. Either dependence on another power or revolutionary mass struggle strikes at U.S. domination.

This aim has been among the guides of U.S. policy during the past quarter of a century, and comes to the forefront in the war. The Panama conference brings it a mighty leap toward realization.

Who are the Rivals?

In spite of the Monroe Doctrine, the United States was a minor factor in Latin America before the last war. England had been by far the principal influence, with Germany moving up during the decade preceding 1914. The war and the reconstruction years which followed gave the U.S. its first big chance; and money, goods, warships and marines, were pumped south. England rapidly regained an important position while Germany was frozen out. In the last few years, however, Germany went ahead again, and overtook England in volume of trade—though both together have had less than the United States' 36%. In amount of capital investment, England and the United States are probably now about even, with no other nation approaching. Indeed, from all points of view, the powers other than England and Germany hardly count.

As soon as the war began, Germany's trade was virtually eliminated. In spite of her navy, England's must be seriously curtailed, both because of the difficulties of convoy and because of the scarcity of export goods which will be available from British industry.

The United States proposes that this withdrawal of her chief rivals shall be permanent. The Declaration of Panama was Roosevelt's way of making this proposal known.

Some Problems Ahead

The Declaration was "adopted unanimously" by the conference. There was as much chance of an open negative vote as of Estonia's rejecting Molotov's proposals. Summer Welles was there to dictate, and the others to sign. But the sorrows that were hidden under the unanimous vote stretched all the way to Berlin and, above all, to London.

Argentina and Bolivia, for example, have for long been closely tied to London. They tried to object, but Welles granted them only a face-saving clause or two. And London must meditate bitterly about its plans for a Brazilian regime less wholly at Wall Street's orders.

And then there is this: Britain and France have many possessions in the Americas. These are most valuable in war, not merely as sources of supplies but especially as bases for warships. The language of the Declaration can be interpreted to mean that these possessions cannot be used as such bases.

Of course, proclaiming the Declaration does not put it into operation. It is not yet accepted by the belligerent powers; and if it is accepted in words, this will not guarantee their acceptance in deeds. Acceptance will be ensured only by force; and the force in question can only be United States ships and planes. These however, are concentrated in the Pacific: for the second of the minimum war aims of U.S. imperialism is free entry into the Far East.

From this, by the way, it would seem to follow that "the principle of a two-ocean navy" will be adopted by the next regular session of Congress.

It is true that the Declaration is aimed primarily at Germany; and it is true that Roosevelt will enter the war against Germany. But at times England must be less than delighted as she watches her mighty ally!

Yes, and Canada too is in the Americas. Would it be so startling if Canada "declared her independence" from the Empire during the course of the war and its aftermath? On U.S. War Department maps of the war resources of the great powers, those of Canada are listed in the column of the United States.

United States Army Amateur Radio Reserve, believes amateur radio "can be as valuable for the Mrs. Ted Bourke, only woman member of the purposes of war as it is in establishing friendships in time of peace." Just another instance of the truism that everything the bourgeoisie touches it poisons.