

WORKERS' FORUM

Write to us—tell us what's going on in your part of the labor movement—what are the workers thinking about?—tell us what the bosses are up to—and the G-men and the local cops—and the Stalinists—send us that story the capitalist press didn't print and that story they buried or distorted—our pages are open to you. Letters must carry name and address, but indicate if you do not want your name printed.

Bertram D. Wolfe Has Resigned From the Lovestone Group

Dear Comrades:
Wednesday, Nov. 13, at the summarizing of the Independent Labor League of America pre-convention discussion on the war issue, Bertram D. Wolfe, reporter for the minority, resigned from the organization.
Reporting for the majority (Lovestone, Herberg, Herman et al) which represents pro-Allied views ranging from demands for limited aid, to support of the recent battleship gift and calls for more, was B. Herman, who holds an extreme pro-British view.
Wolfe reported for the minority, which supports an anti war position containing variations from the orthodox Leninist position to pacifism. Wolfe's resignation left the brunt of the fight on primarily younger elements who, deprived of his experienced assistance and prestige, will not be able to bring any sort of forceful opposition against the seasoned maneuverings of Lovestone and Co. Espe-

cially since the minority has but one member left on the leading political bureau, Jim Cork.
Herman directed slanderous accusations against the chief minority spokesmen: Wolfe, Cork, Stewart, Kone and Symonds. Part of his accusations were to accuse minority spokesmen of echoing the Daily Worker, Herbert Hoover and Lindberg and of acting in a manner that will please Hitler, of being liars and fakers. These tactics aroused the anger of most of the general membership but most of them can be counted on to follow Lovestone.
In Wolfe's resigning without feeling it necessary to dignify the minority's stand by presenting a resolution or attempting to form a minority faction to fight for an anti war position at the convention in late December, the I.L.L.A. makes its final bow and will shortly, after the convention give up any pretenses at being a political organization it will continue solely as a "discussion and publication society." A statement amounting to this was made at the meeting after Wolfe's resignation by D. Benjamin, who re-

cently resigned as N. Y. District organizer after holding the position for a number of years.
We who write this feel the left wing movement should know about Wolfe's resignation and the accompanying situation even though he has not seen fit to publicize it nor has the *Workers Age* deemed it necessary to announce it as yet.
N. Y., Nov. 26

For REVOLUTIONARY Socialist Unity, from a group who will continue to seek it.
(Upon being informed by us of the receipt of the above letter, Comrade Wolfe confirmed the fact of his resignation from the Lovestone group. He states that he does not plan at present to join another organization.—EDITORS.)

Portrait of Trotsky At Whitney Museum

Included in the Whitney Museum's annual exhibition of contemporary American painting, current until January 8, is a portrait of Leon Trotsky by Harold Weston. Although the picture attracts attention more because of its subject matter than as an outstanding work of art, it is well-painted and expresses appropriate forcefulness. Comrades will take pleasure in seeing it. The Whitney Museum is on Eighth Street, near Fifth Ave., New York City.

Note For Wall St

The semi-official *Infantry Journal* for September-October 1940, declares: "After all, we helped beat the Germans in 1918 and we can do it again just as then." Get ready for another 1918, boys! Remember those billions in war profits?

Progressive Stand of the CIO Convention

Its Defense of Industrial Unionism Must Be Backed Wholeheartedly

By FELIX MORROW
(This is the second of a series of articles on the CIO Convention.)

I think it is worth dwelling again, as in my first article, on the great significance of the stand taken by the CIO convention on labor unity. I have described the dramatic sequence of speeches, culminating with that of John L. Lewis, affirming the continuance of the fight for the victory of industrial unionism in the mass production industries. It is worth repeating that Lewis was so effective precisely because he told the whole truth when he told the CIO unions: "There is no peace because you are not yet strong enough to command peace upon honorable terms."

One can hardly exaggerate the cumulative effect of the speeches of the pro-CIO forces. It was certainly devastating to the Hillman supporters. The corridors had been full of talk about defections to Hillman among the Rubber Workers, the Auto Workers, etc. If any of these had wavered, it was not apparent when the debate on unity took place! When it came time to vote, not even the Amalgamated delegates chose to record themselves in opposition.
The importance of this great victory is best realized if we recall the atmosphere in which the convention met. For months, the delegates had been under governmental and employer pressure to effect "unity" with the AFL. That pressure had increased tenfold since Roosevelt's electoral victory. Would the delegates resist all that pressure?
Unfortunately they, and especially their chief figures, had shown themselves unable to re-

sist other kinds of pressure from the same sources: they have been cowed by the "national unity" ballyhoo to the point of well-nigh surrendering the strike weapon, have retreated or stood still on all the major fronts, and as a result the CIO could report dishearteningly few gains during the past year.
Fortunately, the convention delegations understood that on the question of "labor unity" there could be no retreat; that if they capitulated on this question, there would be no industrial union movement at all. And they stood firmly by their guns.

It is all too true, that the convention did not take the steps necessary to implement its affirmation of the principles of industrial unionism and organizing the unorganized.
It was not accidental, for instance, that the key problem of organizing Ford was almost forgotten, and had to come on the floor the last day by unanimous consent of the delegates—apparently the UAW delegation had forgotten to hand in any resolutions on the Ford issue before the convention!

That means that the gap between Lewis, Murray and their associates on the one hand, and the Hillman breed on the other, is by no means deep enough to assure the future of the CIO. Lewis is satisfied by Washington's handouts; Lewis and Murray aren't. But both Hillman and Lewis-Murray think primarily in terms of handouts from Washington, are preoccupied with aid from the NLRB and the government agencies in general, rather than in leading the organized workers to win their demands by their own independent strength.

All this is unfortunately true. But by the very decision to continue the fight for industrial unionism, the convention committed itself to a road which will lead many a labor leader who now thinks in Murray and Lewis' terms into realms he never expected to tread.
The road of industrial unionism has a logic of its own, which is not the present logic of Lewis and Murray! It is a logic of militant struggle for the great masses, of class struggle, though Lewis and Murray deny the reality of that class struggle.

The methods of class collaboration, of currying favor with the bosses and Washington have brought no results. Their bankruptcy becomes increasingly evident with every passing day.
In this epoch of the death agony of capitalism the workers are literally driven to struggle for very preservation of their lives against the war machine of the government and the bosses. Fight or die! Increasingly, those become the only alternatives. The decision of the CIO convention assures the workers of a powerful weapon in the coming great battles.

That is what the convention will be remembered for, that is what will be recorded in history as its enduring contribution, when all the patriotic and conciliatory speeches of Lewis and Murray will have been long forgotten.

The methods of class collaboration, of currying favor with the bosses and Washington have brought no results. Their bankruptcy becomes increasingly evident with every passing day.

In this epoch of the death agony of capitalism the workers are literally driven to struggle for very preservation of their lives against the war machine of the government and the bosses. Fight or die! Increasingly, those become the only alternatives. The decision of the CIO convention assures the workers of a powerful weapon in the coming great battles.

That is what the convention will be remembered for, that is what will be recorded in history as its enduring contribution, when all the patriotic and conciliatory speeches of Lewis and Murray will have been long forgotten.

AFL Convention...

(Continued from Page 1)

ell power to suspend international unions "in case where 2 or more national and international unions unite and conspire to create and launch an organization for any purpose dual to the American Federation of Labor."
David Dubinsky, head of the In-

ternational Ladies Garment Workers who deserted the CIO industrial unions "in cases where 2 or more national and international unions unite and conspire to create and launch an organization for any purpose dual to the American Federation of Labor."
David Dubinsky, head of the In-

Negro Delegates Jim Crowed by AFL Central Labor Body

A. Philip Randolph and Milton Webster, the lone Negro delegates at the AFL convention at New Orleans, in the midst of their vain fight to wipe out the "jolly white" policy of the AFL crafts, found themselves Jim Crowed out of an entertainment for the convention delegates arranged by the New Orleans Central Labor Council.
Then the New Orleans central body had the gall to send Randolph and Webster a check providing for their separate entertainment. Needless to say, Randolph and Webster sent the check back.

der and by preventing the interruption of production through stoppages for any trivial reason—or for any reason."
The next day, it is true, Green back-watered on this extreme assertion by excitedly informing the press, "I meant no such thing as giving up the right to strike. I was referring to the need of setting up tribunals or other machinery to safeguard against the necessity for strikes." No doubt a lot of heat had been turned on Green by some of the delegates between the two statements.

CRAFT RAIDS PROTESTED

Michael O'Gorman, representing a federal union of 2800 members at the Midvale Steel Co. in Philadelphia, attacked the craft unions on this score and pleaded with the craft internationalists "to leave us alone." Morris Pratt, speaking for the Refinery Workers federal union of East St. Louis, charged that the Operating Engineers Union was trying to "take over" his organization. Other delegates from federal unions made the same point.
Even Dubinsky, making a violent denunciation of the CIO and Lewis on the question of unity negotiations, was forced to call attention—in his own cowardly and feeble way to be sure—to the real hostility toward industrial organization still burning fiercely among the AFL tops. During the session of November 28, Dubinsky pleaded with the craft chiefs, declaring, "There is no need for differences between labor. But there must be a broader attitude toward those who favor industrial organization." He admitted sadly that he would prefer a "more progressive" attitude in the AFL toward the problem of organizing the unorganized and the industrial form of union.

JIM CROW CONTINUES

In striking contrast with the brotherhood with which the many Negro delegates were treated at the CIO convention, and the various progressive steps taken by the CIO to unite the Negro and white workers, the AFL convention reaffirmed its traditional Jim-Crow policy. The modest proposal of A. Philip Randolph, President of the Sleeping Car Porters, for the setting up of an inter-racial committee within the Federation to remedy discrimination by uplons against Negro workers, was rejected. The convention merely repeated the hands-off formula it has used so often before, merely asking the international unions "to give most sincere consideration" to the problem—carefully avoiding the setting up of any machinery which might actually do something on the matter. The action of the convention brought a bitter and merited rebuke from Randolph who year after year has vainly sought justice for his people from the craft-moguls.

FAWNING UPON ROOSEVELT

One of the most disgusting aspects of the convention was the manner in which Green and Co. fawned and scraped before the government and its representatives. While graciously accepting an \$8000 increase, bringing his yearly salary to \$20,000, Green was eager to offer the "sacrifices" of the workers for the sake of "national defense."
Green went so far as to state: "There are a number of ways in which we (!) can sacrifice—by giving service of the highest or-

THE "RACKETEERING" ISSUE

The sorriest spectacle at the convention was Dubinsky.
He introduced a resolution to give the AFL executive council power to oust any union official found guilty of "any offense involving moral turpitude."
All Dubinsky received for his efforts was a good sock in the mouth and the enmity of all his "friends" among the AFL officialdom.

The officialdom, in turn, presented a cowardly front on the whole matter. Instead of telling the bosses to go to hell and keep their snouts out of the internal affairs of the unions; denouncing the smear campaign "to help Labor for its own good" as nothing but an attempt by the bosses to get their fingers into the union affairs; and instructing the bankers and industrialists to have a mind for the bill: own racketeering which takes billions for the thousands taken by the relatively few labor racketeers; the AFL leaders passed a feeble resolution condemning racketeering in general as a concession to this boss pressure.

Nothing is more condemnatory of the entire conduct of this convention than the fact that a major share of its time was spent in fighting and fumbling over the issue of "racketeering."
To add spice to the mess concocted at the convention by the craft chiefs, Madame Perkins, Milo Warner, head of the American Legion, and Sir Walter Citrine, and a whole parade of similar types, whooped it up for war, unlimited support to the Roosevelt administration and its anti-labor pro-war program, and for more "sacrifices" from the workers. Citrine, who was knighted by the British monarchy and not without cause, described "with pride" the "voluntary" surrender by British labor of the right to strike and the acceptance of "practically unlimited" working hours in the interests of British imperialism.

In every respect this AFL convention demonstrated that the CIO is still the basic and progressive union organization of American labor.

Lenin, Trotsky and the First World War

By JAMES P. CANNON

In advancing our military transitional program, we proceed from the point of view that permanent war and universal militarism have become the dominant characteristics of our epoch, and we visualize the social revolution as the immediate outcome of the imperialist war. We begin, as did Lenin, with a declaration of irreconcilable class opposition to the imperialists and their war. It is only by means of this principled standpoint of class opposition that the cadres of modern Bolshevism are formed and clearly delimited from all other parties, groups, and tendencies, which to one degree or another, tend toward conciliation or collaboration with their national ruling class in the war.

But the situation which confronts us today is not an exact duplication of that which confronted the revolutionary Marxists at the outbreak of the first World War in 1914. For one thing, the capitalist order has reached a far more advanced stage of decay and is more susceptible to revolutionary overthrow. In addition, we have the benefit of twenty-six years of the richest historical experiences which have been generalized by the great Marxist, Trotsky. These circumstances enable us to go farther, with more concretely worked out slogans of agitation to advance the class struggle under conditions of war and militarism, than was possible for the revolutionary Marxists at the beginning of the first World War.

Trotsky, the author of our program, contributed extremely important thoughts to the workers' vanguard facing the second World War: the immediacy of the revolutionary perspective in connection with the present war, and the necessity for transitional slogans which can serve to mobilize the masses for independent class action leading up to it. It is precisely this immediacy of the revolutionary perspective that makes the transitional program a burning necessity.

CONTINUING, NOT REPEATING, LENIN'S WORK

"Our policy," Trotsky wrote, "the policy of the revolutionary proletariat toward the second imperialist war is a continuation, of the policy elaborated during the last imperialist war, primarily under Lenin's leadership. But a continuation does not signify a repetition. In this case too, continuation signifies a development, a deepening and a sharpening." (*Fourth International*, October, 1940). He reminded us, and we repeated after him, that not even Lenin had visualized the victory of the proletarian revolution as the immediate outcome of the first World War.

At this point Lenin suddenly acquired an advocate in a camp which hitherto has not been distinguished by its fidelity to Leninism. Shachtman, comrade-in-arms of the avowed anti-Bolshevik Burnham, and the present leader of the "Workers Party" (the Burnham group minus Burnham), comes to the defense of Lenin against us. The "floating kidney," as Trotsky denominated Shachtman, hobs up in the most unexpected places!

However, we have committed no assault on Lenin, and he is in no way in need of the dubious "defense" of this attorney. It is necessary to take a little time out to prove this, because the authority of Lenin is one of the greatest treasures of the revolutionary movement. His name is written beside that of Trotsky on the banner of the Russian revolution. We proclaim the extension of this revolution throughout the world in the name of Lenin-Trotsky. We must not permit the slightest confusion as to how we regard Lenin; and it is a matter of simple respect to his memory to protect him from the hypocritical support of an advocate who is known among Leninists only as a betrayer of Leninism.
It will take a little time and space, but this

can't be helped. It is a simple task—mainly work with a shovel. His own confusion and instinct to sow confusion—two qualities always happily married in Shachtman's factional "polemics"—plus his unfeeling twisting, falsifying and misrepresenting the words of others and the events of the past are all piled together here also. It is simply necessary to dig this stuff away, and then to unwind the "quotations" and replace the historical incidents in their true position. Then nothing will be left of the dirty mess that Shachtman has made of our alleged attack on Lenin and Shachtman's "brief" as attorney for the defense.

WHAT LENIN REALLY SAID!

The defense of Lenin is the second "point" in Shachtman's indictment of our military policy. The occasion for it was the publication of my speech to our Chicago Conference which adopted our resolution. Shachtman made a big "case" out of what I said about Lenin, or rather, what I didn't say. Here are the sentences which Shachtman quoted from my speech: "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." Shachtman characterized this as a "monstrous falsehood," and as a "complete misrepresentation of the views and traditions of the Bolsheviks in the last war." He offers a number of "quotations" to prove that Lenin and the Bolsheviks advocated revolution during the war, he implies that Lenin expected revolution as the war's immediate outcome, and finally asks: "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!'"

Our quoter undoubtedly establishes the fact that Lenin was in favor of revolution, that he had a program of revolution. And he tries to make it appear that I denied it, or didn't know it. Shachtman's whole case rests upon this false construction. Lenin advocated the "program of revolution" not only during the World War but before it, before 1905, from the very beginning of his activity as a revolutionary Marxist. Shachtman's entire argument is directed against a contention which I did not make.
He makes his argument appear superficially plausible by the use of two well-known devices of literary charlatans. First, he mutilated the quotation from my speech, breaking it off short and eliminating immediately following sentences in the same paragraph which made my meaning more clear and precise. I wrote: "Even Lenin did not visualize the victory of the proletarian revolution as the immediate outcome of the war." Shachtman twisted it and distorted it into a denial that Lenin had "a program of revolution," during the war. But I think it is thoroughly clear to a disinterested reader that I was speaking of something else, namely, Lenin's expectations as to the immediate outcome of the war, and not at all of what he wanted and what he advocated.

LENIN'S OWN WORDS QUOTED

My meaning was made more precise by the sentence which immediately followed: "Just a short time before the outbreak of the February revolution in Russia, Lenin wrote in Switzerland that his generation would most probably not see the socialist revolution. Even Lenin had postponed the revolution to the future, to a later

decade." The context of my published speech, from which the sentences were extracted, makes it even clearer that the references to Lenin were concerned not at all with differences of program, but only with the immediate perspectives of the revolutionary Marxists in this war and in the first World War. I don't see how anyone can seriously dispute our contentions on this point because the words of Lenin himself constitute the basis for the reference. The *October Fourth International* cites two exact quotations on the point to which I referred without directly quoting.
"It is possible, however, that five, ten and even more years will pass before the beginning of the socialist revolution." (From an article written in March, 1916, Lenin's Collected works, vol. XIX, p. 45, Third Russian Edition).
"We, the older men, will perhaps not live long enough to see the decisive battles of the impending revolution." (Report on 1905 Revolution delivered to Swiss students, January, 1917, idem, page 357).

That is not all. The main quotation from Lenin which Shachtman cites in his polemic against us—a quotation which he also mutilates to twist the meaning—shows that Lenin was not speaking of the revolution as an immediate perspective; that is, the quotation will show it when we restore the words which Shachtman cut off in the middle of a sentence. He quotes from the article of October 11, 1915, which appears on page 347 of the English edition of Lenin's works, Volume XVIII: "... It is our bounden duty to explain to the masses the necessity of a revolution, to appeal for it, to create the fitting organizations, to speak fearlessly and in the most concrete manner of the various methods of forceful struggle and of its 'technique'..." There Shachtman ended the quotation, breaking Lenin's sentence off at a comma.

WHAT SHACHTMAN LEFT OUT!

Here are the immediately following words which he left out: "This bounden duty of ours being independent of whether the revolution will be strong enough and whether it will come in connection with the first OR SECOND IMPERIALIST WAR, etc." Lenin obviously was not arguing about the immediacy of the revolution as we visualize it in connection with the present war, but about the necessity of advocating it and preparing for it.

If any further proof is needed one only has to read the rest of Lenin's article! In the very same article, on page 349 of the same volume, Lenin continued: "As to the untimeliness of preaching revolution, this objection rests on a confusion of terms customary with the Romance Socialists: They confuse the beginning of a revolution with its open and direct propaganda. In Russia, nobody places the beginning of the 1905 Revolution before January 22, 1905, whereas the revolutionary propaganda, in the narrow sense of the word, the propaganda and the preparation of mass action, demonstrations, strikes, barricades, had been conducted for years before that. The old *Iskra*, for instance, preached this from the end of 1900, as did Marx from 1847 when there could have been no thought as yet about the beginning of a revolution in Europe."

Shachtman took my remarks about the immediate perspectives of Lenin during the first World War, lifted them out of their context, mutilated the paragraph from which they were extracted, twisted them into an attack on the program and traditions of the Bolsheviks which was not intended or implied in any way by me, and then Shachtman attempted to bolster his thesis by quotations from Lenin which in reality prove the opposite—when they are honestly quoted without breaking off sentences in the middle, and without suppressing other sentences in the same article

which make Lenin's real meaning even clearer.
To top off his exercise in literary skulduggery Shachtman refers to the "outlived" Lenin, using quotation marks to convey the impression that he is quoting me. That is an outright literary forgery. I never used such an expression and could not do so; it is not my opinion.

HIS ATTACK AIMED AT TROTSKY

All this literary fakery and forgery in "defense" of Lenin has a fundamental aim which is not frankly avowed, but only thinly disguised. Against whom is Shachtman really defending Lenin? To be sure, he mentions only "Cannon," but it is perfectly obvious that Cannon in this case is only serving Shachtman as a pseudonym for the real target of his attack. My remarks about Lenin's perspective during the first world war were no more and no less than a simple repetition of what Trotsky said on the subject. It was he who called our attention to the relevant quotations and explained their precise significance.

In the October number of our magazine *Fourth International* which Shachtman had at hand when he wrote his article in *Labor Action* of November 4th—he refers to the Goldman-Trotsky correspondence contained therein—Trotsky wrote: "Prior to the February Revolution and even afterward, the revolutionary elements felt themselves to be not contenders for power, but the extreme left opposition. Even Lenin, relegated the socialist revolution to a more or less distant future... If that is how Lenin viewed the situation, then there is hardly any need of talking about the others."
Here is the real nub of the matter. Shachtman's attack on "Cannon" in behalf of Lenin is in reality aimed against Trotsky in a cowardly and indirect manner. He wants to set Lenin against Trotsky, to make a division in the minds of the radical workers between Lenin and Trotsky, to set himself up as a "Leninist" with the sly intimation that Leninism is not the same thing as Trotskyism. There is a monstrous criminality in this procedure. The names of Lenin and Trotsky are inseparably united in the Russian Revolution, its achievements, its doctrines and traditions, and in the great struggle for bolshevism waged by Trotsky since the death of Lenin. "Lenin-Trotsky"—those two immortal names are one. Nobody yet has tried to separate them; that is, nobody but scoundrels and traitors.

Shachtman's article in *Labor Action* serves the same aim as the special "Trotsky Memorial Issue" of our magazine which was published only to defame the memory of Trotsky, to belittle him, to justify themselves against him and, at the same time—like any shopkeeper looking for a little extra profit—to claim his "heritage."
Trotsky, as if anticipating such attempts, gave this answer in advance. Here is what he wrote in the *Socialist Appeal*: "Only the other day Shachtman referred to himself in the press as a 'Trotskyist.' If this be Trotskyism then I at least am no Trotskyist. With the present ideas of Shachtman, not to mention Burnham, I have nothing in common... Towards their new magazine my attitude can only be the same as toward all other petty-bourgeois counterfeits of Marxism. As for their 'organizational methods' and political 'morality', these evoke in me nothing but contempt."

The literary manners and morals of petty bourgeois dabblers in politics are no better than their theses. With such people, as Trotsky once remarked, it is not sufficient to check their theses; it is necessary to watch their fingers too! If we keep this salutary warning in mind the "theses" of Shachtman directed against our military transitional program can be disposed of without difficulty. As I said before, it is mainly work with a shovel.