

Conscript the War Industries Under Workers Control!

(Concluded from last issue)

Now that we understand the situation and what it is that the ruling class wants and what we want, the first step is to make some demands of them. Let us proceed with the boss in the army the same way we proceed in the factory.

We understand what to do when we have grievances in the factory. We make certain demands of the boss and send in a committee of our own choosing to represent us. Sometimes, in the factory, we find it necessary to go on strike. We put out a picket line. The scabs are kept out. The workers' jobs are in jeopardy. They need these jobs

in order to feed their families. (In the army our lives are in jeopardy.)

The workers don't have any confidence in the boss. During a sit-in strike we remain in the plant and sit at the machines so that no one can use them. The boss who pays us low wages for long hours; hires scabs, strikebreakers and thugs and calls in the police; is the same boss that forces us into the army and drags us to his war.

In the factory they put their superintendents and managers over us, in the army they put their men over us as officers. In fact, some of these same factory superintendents

and managers become officers in the army. Big business and the imperialist army are tied together.

Our First And Main Demand

The first and foremost demand to make of the ruling class is the NATIONALIZATION OF THE WAR INDUSTRIES UNDER WORKERS CONTROL.

All the war industries must be conscripted and placed under the control of the workers. The government claims that this is not a war for profit, that it is not for the owners of these industries. Roosevelt says that no new crop of

millionaires will come out of this war. Steps must be taken by the workers to make this promise effective. Nothing has been done yet. The bosses are piling up huge profits already. United States Steel had a profit of 1743% the first six months this year, over the same period of 1939.

The workers who are not in the army and navy will run the factories. The bosses will get wages just like the workers, if they do any useful work in the industry. There is no reason to give them huge salaries, dividends and interests if they do not actually work and participate in production.

(Continued on page 4)

Workers! This Is Not Our War!
It Is a War for Boss Profits!
Join Hands in Independent
Labor Action Against the War!

LABOR ACTION

In This Issue —
The Second Article in Series on
Fascism and War by Max Shachtman
Appears on Page 2.

NOVEMBER 4, 1940

ORGAN OF THE WORKERS PARTY, SECTION OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

THREE CENTS

LEWIS MARCHES INTO GIRDLER'S CAMP!

Those Who Support the Boss Parties Deliver Blow Against Labor's Interests

John L. Lewis, president of the CIO and the militant miners' union, has raised the banner of the most reactionary section of the ruling class in the United States and is now marching in step and abreast of Girdler, Weir, Ford and Morgan.

After sulking in his tent throughout the last few weeks of the presidential campaign, Lewis comes out for Wendell Willkie, spokesman for the most irreconcilable and brutal enemies of the working class in this country. For the present, at least, Lewis finds himself in the camp of Tom Girdler; the same Girdler who would quit and plant potatoes before he would abide by section 7A of the NIRA. This is the same Girdler too who is responsible for the murder of CIO workers in the Little Steel strike of 1937. It is the same Tom Girdler who has steadfastly refused to bargain collectively with the Steel Workers Organizing Committee.

Here is what Lewis said about Girdler in 1937: "Tom Girdler is a heavily armed monomaniac with murderous tendencies who has gone berserk. Girdler should be disarmed and restrained by the government before he turns the steel districts into a bloody shambles and looses all the pent-up forces of human passions." These are strong words, but they fit the lord of Republic Steel today just as they did in 1937.

Lewis enters into a covenant with Henry Ford, the pious old scoundrel who organized an army of thugs and cutthroats to harass and intimidate his workers and club CIO representatives who came to organize the workers in his factories.

THE WORLD AT WAR

Greece Drawn into the War As Axis Powers Make Move Toward Near East Oil Fields

By MAX STERLING

The Axis has struck again in the southwest of Europe and Greece joins the list of pawns sacrificed in the great struggle between the "have" and the "have not" nations for world empire.

This time the Axis powers are directing their efforts against the British Empire proper. Greece is a major step towards the oil fields of Iran and Iraq. Because the British know what is at stake they are backing Greece to the limit. The British fleet in the Mediterranean has already occupied the strategic islands of Crete and Corfu and are reported to have landed troops at Salonika in order to prevent Italy's cutting Greece off from Turkey.

Turkey may soon be involved. If so, the Germans will shortly move their tremendous military machine against her from bases in Rumania and Bulgaria. The Yugoslavian nation is trying hard to remain neutral but it is hardly likely that she will be able to resist any demands made upon her by the Axis powers. She is caught between the latter, and they can crush her as in a vise.

The war in the southwest of Europe and toward the Dardanelles cannot but have the greatest importance for Russia. Axis control of the Dardanelles would mean control of movement to and from the Black Sea. It puts the Axis in a position where it can bottle up Rus-

sian seapower and commerce, and attack her ports in the south.

STALIN ROLE UNSURE

It is certain that Stalin lacks enthusiasm for the new offensive of his "friends". That they may have informed him of their intentions in advance probably consoles him very little. Stalin can only stand helplessly by and hope for successful resistance against the Axis. As for the Turks, they no longer count on Russia's assistance, knowing that Stalin's tieup with Hitler has paralyzed him. The Nazi armies stand too close to the Russian borders for Stalin to make any false moves now. What Stalin thinks about the events that are now transpiring can best be judged by the fact that the Communist Party of Greece has pledged itself to completely support Greek resistance. Hitler knows very well how uncomfortable Stalin feels. Scaring Stalin deeper into the imperialist partnership with him, he grants Stalin certain concessions and a share in the loot.

The latest concession was to give Russia a place in the Axis controlled Danube Commission. It is not known what Hitler has promised Stalin for his complaisance in the new Axis drive but events will probably reveal this too. Stalin's anxiety over affairs in southeastern Europe will also hurry him into a pact with the Japanese. The discussions that are now taking place with the Japanese plenipotentiary in Moscow seem to be nearing a successful conclusion, and the price Stalin will pay will be to betray his support to China's struggle against Japan. This is exactly what Hitler wants. He wants to have the Japanese free to divert the Anglo-American forces in the Pacific. At the same time, the Stalinist lie that the Stalin-Hitler pact meant the isolation of Japan is shamefully exposed.

PETAINE-HITLER TALKS

Hitler's talks with Petain and Franco will soon unfold in all their significance. The conqueror does not make special trips to his vassals for nothing. Everything points to some deal in which Hitler will utilize Spain and France as points of departure for his military campaign against the British Empire but this time from the direction of Gibraltar and French colonial bases in the Near East and Africa.

For Hitler the time element is very important. He must crush Britain before total American participation makes that impossible. Having failed to deliver a knockout blow to Britain in the British Isles he intends to deliver that blow to the Empire itself. That is why so much importance is attached to the present scene of operations.

LET THE PEOPLE
VOTE ON WAR!

Lewis joins with Ernest Weir, treasurer of the Republican National Committee; the same Weir who operates the feudal barony of Weirton, West Virginia, the same Weir whose armed gangsters drove CIO organizers from Weirton in 1936-37. Lewis goes arm in arm with Eugene Grace of Bethlehem Steel who up to now has refused to abide by the Walsh-Healy Act and whose workers are now threatening strike. Lewis becomes a buddy of Thomas Lamont of Morgan and Co.; the same Lamont who went slinking into the Republican convention to direct the nomination of Willkie.

John L. Lewis goes over to the party of Herbert Hoover, the organizer of Bloody Thursday; this stuffed shirt international organizer of misery for the workers of every region where he operated as a promoter of mines and salesman of mining stock.

What are the reasons given by Lewis for switching from Roosevelt, whom he so ardently supported in 1936, to Willkie and the Republican Party in 1940? First he gave as a reason that he is opposed to a third term for Roosevelt. The president has a "personal craving for power"; "America wants no royal family"; "America needs no superman . . ." and "denies the philosophy that runs to the deification of the state." Roosevelt may "create a dictatorship in this land."

Also, the leader of the CIO is opposed "to any involvement of our country in foreign wars." Lewis is for abatement of war but he finds that every act of Roosevelt leads straight into the European conflict. War "kills off the vigorous males who, if permitted to live, might question the financial exploitation of the race."

Lewis is also against Roosevelt and the Democratic Party because the Democrats did not keep faith with him and the CIO. After throwing all its resources behind Roosevelt in 1936, "labor today has no point of contact with the Democratic Administration in power, except for casual and occasional interviews . . ." Mr. Hillman of the War Preparations Commission, Mr. Tracy, Assistant Secretary of Labor, and other labor leaders in the government would deny this assertion.

"After seven years in power, it (the Democratic Party) finds itself without solution for the major questions of unemployment, low national income. . . There still exists the same national unhappiness that it faced seven years ago." As his final assault on the present administration Lewis cites its incompetence in the handling of foreign trade and its failure to prepare the country for economic existence during the adverse conditions that will obtain in Europe after the war.

What does John L. Lewis advise workers to do to protect themselves against the depredations and disinterest of Roosevelt and the Democratic Party? He tells them to vote for Willkie and the Republican Party. What reasons does Lewis give the working class for voting for Willkie? "He is a gallant American. He has opened his heart to the American people. He is not an aristocrat. He has the common touch. He was born in the briar and not to the purple. He has worked with his hands and has known the pangs of hunger. . ."

Willkie has promised, says Lewis, "that he will put the unemployed to work; that he will abolish pauperism . . . that he will take the representatives of labor into his cabinet and into the policy-making agencies of the government . . . he has said that he believes in and will enforce the right of labor to organize, and will promote collective bargaining between industry and labor . . . he has said that he will preserve and maintain all social legislation . . . has given his guarantee . . . he will not send the sons of American mothers and American fathers to fight in foreign wars."

These are the chief reasons John L. Lewis gives for supporting Wendell Willkie and opposing the reelection of Roosevelt. If

(Continued in editorial column, page 4)



Army Accidentally Reveals Strike-Busting California Brass-Hats Let Cat Out Of Bag In Speeches To Businessmen

By JACK FERGUSON

LOS ANGELES, Calif.—Letting the cat out of the bag, Army officials here last week revealed how they expect to aid employers in smashing strikes, and also that they had warned employers to replace men with women since an army of 4,000,000 was coming.

Higher-ups immediately sought to cover up these very damaging revelations because, to quote the boss of the Los Angeles draft board, "It is this type of statement that creates unrest and panic."

How It Works

The first Army blunder came when Colonel Walter H. Adams told the manufacturing and industries committee of the Chamber of Commerce here, that any man on strike was liable to be immediately thrown into the Army.

"What happens if a man goes out on strike, after having been occupationally deferred," a Chamber of Commerce official asked the Colonel. "I would say that his status has

been changed and he should notify the draft board and be subject to service," the Colonel replied.

"On all cases, the draft board will rule. From this board there is but one appeal, that of the local appeal boards of which there are six in Los Angeles County."

"The draftee can not appear in person or through an attorney before them, but he will submit his questionnaire which the appeal board will study and on which it will rule," Colonel Adams explained.

Since the local appeal boards are composed of businessmen, and the striker will not even be given a hearing, it is quite obvious that the threat of "shut up and go back to work or you'll be put in the Army," is going to be used heavily by the bosses against union militants.

Try To Backwater

The second blunder which Army officials are now seeking to cover up was made by Major Arthur R. Baird to another meeting of the Chamber of Commerce.

Pointing out the strong possibility of the drafting of 4,000,000 men, Major Baird urged the employers to "take a long range view of this employment deferment and give serious thought to replacing men with women."

"There will be a terrific withdrawal of men from industry," Major Baird emphasized, "if we should have to have an Army of 4,000,000."

Similar advice to businessmen was advanced last week by the astute magazine, Business Week, which reprinted ads from the London newspapers showing how employers had advertised for women and men over draft age to take up the "labor shortage" due to conscription.

Army officials subsequently announced that there would be a declaration from Washington repudiating these statements in an effort to calm the fears of the eligible draftees and union men. Of course, such a denial of the policy would serve only to conceal once again the anti-union aims of the present conscription law.

Leviton Boss Still Stalling Despite Union Vote

By SUSAN GREEN

BROOKLYN, N.Y., October 23—Immediately upon the counting of the votes last Thursday, showing that an overwhelming majority of the employees of the Leviton Manufacturing Company wished to be represented by Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, union officials sent a telegram to Leviton requesting an immediate conference on wages and conditions.

The boss's reply was that the company would wait until official certification of the election results came from Washington. Such certification came from the National Labor Relations Board Saturday morning. However, following through on his dog-in-the-manger policy, Leviton is now taking advantage of the five days allowed him to protest the

election if he wishes.

I was informed at strike headquarters that there is absolutely no ground for a protest, and Leviton knows it. The NLRB officials who supervised the balloting stated that the Leviton workers participated in the most orderly election they ever witnessed. In the first hour, 1,000 workers cast their votes. Of the total votes cast 1,299 were for Local 3, 70 were against the union, and 16 votes were challenged by the company.

In the meantime, the strikers are attending to the grim business of keeping the plant tied up tight. Every morning, between 700 and 800 and more pickets are on the job at the plant. Amply protected by from 200 to 300 cops on motorcycle, on horseback and on foot, nine private cars enter the plant—carrying strike-

breakers. Were it not for the tremendous police force that the city government so generously supplies the boss in this struggle, the strikers could prevent even these few scabs from functioning.

A Meeting

—celebrating the anniversary of the Russian Revolution will be organized on November 17 by Local New York of the Workers Party. Max Shachtman, national secretary of the Workers Party, and Nathan Gould, Organizer of Local New York, will be the principal speakers. Details of the meeting, time and place, will be announced shortly. A wide publicity campaign is being planned for this meeting.

Fascism and the World War by Max Shachtman

ARTICLE TWO

Fascism's rise to power in Germany, its consolidation, and above all the spectacular victories it has won in the war, have had a decisive influence in shaping the thoughts and actions of the working class. Especially in the democratic countries, the labor movement is increasingly aware of the peril to its existence represented by Hitlerism, increasingly anxious to fight it to the death. The worker's hatred of fascism and all it stands for is sound to the core.

Up to the present, however, the revolutionary vanguard elements have been unable to give this hatred a clear-cut class expression. Rather, it has been cunningly and effectively exploited by every capitalist demagogue, every professional "democrat" and every one of their retainers in the labor movement. It has been basely perverted in the interests of a decadent social order, for the preservation of capitalist rule, for the promotion of the profits and privileges of one imperialist gang against another. The most detestable form of this exploitation of a progressive sentiment for reactionary purposes is the use made of it to lead proletarian cannon-fodder docilely into supporting the capitalist democracies in the present war.

We didn't do so well against fascism in Germany when we had the chance in 1931 and 1932 and 1933—say the social-democrats—but we're ready to make up for it now under the sacred leadership of Daladier or Churchill or Roosevelt.

War is a terrible thing; it threatens the standards of living and even the existence of the working class—

The Cannonites Decide On A Change Of Front

Among the recent examples of change of front is the unfolding of a new policy towards the war and militarism by the Socialist Workers Party (Cannon group). It is worthy of detailed examination precisely because it is calculated to appeal to those revolutionary workers who were educated in the spirit of Lenin's uncompromising ideas. Let us see just what it has and what it has not in common with these ideas.

The policy, specifically described as a new one, has its origin in a point of view developed by Trotsky shortly before his assassination. It is presented publicly, with characteristic amplifications, one-legged analogies and other improvements, in two speeches delivered by Cannon at the last meeting of the S.W.P. National Committee in Chicago and a resolution adopted there, all of which appear in recent numbers of the Socialist Appeal.

Our examination could not possibly dwell on all the ludicrous theoretical boners with which Cannon's contribution is studded and which have always been a source of polite merriment among his less awed colleagues. That would be too long a task for one or even two articles. Insofar as it is possible to crash through the commonplaces and pomposity that surround its central points, we shall deal only with those points.

"These are new times," says Cannon. "The characteristic feature of our epoch is unceasing war and universal militarism." So far—even if not very new—so good. And what new policy does the revolutionary Marxist movement need for these new times which it did not

Just What Was The Bolshevik Policy?

We have learned, in politics, that the attempt to present an old policy as a new one, or a new policy as merely an old one, usually conceals something quite different. But before we look to see if that is so in this case, let us inquire into the reasons, the premises, for a new policy.

We must rid ourselves, says Cannon, of a hangover from the past of our own movement. "We said and those before us said that capitalism had outlived its usefulness. World economy is ready for socialism. But when the World War started in 1914 none of the parties had the idea that on the agenda stood the struggle for power. The stand of the best of them was essentially a protest against the war. It did not occur even to the best Marxists that the time had come when the power must be seized by the workers in order to save civilization from degeneration. Even Lenin did not visualize the victory of the proletarian revolution as the immediate outcome of the war." (Emphasis in original.)

Now, having read what the premises for the "new" policy are, we rub our eyes for the second time. One would think that the need of imposing the new line on his party did not require such an insistent display of contempt for commonly-known facts. We restrict ourselves to the term "contempt" only because it is not quite clear to us whether it is falsification that is involved or merely ignorance.

Not even "the best of them," not even "the best Marxists," and not even Lenin looked forward to the proletarian revolution in the last war? Let us see:

In one of its very first manifestoes following the outbreak of the war, the Central Committee of the Bolshevik party declared in October, 1914: "The war has placed on the order of the day (in the advanced Euro-

Trying To Reconcile The Irreconcilable

Now why is Cannon compelled to resort to so transparently false an argument to motivate the change in course? The answer is not hard to find. His problem is to reconcile the irreconcilable; adherence to the revolutionary anti-war tradition of Lenin and Bolshevism, with advocacy of a new and different policy towards the present war crisis that has little in common with that tradition. He resolves his problem very simply—by a complete misrepresentation of the views and tradition of the Bolsheviks in the last war. Once that is done, he is ready to proceed with his "new" policy. We have already seen that his first attempt to describe what is "new" in the policy adopted by the S.W.P., is simply a failure. Let us see how he fares with his other attempts.

Pacifist opposition to war is futile or misleading or even reactionary. Good, and like most of the commonplaces of which Cannon is qualified master, true. Moreover, it is worthwhile repeating and explaining this truth over and over again. The working class, and revolutionists in particular, are not and cannot be opposed to war as such and therefore to all wars. We were for the war in Spain; we are for the war of a colonial people against an imperialist power (China vs. Japan); we are, above all, for the war of the workers against their oppressors. The professional pacifists are at best utopians (disarmament, or abolition of war, under capitalism) and at worst, as a rule, they disarm the exploited in face of the enemies of the people. But Marxists have pointed this out for almost a hundred years. The whole modern revolutionary movement was brought up, especially by Lenin and Trotsky, in the last quarter of a century with a keen appreciation of these ideas. Repeat it today? Emphasize it more and more? Yes. But that is not new—at least not to the Marxists.

Individual abstention from imperialist war is futile and reactionary. Good, and again, true. We are not "conscientious objectors." If the imperialist government, because of our weakness, compels us to enter the

say the labor lieutenants of imperialism—but fascism, which we ourselves, cannot fight, is worse and so we must fight it under the banner of imperialism.

We used to have some confidence in the working class and socialism—say the intellectuals who have completed their retreat to capitalism—but now everything, especially the class struggle and all idea of revolution, must be abandoned in the interests of the holy war against fascism.

Our traditional principles and beliefs held in the past—they all say in one way or another—but they hold no longer because fascism makes it necessary for us to revise them or to drop them altogether.

The tragic hordes of refugees fleeing before the mechanized armies of Hitler have as their no less tragic counterpart the flight from working class principles of virtually everybody in and around the labor movement. Some are moving fast, and some faster, but almost all of them are in flight.

It would be somewhat surprising if even the most revolutionary section of the working class were not affected in one degree or another by the atmosphere thus created. We know from the last world war that those revolutionists who were able to resist the impact of the powerful chauvinistic wave, not give a single inch to it, were exceedingly few in number and remained in total isolation for a long time. Others either plunged into the war current or drifted with it and landed far from the shores of the working class. In those days, the pretext for abandoning Marxism was the need of preserving labor from the horrors of Kaiserism or Czarism; today, it is the horrors of fascism.

have yesterday? "The workers themselves must take charge of this fight against Hitler and anybody else who tries to invade their rights. That is the whole principle of the new policy that has been elaborated for us by comrade Trotsky. The great difference between this and the socialist military policy in the past is that it is an extension of the old policy, and adaptation of old principles to new conditions." (Emphasis in original.)

Having read what the "whole principle of the new policy" is, we rub our eyes for the first time. "The workers themselves must take charge of this fight against Hitler and anybody else who tries to invade their rights." Just what is new in this policy, at least so far as the Marxist movement, or the modern Trotskyist movement, is concerned? Of which old policy is it an extension? Liberals, social-democrats and Stalinists in the past (and today) placed the fight against fascism in charge of the bourgeoisie. That is true. But not we.

Especially since the rise of the Nazis in Germany in 1931, Trotsky above all taught the movement that "the workers themselves must take charge of this fight against Hitler" and Hitlerism, both on a national and an international scale, both in the case of civil war in one country and in the case of imperialist war between bourgeois-democratic and fascist nations. That thought runs through every document of the Fourth International, every document of Trotsky, from 1931 down to the thesis on "The War and the Fourth International" and "The Transitional Program of the Fourth International." If that is the "whole principle of the new policy," what was the principle of the "old" policy?

pean countries, M.S.) the slogan of a socialist revolution." The resolution of the Bolshevik conference in Switzerland, March, 1915, declared: "Civil war to which revolutionary social-democracy calls at the present period is a struggle of the proletariat, with arms in hand, against the bourgeoisie for the purpose of expropriating the capitalist class in the advanced capitalist countries, for a democratic revolution in Russia (democratic republic, eight-hour work-day, confiscation of landowners' lands), for a republic in the backward monarchist countries in general, etc. . . . A revolutionary crisis is approaching."

Cannon now tells us that "the stand of the best of them was essentially a protest against the war." If the above perspective and program of the Bolsheviks ("the best of them") was only a protest against the war, what, if you please, would a program of revolution look like?

Again, in his article of October 11, 1915, Lenin wrote, precisely against those who did not have a revolutionary perspective: ". . . We are really and firmly convinced that the war is creating a revolutionary situation in Europe, that all the economic and socio-political circumstances of the imperialist epoch lead up to a revolution of the proletariat . . . (therefore) it is our bounden duty to explain to the masses the necessity of a revolution, to appeal for it, to create befitting organizations, to speak fearlessly and in the most concrete manner of the various methods of forceful struggle and of its 'technique' . . . And a year later, at the end of 1916, the same 'not-even-Lenin' wrote in his criticism of the German Marxists: 'In the years 1914 to 1916 the revolution stood on the order of the day.' And above all, what in heaven's name was the meaning of Lenin's slogan, repeated a thousand times during the last war, 'Turn the imperialist war into a civil war?'

army, we enter. If it compels us to participate in its war, we participate. We do not claim 'exemption' on grounds of conscientious objection. Such opposition to imperialist militarism and war is futile because it is based on individual action instead of action by the organized masses. And if the masses were conscious and strong enough to impose a demand for 'exemption,' they would be strong enough to take power and put an end forever both to militarism and war. Such opposition is reactionary, because, if carried out by us, it would mean eliminating revolutionists from the aggregate of the workers in uniform, thus leaving them prey to chauvinists and reactionaries. But these views are at least twenty-five years old in the Marxist movement. When Cannon says of us, the Workers Party, that 'They were primarily concerned about the various ways of evading the draft,' he merely adds another monstrous falsehood to the one he tells about Lenin in the last war, doubly monstrous because of the interest which 'perspicacious' authorities would show in the lie . . . But be that as it may, wherein is what he says on this point new—that is, new to the Fourth International, for it is a new policy for the International that he is proposing?

The interests of the workers-in-uniform must be defended. Good, and true, and an elementary duty of the revolutionary movement, of the working class as a whole, both inside and outside the army. We demand decent living standards for the soldiers. We demand full political, democratic rights for the soldiers. We demand an end to all arbitrariness and abuses by the officer caste. We demand the election of officers by the soldiers. We demand an end to the division between the barracks and the civilian population. All these and similar demands have been put forth in LABOR ACTION. But we do not claim that they are "new." They represent the position of the modern revolutionary movement since the beginning of the last World War and, for that matter, for many years before it.

And Finally—The "New Policy"

But if these things, to which Cannon devotes slabs of lead in the Socialist Appeal, are not the "new policy" demanded by the "new times," what is it? We finally come to it in Cannon's summary speech, tucked away in a few modest little sentences. We will quote them so that the reader may have them right before him:

"Was our old line wrong? Does the resolution represent a completely new departure and a reversal of the policy of the past? It is not quite correct to say that the old line was wrong. It was a program devised for the fight against war in time of peace. Our fight against war under conditions of peace was correct as far as it went. But it was not adequate. It must be extended. The old principles, which remain unchanged, must be applied concretely to the new conditions of permanent war and universal militarism. We didn't visualize, nobody visualized, a world situation in which whole countries would be conquered by fascist armies. The workers don't want to be conquered by foreign invaders, above all by fascists. They require a program of military struggle against foreign invaders which assures their class independence. That is the gist of the problem."

"Many times in the past we were put at a certain disadvantage; the demagoguery of the social democrats against us was effective to a certain extent. They said: 'You have no answer to the question of how to fight against Hitler, how to prevent Hitler from conquering France, Belgium, etc. (Of course their program was very simple—the suspension of the class struggle and complete subordination of the workers to the bourgeoisie. We have seen the results of this treacherous policy.) Well, we answered in a general way, the workers will FIRST overthrow the bourgeoisie at home AND THEN they will take care of invaders. THAT WAS A GOOD PROGRAM, but the workers did not make the revolution in time. NOW THE TWO TASKS MUST BE TELESCOPED AND CARRIED OUT SIMULTANEOUSLY.' (See Appeal, No. 43. Our Emphasis.)

There is the new policy of Cannon! There it is, along with the real reason for it. At the beginning we were told that the "new military policy" cannot be found in the records of the Marxists during the last war, because "not even Lenin" visualized a revolution coming out of the war, whereas in the present war we do visualize it. The argument was spurious and Cannon implicitly acknowledges it in his summary. What is new is what Jay Lovestone and Sidney Hook say is new, what all the social-patriots say is new, namely, the dramatically speedy advance of the Hitlerite armies which "we didn't visualize, nobody visualized."

"The workers don't want to be conquered by foreign invaders, above all by fascists." Quite true, and in that the workers are quite justified. But that was true also in the last world war. The German workers, with their socialist traditions and institutions, did not want to be conquered by the invading Cossack representatives of Czarist absolutism. The French workers, with their republican and revolutionary traditions, did not want to be conquered by the invading Prussian Junkers and

A Slogan With Class-Collaboration Overtones

What about the slogan of "control of military training by the trade unions," which the Cannonites seem to present as the "new" element in their policy? Nonsense! That is not what is essentially new in the policy; it is only an offshoot of the "new" course. Military training of the workers and under-workers' control? Of course! What else is our already pretty-well-established slogan of a people's army based on the trade unions? Yes, we were and remain for the arming of the workers, for a people's army based on the most authentic organs of the masses today, the trade unions. That's the army we rely upon to fight our battles, to defend our interests against reaction at home and abroad. As a separate and class institution of the workers, we want it to be completely independent today of the capitalist state machinery, of its military apparatus in particular. Tomorrow, if the people are ready for it, we want it to replace that apparatus.

Of our slogan we can truthfully say: we are revising (not revising) Lenin's old "proletarian militia" slogan of the last war, "modernizing" it neither in principle nor tactically, but only agitatingly, from the standpoint of the concrete situation in our day. Our slogan of a people's army based on the trade unions is the indispensable complement of the fight we carried against conscription, that is, against the building and consolidation of imperialist militarism. (Parenthetically: Cannon knows this, of course; but that does not prevent him with characteristic disloyalty and malice from putting our fight against conscription into the same category with that of Norman Thomas and other pacifists!)

Is this, however, what Cannon's slogan amounts to? It is sometimes hard to say—reading the Appeal—because "military training under trade union control" is presented there with deliberate ambiguity. At times, it seems to call for the establishment of a separate armed force, brought together, armed, trained, directed and controlled by the class organizations of the workers, the trade unions, and not as a part of the imperialist army. Given that sense, the slogan is identical with our slogan of a "people's army" and is one hundred percent correct.

Elsewhere in the Cannonite press, however, the slogan is interpreted as a demand for trade union "control" of the conscript imperialist army—which is something quite different! Thus—to take the most striking sample from the Appeal—the headlines in No. 39: "N.J. Survey Shows Workers Want Union Control of Military Training. Approve Enactment of Conscription. But Also Favor Union Control of It." The story that follows corresponds to the headlines.

Dangerous Symptoms Manifested In Practice

In their anxiety to find a "practical" program, to adapt themselves to the patriotic, anti-fascist moods of the workers (that is, to the anti-fascist moods which the bourgeoisie have subverted to the needs of bourgeois patriotism), the Cannonites have given an important finger to the devil of national defensism. It would be stupid to put them in the camp of the social-patriots, of course. But while they are not in flight from revolutionary internationalist principles, they are moving away from them. The "two tasks" which they want to carry out "simultaneously"—there is a treacherous trap they have set for themselves. That trap is all that is new in Cannon's "military policy of the proletariat."

It is in light of this overwhelmingly important fact that the recent other "peculiar" developments among the Cannonites must be judged. We list a few of the more significant ones made understandable only by understanding the main point we have made:

1. Dropping the fight against conscription like a hot potato—weeks before it became law. Worse: the sabotaging of that fight by repeating every week that it is useless, that conscription is "inevitable," that all its opponents are miserable, poisonous pacifists. Worse yet: deliberately falsifying the facts to suit the "new" policy. For example: Before the "new" policy gained its full impetus, the Appeal recognized (No. 32) what everybody knew: "There is today a great wave of popular

the Hohenzollern dynasty. And not only the workers in general, but we, the revolutionary Marxists, in particular, and that both in 1914 and in 1940.

But what follows from that for Marxists? The policy of the social-patriots, of Scheidemann and Cachen and Henderson in 1914, Blum and Bevin and Onal in 1940, the policy of supporting the imperialist war in the name of "defense of the fatherland" (or "defense of the working class and its institutions and rights") from the "invading aggressor"?

Not for a minute! We have always replied, and we still do: This is a war between imperialist bandits for the re-division of the world and its spoils, and not at all a war between democracy and fascism, between defender and invader. The latter is a vicious imperialist lie, and if you believe it you are a dupe of the ruling class and its apologists. But you want to fight fascism? Yes, of course we do. However, there is but one road in that fight—all others lead to the triumph of fascism. That road is the overthrow of the imperialist ruling class, the establishment of workers' power, of the socialist nation, which will resist all counter-revolutionary aggressors and invaders with arms in hand.

That has always been the position of the revolutionary Marxists. Cannon confirms it. What if we are attacked by a foreign power? he is asked. He says he used to answer: "The workers will first overthrow the bourgeoisie at home and then they will take care of invaders." That is, from the revolutionary standpoint, the right of national defense in war is conferred upon the working class only after it has taken power from the imperialist ruling class, and has a nation to defend. This, and nothing else, is what has always distinguished the revolutionary Marxists, the socialist-internationalist, from all varieties of social-patriots and social-chauvinists. The argument of the latter, from 1914 to 1940, has been, contrariwise, that the workers must defend "their" country from "invaders" whether or not they have yet succeeded in overthrowing the bourgeoisie.

Now, however, Cannon calls for a different, a new answer to the demagoguery of the social democrats. "Now the two tasks must be telescoped and carried out simultaneously." What two tasks? Task One: "Overthrow the bourgeoisie at home" and Task Two: "take care of the invaders," i.e., national defense. No amount of sophistry—and we look forward to the usual quota—can wipe out this fact:

Up to now, Cannon, together with all other partisans of Marxism, declared that national defense in an imperialist war was permissible only after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Today, in virtue of the "new" policy, Cannon declares that national defense is permissible "simultaneously" with the struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie. In other and simpler words, national defense in imperialist war is permissible while the bourgeoisie still rules!

There is the "new" policy of the Cannonites and nothing else! And so far as the Fourth International and its precursors are concerned (we cannot speak for other groups in the labor movement), it certainly is new!

Why is this second interpretation different from the first? The first—a separate, independent, army of the workers, a "proletarian militia"—is a slogan of class struggle. It stands on the same social feet, so to speak, as a trade union itself. It may be and at the outset it would be, shaded by class-collaborationist officials, just as, for example, the pre-1933 independent social-democratic military organization in Germany, the Reichsbanner, or the Red Front-Fighters League of the Stalinists. Yet it remains, like the unions, a class organization of the proletariat, and it can always be "reformed" of its defects, i.e., transformed peacefully into a revolutionary institution. The second—"trade union control" of the conscript army—is a slogan of class collaboration, especially in view of the present trade union leadership (for in this slogan, the reformist character of the officialdom is involved). This slogan stands on the same social feet as a call for "trade union control" of the Roosevelt government. That is why revolutionary Marxists have never put it forward and do not put it forward today. The bourgeois army cannot be "reformed," transformed into an institution or instrument of the working class. The proletarian analysis of it, and attitude towards it, is the same as it is towards the bourgeois state, of which the armed forces are the principal physical constituent and characteristic.

Cannon, with vulgar disregard for Marxian theory, compares the army with a factory, a political with an economic institution. His comparison is significant. The working class will take over the factories; it will not take over the imperialist army any more than it will take over the imperialist state. According to the "out-lived" Lenin and, before him, of Marx and Engels, it will "shatter" the existing state apparatus and replace it with an entirely new and different machinery. Meanwhile, to be sure, revolutionists will no more "abstain" from participating in the armed forces of the bourgeoisie than they abstain from participating—allowing for obvious changes—in the parliament of the bourgeoisie.

"Trade union control of military training" in the present army is essentially class-collaborationist, finally, because the trade union "controllers" would only be captives of imperialism, could only be the executors of the policy and purpose of the army, both of which are decided or determined by the imperialist bourgeoisie and its executive committee—the government, the President-Commander-in-Chief and his Staff. It is tragic to think that such ABC's have to be re-stated not in a polemic against social democrats but in a polemic against a . . . Bolshevik.

opposition to the conscription bill now being debated in Congress . . . millions of workers and farmers oppose conscription. . . . Two months later, the Appeal discovered (No. 41) that "it is a hopeful fact that the great mass of the workers who are required to do so will go to the registration places on Wednesday seriously and without whining or empty regrets. They go to the army as they go to the factory." And two weeks later, Cannon writes (No. 43) that "the workers were for conscription." The type of lie is a bad symptom; the lie itself is a bad symptom.

2. The unprecedented furious assault on "pacifism" by the Cannonites. The "pacifism" of the broad masses is healthy and sound—let the Cannonites shout all they please about this in their newly-acquired stage-sergeant's bluster! It has little, if anything, in common with the professional and "theoretical" pacifists, like the patriotism of the masses, their "pacifism" is progressive, at any rate, potentially progressive. It represents the justified suspicion that fills the people about the imperialist war-mongers and their wars. It represents their hatred and dread of the horrors of war which has become a permanent phenomenon of a rotten social order. It represents their yearning for peace, for security. It is often possible, necessary and right to make a bloc with pacifists against social-patriots, for example; never possible to make one the other way around!

(Continued on page 4)

Bundle Orders Improving—But No Where Near Enough

Last week a plan was presented to all branches by the National Office whereby branches could double their bundle orders with very little extra cost to themselves and at the same time put them in a position to realize some profit on their LABOR ACTION sales. We believe that the plan is a practical one and if properly carried out will go far toward making LABOR ACTION self-sustaining and at the same time—and even more important—doubling the circulation. Thus far only two branches have sent in their orders for twice their regular bundle order on the new plan. These two branches, Buffalo and Worcester are to be congratulated for their quick response. We hope that by the time that this issue reaches you we will be able to report many more doubled bundles.

Though there has been some improvement in bundle order payments, it has not been nearly good enough to offset the very serious financial difficulties with which we are faced. The laggards still remain the laggards—Akron, Berkeley, Chicago (the worst), Cleveland, Los Angeles (almost as bad as Chicago), Newark, New York. We repeat, if these larger branches paid up for past bundle orders, LABOR ACTION would not have to be faced with this perpetual financial crisis.

A Model Branch

We want to say a word about St. Louis. As contrasted to many other branches, their literature department functions like clockwork. Prompt payments, good bookkeeping and above all, go-getting. This week we received 14 subscriptions with a check enclosed, and a request for all the names that we can supply in their territory that might be used for soliciting more subs. Here is a branch that uses its own initiative, plans its own subscription drives and considering its size does more with Party literature than any other branch in the country. A good example to follow!

Since this column was last in print, subs have been received from Chicago (2), Los Angeles (3), New York State (1), Washington (1). We believe that there are many more subs to be had if effort is put forth to get them. St. Louis proves the point.

A press financial statement will be ready promptly on November 1st and sent to branches through Party channels. It should be read carefully and taken up with every branch with the view of improving it for December 1.

And again, we want your order for double your bundle before the next issue of LABOR ACTION is ready for mailing.

Washington has increased its regular bundle by 12. Newark goes down 5. New Brunswick goes down 10. Boston ups its bundle by 15 and pays its bills. More changes for the better next week.

Negro Urges Election Of Shachtman

An audience of 200 Negro workers warmly received the candidate of the Workers Party, Max Shachtman as he delivered the principal address of the evening at a rally called to protest Jim-Crow in the army and national defense. Participating in the organization of the meeting were the St. Augustine Church Youth Group, the Prospect Avenue branch of the NAACP and the Listener News, Negro newspaper published in the Bronx.

Urging a militant fight against Jim Crow, wherever and whenever it chooses to raise its barbaric head, Shachtman traced the roots of Jim Crow tyranny to the system of boss rule which inspires and promotes race prejudice. Lynch rule, said Shachtman, is a means whereby the exploiters of labor, black and white, seek to divide the working class and hold its most exploited section, the Negro, in subjection. Only by militantly uniting labor in common cause against the boss class, can Jim Crow in civil and army life be adequately fought. Not by begging, not by seeking favors from the exploiters, but by persisting in action the capitalist overlords of this land—said Shachtman—only in that way can the Negro achieve real emancipation.

In addition to Shachtman, the speakers of the evening included Mr. George Murphy, publicity director of the NAACP, and Mr. Davidson, chairman of the local NAACP branch. Dr. William Huggins, Negro educator, chaired the meeting. Mr. Davidson, in his speech, urged the election of Shachtman to Congress as a "friend of the Negro people."

The organizer of the Bronx branch of the Workers Party offered the services of the branch in the fight against Jim Crow.

LABOR ACTION

BRONX CAMPAIGN EDITION

CAST AN ANTI-WAR BALLOT, VOTE FOR MAX SHACHTMAN!

Our Platform

TWELVE POINT ELECTION PLATFORM OF MAX SHACHTMAN, WORKERS PARTY CANDIDATE FOR CONGRESS IN THE BRONX (23rd CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT)

1 Against The War! Against Fascism!

The entire world now faces the twin scourges of capitalism—Fascism and War.

We share the feeling of horror and hatred the American masses have for Fascism. We want to see this pestilential reptile crushed before it crushes all of us.

Shall we therefore support the war of the Democracies against the Axis powers? Shall we therefore support the program of militarization of the United States today? Shall we therefore support those who are rushing this country into the World War?

NO!

This is not a war against Fascism! This is not a war for Democracy. The present war is like the war of 1914-1918—a war for imperialist plunder, for profits, for colonies, for sources of raw materials, for fields of capital investments, for control of cheap labor.

American capitalism, having failed to solve the problems of depression and unemployment, now wants to solve them on a world scale—by plunging the country into war. Like the Axis powers, the United States is fighting to dominate the world. Already, in preparing to fight

this imperialist war, the United States is drawing ever closer to the totalitarian system of government of the Axis powers.

The Workers Party is against this country entering the war and against the more and more openly fascist "national defense" program which both major parties endorse.

2 Conscription Is A Step Toward Totalitarianism

The adoption of military conscription, in the face of the decisive opposition of the majority of the people, is being coupled in Washington with the idea of labor conscription in industry.

Tomorrow, workers will be toiling in war industries, and then in the other industries, under military discipline, and for the low army wages. Tomorrow, the workers will be deprived of their powerful weapon for righting economic wrongs—the right to strike.

3 Confiscate The Wealth Of The Parasites!

Expropriate the Sixty Plutocratic Families! The government does not hesitate to confiscate millions of lives by conscription and war. We demand the confiscation of the wealth of the handful of parasites who rule the economic and political life of the country.

4 "Conscript" The War Industries

Nationalize the war industries and place them under workers' control! The Government says this is not a war for profit. The bosses of the war industries, however are not only demanding fabulous profits but they are getting them. These profits will come out of the oceans of workers' blood shed in the war. The government "nationalizes" millions of workers by conscription. We demand the nationalization of the war industries. And since it is the workers who are called upon to die in the war, let them be the men in control of the industries of war.

5 For A People's Army!

The government says we are threatened by foreign invasion, by an attack from Fascism. Then let the people be armed! We did not support conscription and fought bitterly against conscription. We opposed the adoption of the draft legislation.

We have no confidence in the capitalist government—we know only too well its aims in this war. We have no confidence in the present army and the reactionary officers' clique that runs it—we saw only too clearly how it acted in France.

The arming of the people must take place under the complete control of the workers' organizations, the trade unions. They will train and organize the people's army. A people's army will not be an imperialist force interested in acquiring domination over foreign people and colonies. It will not be used to crush labor and labor's rights. It will not be used to smash strikes. The masses can have confidence in such an army, for it will not only resist invading Fascism but also Fascism and all other reactionary forces at home, right here in the United States.

6 Democratic Rights For Conscripts

Full democratic rights for all conscripts and enlisted men! All soldiers, conscripted or enlisted, must be given the right to vote in all elections, local, state or federal. Soldiers must have the right of free speech, free press and free assembly in the army itself—the right to meet freely to discuss any and all questions, the right to receive or to publish any periodical they desire. Soldiers must have the right to organize and elect freely their rank and file committees to represent them in the presentation of all demands and grievances, and in any other negotiations with their officers, Workers

(Continued on page 4)

During the past week, Max Shachtman, national secretary of the Workers Party and candidate for Congress in the 23rd Congressional District, has energetically stumped the Bronx, speaking at a number of outdoor meetings. Other Workers Party leaders have also conducted meetings, and over 75,000 pieces of campaign literature have been distributed.

The deep rooted anti-war sentiment that still exists in the masses, despite all the super-patriotic propaganda dished out by Roosevelt and Willkie, has manifested itself in the large and interested crowds that have gathered to listen to Shachtman. In spite of the chill autumnal nights, crowds of from one hundred to over two hundred Bronx residents stand about, often for over an hour, eager to hear Shachtman's message of working class socialist opposition to capitalism and imperialist war.

A highlight of the week's activities was the speech made by Shachtman at a meeting organized by several Negro groups in the Bronx.

The meeting is reported elsewhere in this issue.

As the Bronx campaign swings into its final week, the Workers Party is mobilizing all its forces to bring it to a fitting climax. In this final week of the campaign, street meetings, addressed by Shachtman and other Party spokesmen, will be held on every night of the week. It is hoped that, by the time this paper appears, technical and financial arrangements will have been completed for loudspeaker equipment. There will also be held two indoor mass rallies, at the following times and places: on Friday, Nov. 1, 9 p.m. at 7 W. Burnside, under auspices of Youth-for-Shachtman Committee; and Monday, Nov. 4, 9 p.m., at Hollywood Gardens, 896 Prospect Ave.

ONE FINAL REMINDER: TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, IS ELECTION DAY. DON'T FAIL TO GO TO THE POLLS AND VOTE FOR SHACHTMAN. PULL THE LEVER MARKED "WORKERS PARTY"! A VOTE FOR SHACHTMAN IS A VOTE AGAINST WAR!



This is not a war against Fascism! This is not a war for Democracy. The present war is like the war of 1914-1918—a war for imperialist plunder, for profits, for colonies, for sources of raw materials, for fields of capital investments, for control of cheap labor.

American capitalism, having failed to solve the problems of depression and unemployment, now wants to solve them on a world scale—by plunging the country into war. Like the Axis powers, the United States is fighting to dominate the world. Already, in preparing to fight

this imperialist war, the United States is drawing ever closer to the totalitarian system of government of the Axis powers.

The Workers Party is against this country entering the war and against the more and more openly fascist "national defense" program which both major parties endorse.

2 Conscription Is A Step Toward Totalitarianism

The adoption of military conscription, in the face of the decisive opposition of the majority of the people, is being coupled in Washington with the idea of labor conscription in industry.

Tomorrow, workers will be toiling in war industries, and then in the other industries, under military discipline, and for the low army wages. Tomorrow, the workers will be deprived of their powerful weapon for righting economic wrongs—the right to strike.

3 Confiscate The Wealth Of The Parasites!

Expropriate the Sixty Plutocratic Families! The government does not hesitate to confiscate millions of lives by conscription and war. We demand the confiscation of the wealth of the handful of parasites who rule the economic and political life of the country.

4 "Conscript" The War Industries

Nationalize the war industries and place them under workers' control! The Government says this is not a war for profit. The bosses of the war industries, however are not only demanding fabulous profits but they are getting them. These profits will come out of the oceans of workers' blood shed in the war. The government "nationalizes" millions of workers by conscription. We demand the nationalization of the war industries. And since it is the workers who are called upon to die in the war, let them be the men in control of the industries of war.

5 For A People's Army!

The government says we are threatened by foreign invasion, by an attack from Fascism. Then let the people be armed! We did not support conscription and fought bitterly against conscription. We opposed the adoption of the draft legislation.

We have no confidence in the capitalist government—we know only too well its aims in this war. We have no confidence in the present army and the reactionary officers' clique that runs it—we saw only too clearly how it acted in France.

The arming of the people must take place under the complete control of the workers' organizations, the trade unions. They will train and organize the people's army. A people's army will not be an imperialist force interested in acquiring domination over foreign people and colonies. It will not be used to crush labor and labor's rights. It will not be used to smash strikes. The masses can have confidence in such an army, for it will not only resist invading Fascism but also Fascism and all other reactionary forces at home, right here in the United States.

6 Democratic Rights For Conscripts

Full democratic rights for all conscripts and enlisted men! All soldiers, conscripted or enlisted, must be given the right to vote in all elections, local, state or federal. Soldiers must have the right of free speech, free press and free assembly in the army itself—the right to meet freely to discuss any and all questions, the right to receive or to publish any periodical they desire. Soldiers must have the right to organize and elect freely their rank and file committees to represent them in the presentation of all demands and grievances, and in any other negotiations with their officers, Workers

(Continued on page 4)



Campaign Notes

By DWIGHT MACDONALD
Publicity Director

As the Bronx Congressional campaign draws to its close, Max Shachtman is still far in the lead so far as speech making is concerned. Although it would be rash to predict his election on that account, there is no question but that Shachtman has made himself more widely known in the Bronx than any of his rivals. He has probably addressed more street meetings than all the other candidates put together. Their lack of energy is understandable: after all, the election is pretty much in the bag for Boss Flynn's man, Buckley, and so why should sensible men waste their time and wear out their throats campaigning? Shachtman differs from them in that, regardless of his chances of getting elected, he has a vital political message to put across to as many people as possible. He is one of the few candidates in this national election, in the country as well as in the Bronx, who has something to say to the people.

The American Labor Party has finally gotten around to printing a campaign throwaway for Jack Altman, their Bronx Congressional candidate. Nothing elaborate, of course, like the copiously illustrated brochures they have put out for Roosevelt—just a tiny square bearing his name, picture, and a few highlights from his biography. This inspiring success story—"Up From Socialism" it should be called—begins by pointing out that the London grammar school Altman attended as a kid has been "since bombed by Hitler". No doubt that Nazi filers had instructions to destroy this historic site, lest it become a future shrine for the international workingclass.

FLASH! S.L.P. SPURNS SHACHTMAN!

"Interested in principles, not in mire or cockroaches" says spokesman The "Shachtman for Congress Committee" recently sent out letters to four left-wing parties inviting them to support Max Shachtman as the only revolutionary anti-war candidate running in the Twenty-Third Congressional District. None of these parties—the Socialist Workers Party, the Lovestone group, the Socialist Labor Party, and the Socialist Party—has as yet indicated that it will support Shachtman in the Bronx.

I print below, as a document of possible interest to students of political psycho-pathology, the reply received from the Socialist Labor Party. This remarkable document is typed on a colorful letterhead bearing photographs of the S.L.P. candidates for president and vice-president (of the United States), as well as the notation, in red ink, that 1940 marks the "Golden Jubilee" of the S.L.P., which is fifty years old this year. The full text of the reply follows:

October 24, 1940
Mr. Dwight Macdonald,
Publicity Director,
Shachtman For Congress Committee,
114 W. 14th Street,
New York, New York.
Sir:

Received your letter of October 17 suggesting that the Socialist Labor Party "endorse and support" what you call your "revolutionary anti-war campaign." Rubbish! An "Anti-war campaign" is not necessarily revolutionary, and yours definitely is not. As far as it is possible to judge an outfit such as yours (neither fish nor fowl nor good red herring) you are reactionary to the core. Whatever gave you the idea that the Socialist Labor Party, with its half-century record of Marxian Socialism, would be interested in your petty political, or would-be political, schemes? The Socialist Labor Party is interested in principles, not in mire or cockroaches.

Go patch up your quarrel with the one who logically represents your political quackery, Stalin. It may be interesting enough to watch swine rending swine, but it is neither inspiring nor edifying. If you had possessed sufficient brains, and common decency, you

might have saved yourself a lot of troubles and headaches if in the past you had read S.L.P. literature. What you have discovered, or what you think you have discovered, agent Stalin and his gang, the S.L.P. foretold years ago.

There is only one revolutionary Marxist organization in the United States—the S.L.P. Revolutionists do not "support" reformers or phony "revolutionaries." Go and fish for the kind of votes you desire where you are likely to find them—in the petty bourgeois lame duck pond.

Sincerely yours,
For the Socialist Labor Party
Emil F. Teichert

No one can say that the Socialist Workers Party doesn't hew to its political line, letting the chips fall where they may. And they fall in some very odd places sometimes. Thus the Cannon group refused to join the Workers Party picket line in front of the Soviet consulate protesting the murder of Trotsky. The reason? It might be interpreted as an attack on the Soviet Union!

The current example of this kind of sectarian simple-mindedness is the decision of the S.W.P. to support, in the Bronx Congressional elections, the pro-war super-patriotic

To The Campaign A Contribution

Shachtman Committee,
Director.

Dear Sir:

Enclosed please find two dollars (\$2.00) for subscription for election campaign of M. Shachtman.

Unfortunately the amount is not very large—I only earn \$10 a week—but I'm of the opinion that it is workers' money you want in any amount, so here you are.

Unfortunately, I can't vote for Mr. Shachtman because he is not in my congressional district but I send you this money as a concrete measure of support.

R. M.

Jack Altman—whose war-mongering was so unabashed as to cause the Socialist Party to expel him recently—in preference to Max Shachtman, candidate of the Workers Party. The reason? Because the pro-war Altman is running on the American Labor Party ticket, whereas the anti-war Shachtman is the candidate of a "petty-bourgeois pacifist sect".

Does this sound unbelievable? I quote from an editorial in the October 26 issue of *Socialist Appeal*: "Apart from candidates of our own party, there are two kinds of candidates that we are prepared to support in the coming election. The first would be candidates of workers' parties, no matter how small, whose platforms are similar enough to our own to justify such support. (I wonder just what parties these may be—D.M.) The second are those candidates who represent a substantial body of organized workers and whose success in the elections would constitute a gain for the principles of independent working class political action; these we support despite our disagreement with the platform on which they are running."

"Thus we support those candidates of the American Labor Party in New York and the Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota who are running solely as the candidates of their own parties and are not also the candidates of bourgeois parties." This includes Jack Altman, who is running on the A.L.P. ticket alone for the good and sufficient reason that there was no possibility of making a deal with either of the bourgeois parties in the Twenty-Third Congressional district. (Just how much of a blow for "the principle of independent working class political action" Altman's candidacy in striking may be gauged by any one who drops in at A.L.P. clubhouses in the Bronx and

(Continued on page 4)

		CONGRESSMAN	
	A		LOWELL H. BROWNE
	B		JOSEPH A. BUCKLEY
	C		JACK ALTMAN
	D		ISIDORE BEGUN
	E		MAX SHACHTMAN

The above is an APPROXIMATION of the Congressional Ballot in the 23rd Congressional District of the Bronx. We were unable to obtain the official order of the candidates from the election board in time for publication in this issue. It is possible that the order of the Communist Party and the Workers Party will be reversed. Be sure, therefore, to watch for the Workers Party emblem and for the name MAX SHACHTMAN, before pulling the lever.

"That's Real Socialism He's Talking"

We Listen In On A Typical Shachtman Campaign Meeting

By ELSIE DINSMORE

At 6:30 p.m., the platform goes up on the corner of Prospect and Tremont in the Bronx. This is a popular corner in the campaign period and it must be held until the speakers and supporters arrive at 8:30 p.m. Shortly before the first speaker arrives, LABOR ACTION and leaflets saying "Max Shachtman, Workers Party candidate in the 23rd Congressional District, will speak at 9:30 p.m." are given out and a few people stop to gaze at the bare platform with its standard-size American flag and its sign: "WORKERS PARTY, 114 WEST 14TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY."

At this point in other meetings a few small boys usually gather around, the early nucleus of an organized band of hecklers. If we are lucky they will tire before the speaker arrives, but unlucky if they remain to disrupt the meeting—which they can do with great efficiency.

But tonight it is cold and windy and only the serious critic and friendly voter cares to stand around. At 8:30 the Chairman mounts the platform and introduces the first speaker. At the same time placards are raised around the platform with pictures of the candidate and anti-war and pro-labor slogans. The first speaker begins by talking to the sidewalk but ends by gaining an audience of about 200. A large majority of the people who stop to listen, stay throughout the two hours or more of speeches. They are really interested in the fate of the world and what we have to say about it,

despite the cold and no matter whether they agree with us or not.

There is also a strong Roosevelt section in the audience, which, at one time, breaks out into a chant "We want Roosevelt." At various other points members of this group shout that we are un-American, Stalinists, Trotskyists, and that we should go back where we came from. One heckler says of the first speaker that his father may have been born in America but that the speaker himself was not an American. I ask the heckler "What is he then?" "Well I just know he isn't American." The same heckler states that it would be un-American to vote for Willkie—in fact, un-American to vote for anyone but Roosevelt (shades of Hitler and Stalin!).

When Shachtman arrives at 9:30 more placards go up, remarks are passed about the speaker's moustache, the fact that he doesn't look like his picture, etc. The heckling, now well developed, catches the new speaker up with almost his first words. But Max likes nothing better. "Stop moving around" he tells one heckler, "I want to know where you are." Another one he admonishes, "How can I be a Stalinist. They killed my leader, Trotsky."

He makes the crowd laugh, he makes them feel intensely what he feels by repeating a phrase once, twice, then another phrase once, twice.

"That's real socialism he's talking." And again, when Max is talking about our part in the army he mutters, "That's mutiny. That's what we did in Siberia in 1918." He tells me later, proudly, "I've been a radical for twenty years. I voted for Debs."

Towards the end of Shachtman's speech Max talks about the government in England and how only a workers' government can bring victory over Hitlerism. A heckler calls out, "England has a Labor government." Max ignores him. "England has a Labor government" the heckler repeats—over and over again while Max goes on—until suddenly the speaker shouts, "Who is the Foreign Minister? Who is the Prime Minister? Who is the head of the army?" Etc., etc. The heckler gives up.

The crowd turns for a moment to watch a Willkie parade go by. A few slip off but most stay. And they listen, they are deeply interested and when Max steps down from the platform they clap—a real tribute from a street audience. It's a cold night and in a few minutes the crowd of two hundred has disappeared. If it had been warm a big crowd would have gathered around one man who had something he wanted to say.

But it is cold. The platform is folded up and strapped on the back of the campaign car, the posters are thrown into the rumble seat, 4 or 5 shivering supporters crowd in beside our candidate as he rolls off to his next engagement.

Editorials

FASCISM and WAR

OUR PROGRAM AGAINST THE WAR

1. Not a man, not a cent for Wall Street's war. All war funds to the unemployed.
2. For a rising scale of wages to meet increasing cost of living. Thirty Thirty—\$30 weekly minimum wage—30-hour weekly maximum for all workers.
3. Expropriate the Sixty Families. For Government ownership and workers control of all war industries—aviation, steel, chemicals, railroads, public utilities, etc.
4. Against both imperialist war camps. For the Third Camp of World Labor and the Colonial Peoples.
5. Let the people vote on war. For the right of youth to vote at the age of 18.
6. Abolish secret diplomacy. Open the files of the State Department.
7. Withdraw all armed forces from territory outside the United States. Free the colonies. Hands off Latin America.
8. Against compulsory military training and conscription.
9. For the defense of civil liberties and workers' rights. Stop the persecution of aliens. Against the M-Day Plans and war-time dictatorship.
10. For full social, economic and political equality for Negroes. End discrimination against Negroes in industry and trade unions.
11. For an independent Labor Party.
12. For Workers' Defense Guards against Fascist and vigilante attacks.
13. No confidence in the Roosevelt government. For a workers' government and a people's army.
14. For Peace through Socialism. For the Socialist United States of the Americas, for the Socialist United States of Europe, and for the World Socialist Federation.

Lewis Joins Girdler

Roosevelt is elected, Lewis says that such re-election will demonstrate that he had the support of the working class. This will mean a vote of "no confidence" in him and he will retire as president of the CIO.

Lewis's speech spread consternation and confusion in the ranks of the CIO. This was particularly true of the hand-raising Stalinists who have played the role of sly and sneaking stooge to John L. in the CIO. In the trade unions he has been their "beloved leader"; they have kowtowed to him right or wrong in order to remain entrenched in the CIO to promote Stalin's foreign policy and carry on their union-wrecking activities.

We have said that in supporting Willkie and the Republicans Lewis locks arms with the most reactionary section of the ruling class. The workers hate Willkie, they distrust him, they fear a return to the Hoover days of blood and starvation. For the mass of the workers Willkie represents everything that workers are trying to escape: mass misery, hunger, nakedness and the brutal and cynical indifference that characterized the Hoover Republican administration.

How do Lewis's words in support of Willkie stand up under examination? Not at all. Roosevelt is driving toward war but Willkie will work for peace, says Lewis. What nonsense! If Lewis doesn't know better than this he is a simpleton. Both Roosevelt and Willkie are for war. Willkie is for Wall Street and Wall Street is for war. The denizens of the financial world and the big industrialists must be for a struggle against Germany in order

to protect their imperialist interests.

The Democratic Party did not keep faith with labor. Of course it didn't. That isn't the program and the business of the Democratic Party. The Democratic and the Republican Parties keep faith with the ruling class, whose political instrument they both happen to be.

After seven years the Democratic Party has no solution for the ills of the workers or the masses of the people. Is Lewis surprised at this? The main aim of the Roosevelt administration was to save capitalism and give it a few more years of rule. The bourgeois who support and finance Willkie believe that Willkie can do this job better, therefore they want to make a change. They believe that Roosevelt has been too lenient with the workers. He and the section of the ruling class which supports him believe that in order to perpetuate capitalism some concessions must be made to the workers. The Willkie-men believe in the mailed fist in the manner of Girdler and Ford. This is a matter of standard policy with them. They want no Roosevelt brand of imperialism with its toleration of Wagner Acts and Walsh-Healy Acts.

"Willkie is a gallant American. He has opened his heart to the American people." This is gallant and puerile blah! How can Lewis talk such nonsense in a serious speech? Every crook and shyster who runs for office in this land of the free and home of the brave, is a gallant American and keeps his heart open to the people until after the election. Isn't Thomas Lamont a gallant American, a scholar and a gentleman? Isn't Henry Ford a gallant American and gentleman of the old school? Isn't he keeping the homely traditions of American life alive: what with his collecting McGuffey Readers, spinning wheels and Little Red Schoolhouses?

Willkie was born in the briar, he is not an aristocrat. And so were Girdler and Ford born in the briar: briars stick out all over them today as many a CIO organizer can testify. This is only a blatant piece of pure demagoguery from Lewis.

Willkie has promised to put the unemployed to work and abolish pauperism. Here is a man for you. If elected he will destroy capitalism! This is the only way to abolish pauperism. If Lewis believes that Girdler, Ford and Lamont will abolish pauperism he is as big a nit-wit as Simple Simon.

And lastly, Willkie (and Morgan, Rockefeller, Girdler, Weir) has given his guarantee that not a mother's son will be sent to fight in a foreign war. Perhaps we didn't understand Wendell's speeches. Perhaps his Wall Street bosses have got religion and resolved never again to covet anything in China, South America, or anything that is their neighbor's.

Our harsh criticism of the Republican Party and Willkie does not (as is well known to readers of LABOR ACTION) mean one bit of support to Roosevelt and the Democratic Party. Our castigation of Lewis for supporting Willkie does not mean that we advocate his support of Roosevelt. The alternative for him, as for the workers as a whole, is not Roosevelt or Willkie as the Workers Party has stated again and again during this campaign.

The leadership of Lewis, Green and other labor leaders has been the kind of leadership that has got the workers into

the confusion that exists in our ranks today. Lewis says that war kills off the young men who if they lived might some day rise against their exploiters. This is true but what has John L. Lewis done toward organizing the working class to "question the financial exploitation of the race." He collaborated with the ruling class, through its chief representative Roosevelt for seven years. Now his answer to this exploitation is to tell the workers to support Willkie, the chief representative today of the very worst of the ruling class exploiters of the race. This doesn't make sense. The instincts of the workers in their revulsion against Willkie are far healthier than the supposedly thought-out politics of Lewis. The working class should make no basic distinction between Democratic Roosevelt and Republican Willkie in this campaign or any other time. They are both capitalist politicians.

The only road for the working class is independent political action under our own banner. Independence from the Roosevelt war machine and the Willkie war machine. On the crucial question of the war the two are identical; there is no difference between them.

Our criticism of Lewis, therefore, has nothing in common with Hillman's. If Lewis hurts labor by joining with Willkie, Hillman, Tobin and the others are guilty of an equal crime by joining with Roosevelt.

The alternative for Lewis was not Willkie or Roosevelt but a bold break with courage, if he had not been shackled by the ideas of the ruling class, Lewis would have told both the Republicans and Democrats: "A plague on both your houses. I stand for the political freedom of the workers, for their political independence and for their own class political organization." He would have told the workers to break from the Republican and Democratic Parties, from the parties of the warmongers and the imperialists, from the parties of wage-slavery, unemployment and hunger. If Lewis understood the relationship between the ruling class and the working class, if he realized the parasitism, and if he was genuinely unselfish in his devotion to the interests of the workers, he would have made the break himself in the course of this campaign. Then he could have led a militant upsurge of the working class against the war, against capitalism, against Willkie and Roosevelt. Instead of this Lewis chose to go over bag and baggage to the Girdlers, Fords and Weirs.

LABOR ACTION
Official Organ of Workers Party
(Section of the 4th International)

Published weekly by the
Labor Action Publishing Company

VOL. 4, No. 30 NOVEMBER 4, 1940

114 WEST 14th STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.
(3rd Floor)

Editor: JOSEPH CARTER
Managing Editor: EMANUEL GARRETT
Business Manager: JOHN BILLINGS

Subscription Rate: \$1.50 per year,
\$1.00 six months
(\$2.00 per year or \$1.50 six months for
Canada and Foreign)

Re-entered as second class matter May 24, 1940,
at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the
Act of March 3, 1917.

(Continued from page 2)

And Cannon? Not a word about all this. Instead, his Plenum resolution, states curtly: "Pacifism is a debilitating poison in the workers' movement." That, and nothing more! Jim Oneal could scarcely improve upon the formulation. And oh! another discovery. Do you know what destroyed the European labor movement in the present war? According to Cannon, it was its pacifism! Yes, yes, black on white. We thus learn (high time!) that pacifism is the greatest danger to the working class and the labor movement. Ernest Bevin, Minister of Supplies in His Majesty's Imperial Government, is, you see, a pacifist, and not a social-patriot.

3. But not a single word from the Cannonites about social-patriotism! Exaggeration? Polemical overstatement? No, that is literally the case. The Appeal has printed both of Cannon's speeches on "military policy" and his resolution. In all three documents, there is not one single solitary word, not a syllable, which mentions social-patriotism. We repeat, not one! Blum and Company in France, and the European labor movement he represented, collapsed, you see, because of pacifism—but not because of social-patriotism! Pacifism is a terrible poison ruining the American workers' movement, but social-patriotism is not even serious enough to be mentioned as a pimple.

The present writer cannot be endorsed by the Socialist Appeal as candidate for Congress on the platform of the Workers Party because he represents a "petty-bourgeois pacifist sect"; the A.L.P. and Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party candidates are endorsed although the Appeal criticizes their "false, opportunist programs." How delicately put! Their "opportunist" but not their "social-patriotic" programs. Is all this mere accident, or is it a case of the old German proverb: In the house of the hanged, you don't talk of rope. . . .

4. We used to speak of the "war program" and "war industries" and we still do. The imperialist patriots, deliberately, speak of the "defense program" and "defense industries." Deliberately—because they must imbue the people with the lie that this is a "defensive" war. The Cannonites used to speak our language on this point. Here, too, we record a change, evidently in accordance with the "new times" and the "new policy." The front page "box" demand of the Appeal (No 32) called for "Trade Union Wages on All Defense Work!" Accident? The Election Platform of the Minnesota S.W.P. (Appeal No. 42) calls for "Trade union hours and wages on all defense and public works programs. . . . Take over without compensation the national defense industries. . . ." In No. 34, we read that "Instead of allowing the [American] Legionaires to monopolize the defense movement, every trade union ought to set about to form Union Defense Guards." It is nice to learn that the much-maligned Legion has been taking care of "our defense"—even "monopolizing" it. Merely loose language? We hope so!

5. The proposal, made in a letter from Goldman to Trotsky, that the S.W.P. drop the slogan of a "People's Referendum on War" (a proposal Trotsky rebuffed). Yet, why not? Drop the fight against conscription because it is "inevitable" then drop the fight against the

war, for it is even "more inevitable"! Is it not rather "strange" that for the last month or more no attention or space has been devoted by the Appeal to criticizing or condemning the new steps Roosevelt takes every day to bring the country closer and closer to participation in the imperialist slaughter? Is it, perhaps, because, this being a "new epoch" of war and militarism, we no longer fight against war and militarism? The fact that Goldman could even make his proposal—surely not in his name alone—is of ominous significance.

Why The "New Policy"?

6. The startling contrast between the speed and wholeheartedness with which Cannon accepted Trotsky's basic thesis (to say nothing of Cannon's contributions to it—historical, theoretical, tactical, analogical), and the curt, even violent opposition Cannon manifested towards Trotsky's other proposal, namely, to give critical support in the elections to Browder and the rest of the Stalinist ticket? On the military policy, Cannon speaks of Trotsky with tenderness, praise, even veneration. On the election policy, Cannon uses the—for him—unprecedented language: "Trotsky. . . put forward a shocking proposal. . . . We took the position that such a drastic change in the middle of the election campaign would require too much explanation, and would encounter the danger of great misunderstanding and confusion which we would not be able to dissipate." Would it not be simpler to put the difference in Cannon's reaction to the two proposals in these terms: (a) to storm against "pacifism" and to shout for "compulsory military training under union control" may not meet with one hundred percent approval of our patriotic union officialdom, but at the same time they would scarcely regard it as terribly "subversive"; whereas (b) to call for critical support of the Stalinists in the unions, even though it is fully in line with the rest of the Cannonite position, both on the war question and the question of defense of the Soviet Union (Trotsky was quite consistent in his proposal), will not sound pleasant in the ears of those "progressive fakers" in the unions with whom Cannonites are collaborating.

At the time of the factional struggle in the S.W.P., which ended in the mass expulsions of the minority and the formation by us of the Workers Party, Cannon pretended that he wanted nothing more than unity, that a split would be injurious to the movement, and more of the same. In his speech, Cannon now admits his real feelings about the split: "It is a great advantage for us that we got rid of this petty-bourgeois opposition." When Cannon speaks of "us" he uses the word like an editorial writer. Therefore, in this case, he is telling the simple, sincere truth. His "new policy" on war and militarism, represents a real departure from the principles of revolutionary Marxism. It is hard to believe that it can go unchallenged in the S.W.P., for there must be in it a group of thoughtful Marxists capable of speaking their convictions and ready to exercise this capacity. If Cannon is able to deal with them as he tried to deal with us he certainly will have a greater advantage in his party than he already has.

Notes—

(Continued from page 3)

tries to find some Altman literature in the snowstorm of Roosevelt-Wal-lace pamphlets on display.)

"It is equally clear," concluded the political masterminds of the Appeal "that no progressive purpose would be served by supporting the candidates of the various petty-bourgeois pacifist sects—the Norman Thomas Socialist Party, the 'Workers Party', the Socialist Labor Party, etc. Their platforms can only delude the workers in this time of war and militarism."

And so, with iron logic, the S.W.P. concludes that the war-mongering labor faker, Jack Altman, because he bears a "labor" label, must be supported against the revolutionary anti-war candidate, Max Shachtman. If the Socialist Labor Party communication printed above may be called an example of political psychopathology, this stand of the S.W.P. may be termed "political sur-realism".

Finally, the APPEAL terms the Workers Party a "petty-bourgeois pacifist sect" and states that its program "can only delude the workers". The platform on which Shachtman is running in the Bronx is printed elsewhere in this issue. I challenge the editors of the APPEAL to demonstrate precisely wherein this platform is "petty-bourgeois" or "pacifist" and also just how it will "delude the workers."

Our Platform

(Continued from page 3)

have fought for that right in the factories; the same workers should have the same right in the barracks.

7 Let The People Vote Against The War

A people's referendum on war! The government says this is a democratic war, a people's war. Then let the people vote on war! The people must have the right to say whether the government shall declare war or not. If it is, as they say, "their war," let them decide whether or not to declare it. The right to vote must be extended to everyone from the age of 18 onward.

8 Abolition Of Secret Diplomacy!

No secret negotiations, no secret commitments, no secret treaties behind the backs of the people! Throw open the diplomatic archives of the government. It was only after the last World War that we were told of some of the secret documents that led the United States into the war without the knowledge of the people. We demand that we know the truth, the whole truth, now, before the United States is led into the war.

9 Preserve And Extend Democratic Rights

No restrictions on the greatest exercise of the right of free speech, free press, free assembly, the right to organize and to strike! If this is a "war for democracy," why should democratic rights be the first to be sacrificed? Labor must guard these rights zealously, and fight every inch of the way to preserve them, to make them more genuine, to extend them in every direction.

10 Against Lynching, And "Jim Crow"

Full social, political and economic equality for the Negroes! It is miserable hypocrisy to talk about "democracy" or a "war for democracy" when 14 millions of our fellow-citizens, the Negroes, are almost completely deprived of their democratic rights in this country. Complete abolition of any and every form of discrimination of Jim-Crowism, is on the order of the day.

11 Repeal The Anti-Alien Legislation

No discrimination against foreign-born workers! We demand the immediate repeal of all discriminatory anti-alien legislation. It is aimed at dividing the workers, at pitting foreign-born against native-born.

12 For A Workers' Government!

A workers government! If Roosevelt or Willkie or the other capitalist politicians do not accept these demands and they do not and will not and cannot, because they are bound hand and foot to Big Business and its system—let the workers take over and run the government themselves!

Conscript War Industries Under Workers Control

(Continued from page 1)

We Also Demand Democratic Rights

The workers going into the army should also demand:—

1. Full political rights. The right to vote in all federal, state and municipal elections while serving in the army and navy. There is no reason for men in the military service to be deprived of this democratic right.
2. The full democratic right of the soldiers and sailors to assemble under their own auspices for political discussion. The right to receive political literature of their choice; the right to have their own publications for the free discussion of the issues involved in the war.
3. The right to retain their previous political and trade union connections during military service.
4. Full democratic right to elect committees from their ranks to handle grievances and represent them in dealing with officers.
5. That the minimum pay be raised to \$60 a month exclusive of "keep."
6. That all racial, religious and political discrimination be eliminated from the army and navy. That any and every branch of the army and navy, and every rank be open to every soldier and sailor without discrimination.

These are all reasonable demands and workers should not hesitate to make them. We have the problem of defeating Fascism. We discuss this question and many other

political, social and military questions in civil life. Why not in the army and navy? In civil life we discuss how the government is run; who should be president, senator, governor. In civil life also we discuss the way the war is being run, what mistakes have been made, what this or that general did that was incorrect or correct according to our various opinions. We have these discussions while we are civilians. We express our opinions on all questions that concern the welfare of the people. If someone replies that military problems are special problems that only a few are competent to discuss, we reject this argument. That's what we hear from the boss in the factory; that we are not competent to have any opinions about the running of the business. We know that this is not true.

Furthermore, we too will become specialists in the army and navy. We will study military science, the operation of the equipment as well as military leadership. And we know that we will be competent. It is imperative for us to be prepared if we are to have our own workers' army and establish a workers' state.

The Workers' State Will Do These Things

The new WORKERS' STATE with its WORKERS' DEMOCRACY will provide every man and woman with a job and a decent standard of living. The workers will enjoy peace, happiness and security. The WORKERS' STATE can do these things because the factories, mines, mills, public utilities, banks and farms will be owned collectively by the workers. The wealth which they produced will be re-

turned to them in wages, schools, hospitals, homes, food, clothing. The wealth of the country will go to those who worked to produce this wealth.

These are the things for the workers to think about seriously as they go into the army and navy. These are the important things for workers everywhere to read, ponder over and discuss.

Hold Your Proletarian Ranks Firm!

The Workers Party of the United States salutes its class brothers of every race, creed, color and nationality as they enter the army. Remain loyal to the ideals of your class! Remain true to the struggle for freedom! We hail your courage, your working class solidarity and your devotion to working class ideals that has already been demonstrated on a thousand picket lines.

Your fellow-workers who remain in the factories will not break ranks. They will maintain the unions and the workers' political organizations. They will preserve their solidarity with you.

Workers of the Army, workers in the factories, let us inscribe on our banners:—

FORWARD TO THE WORKERS' ARMY AND THE WORKERS' STATE!
FORWARD TO THE SOCIALIST UNITED STATES OF AMERICA!
FORWARD TO THE WORLD SOCIALIST FEDERATION!

LABOR ACTION
114 W. 14th Street
New York City

Dear Friends:
I am interested in learning more about the Workers Party and its fight against the bosses' war plans.

Name _____
Address _____
City _____