

# The Future of the A. F. of L.

MINNEAPOLIS, Nov. 28.—Comrade James P. Cannon spoke here before a group of more than a hundred workers on the subject of "The Future of the A. F. of L." Many in the audience had never before attended a Workers Party meeting. The gross receipts were more than twenty-five dollars.

Comrade Cannon began his talk by analyzing the historical essence of the A. F. of L. He showed how it had fulfilled the expectations of Mark Hanna, one of the founders of the Civic Federation, who called the A. F. of L. the "bulwark of American capitalism." He went on to point how the events of the last two years had brought about significant changes which threatened the position of the A. F. of L. At San Francisco, two years ago, the A. F. of L. had been forced to give formal recognition to the principle of industrial unionism. At Atlantic City there had been 11,000 votes for industrial unionism. And a mere speech by John Lewis, himself formerly a member of the Civic Federation, had sufficed to force the withdrawal of Matthew Woll from that organization.

## Into the Unions

"The impulse of the masses, with the coming of the NRA had been 'into the unions.' The million workers could have been organized at that time. These workers longed for a union—the most elementary organization of the workers. Without a union, the workers felt, they have nothing. But the craft A. F. of L. unions came in between the workers and the employers and betrayed the interests of the workers. This happened all over the country. In Minneapolis, Tobin, President of the Drivers International, tried the same stunt. But he didn't succeed. (Applause.)

"In Minneapolis, real organization survived as testimony of the real possibilities in the organization of the workers. What was the answer of the A. F. of L. leadership? In the very days of the June strike when the bosses were trying to wech out of their agreement with 574, the Teamsters President fired a blast which was printed in the newspapers as a weapon against the union. And no sooner had the union buried its dead, no sooner had the smoke of battle cleared and it had gathered together its wounded, than Tobin comes along and tries to break up the union because it wouldn't allow itself to be cheated and brow-beaten. Tobin connived with Green to show the workers that they might perhaps beat the bosses—but, by God! they couldn't beat the A. F. of L. and its almighty 'principles.' Tobin would show the union that he was better than the Citizens Alliance in busting up unions. Well, he tried. And the score is nothing to nothing for both Tobin and the Citizens Alliance. (Applause.)

## Workers Want Industrial Unionism

"Thus, in spite of the accumulated discontent of the workers, the A. F. of L. as such made only the most miserable showing. But the workers, for this reason, didn't say 'to hell with unions!' Instead there was a tremendous pressure to change the form and methods of organization. Every worker reflects this discontent with the old methods and forms. Every discontented worker rallies around any union capable of fighting the incompetency of the old craft unions. Suppose you took 574 to Detroit or Pittsburgh—what unions would have in rubber, in steel, in autos? You can't fool the workers with craft unionism any more. They don't want it. They want industrial unionism. When the craft unionists come in any try to tell them how to run their unions they revolt. The automobile workers, in their convention, called on the eve of the Atlantic City convention, rejected the proposals of Green. In Akron, the rubber workers elected their own President and rejected the protégé of Green. And then come the teachers—the teachers who have never been known to be radicals—the teachers in Ohio rejected the ultimatum from Green that they reorganize the New York local. The teachers told Green to go to hell. Three times before the Atlantic City convention Green got official rebuffs and defeats—unheard of before! And in Minneapolis, Tobin had also failed.

"All these accumulated forces pressed in on the Atlantic City convention—forces which guarantee that there will be no patching up between the contending forces in the A. F. of L. First, then, there is the revolt from below. Secondly, there is the fear on the part of certain of the shrewd leaders. This fear is not unjustified. It is the fear that if the A. F. of L. doesn't quit monkeying around, there will grow up an independent union movement outside of the A. F. of L., leaving the old leaders high and dry without their highly remunerative 'pie cards.' They have seen the handwriting on the wall—these more far-sighted leaders—they have looked across the Atlantic and seen what happened in Europe. Take John Lewis. Lewis is no radical, yet he says that if there are no industrial unions there will be none at all. Hillman, too, in the A. F. of L. conventions made the same point. Thus we find forces pressing for more

## From a Speech Delivered by Comrade James P. Cannon Before a Forum of Minneapolis Workers

modern types of organization both within and without the official A. F. of L.

### Our Tendency

"While on the surface it may appear that the contest is only between two types of leaders—between the horse-and- buggy unionists—there is also a tendency which is even more progressive than the official sponsors of industrial unionism. This tendency aims at more than merely winning a strike. It aims at the foundation of a workers' republic. (Applause.) This tendency is ours; and it will come more and more to the front.

"The difference between Lewis and Green is one of intelligence and not of radicalism. The old Bourbons never learn anything new. They call the unskilled workers riff-raff; they try to keep the unions small and divided into crafts. These old fossils have lived their time. There are going to be many types of labor leaders before we have a workers' republic in the United States, but you can be sure that the Green-Hutcherson type will be among the first to be pushed aside.

### Fear of the Younger Leaders

"The younger leaders know that if you don't organize the strategically situated basic industries you have no organization at all. How can you speak of the American trade union movement when the basic industries are not unionized? These younger leaders are goaded on, also, by another fear—that unless they organize the basic industries first, more radical leaders will come in ahead of them. They don't want to be left on the outside. But they are not radicals, either. They want to deal with the bosses, but in an organized way. The bosses would have liked to cooperate with Meyer Lewis in Minneapolis. But Lewis had no power—he didn't control any unions—so they said to him, 'We're sorry, but we can't do any business.' (Laughter.) The same principle applies to the John Lewis-Hillman-Dubinsky crowd. They know they can't deal with the bosses unless they have powerfully organized industrial unions behind them.

"Now it is one of the nine wonders of the world that John L. Lewis and Co. have been catapulted to the leadership of the movement for industrial unionism. Their record is not so good. Nobody suppressed trade union democracy more ruthlessly than John L. Lewis. Nobody expelled more honest radical workers from the unions. Nobody forced more 'provisional reorganizations' of local unions. Nobody was more violent and unscrupulous in his methods. Yet this man has been projected to the front.

"Nevertheless, his interests and ours to a limited extent coincide.

Our tendency is not that of John L. Lewis. We believe in militancy and our final aim is the foundation of the workers' republic. We don't believe in class-collaboration. We don't believe that the workers can get anything without militancy. But we do stand for industrial unionism because it is a necessary step—because it is a step forward. It is a curious fact that the interests of the most revolutionary and the extremely conservative tendencies coincide to a certain extent. Industrial unionism is objectively progressive. Therefore revolutionists must support it regardless who is at the head of the movement for its realization. But we must not lose our heads and think that industrial unionism is all. We must forge ahead. We must retain our independent position. We must take advantage of every division between the reactionaries and the conservatives.

"The situation is this. The Lewis clique can't leave the workers unorganized. In Detroit the first strike of the season was conducted by an independent union consisting of three unions outside the A. F. of L. that came together and amalgamated. This was a warning to the A. F. of L. Minneapolis is also a warning. Here was a deliberate attempt to break up a union and drive it out of the A. F. of L. for 99 years. And this attempt failed. The idea may get into the minds of the workers: 'To hell with an A. F. of L. charter. Maybe it wasn't the A. F. of L. charter that got us our wage increase. Maybe it was our own organized strength.'

"That is the meaning behind the resignation of John L. Lewis. Lewis doesn't agree with Green—who issued a warning to the 'serious consequences' of forming organizations within the A. F. of L. and of entering into relations with non-A. F. of L. unions (except the Civic Federation, or any other boss union). Lewis is just going ahead the same as before.

"What does this mean for us? Now is the time for progressive and militant elements to push forward. Now is not the time to be cautious. Now is the time to press our demands and to get consideration for them. Now is the time to press further and further into the A. F. of L.

### What Pushed Lewis to the Lead

"Now you may want to know why it is Lewis rather than the radicals who is leading the fight for industrial unionism. The answer is that in the five years of the crisis, the most radical group, the Communists (Stalinists), left the A. F. of L. They went out of the A. F. of L. and pulled many others out with themselves. That's why when all this upsurge from the ranks is taking place, there have been no militants ready to spring into a place of leadership.

## Manager's Corner

We have received so far a total of 164 new subscriptions in our drive for a total of 1,000. This means that in the remaining few weeks much more speed is imperative.

In New York City branches No. 1 and 3 are ahead and fairly certain to make their quota. The Bronx branch (Branch 5) used to lag in our drives. This last week, however, it has made a good start. Branch 8 is small but shows a good record compared with its membership. It will go over the top easily. Outside of New York City only the Chicago branches, Cleveland and Philadelphia have made somewhat of a fair beginning.

Since our last report we have received a total of 89 new subscriptions distributed as follows:

City	Quota	Turned in
Akron, Ohio	20	2
Albert Lea, Minn.	10	—
Allentown, Pa.	50	—
Austin, Minn.	10	—
Berkeley, Cal.	10	—
Boston, Mass.	25	3
Charleston, W. Va.	5	—
Chicago, Ill.	50	13
Cleveland, Ohio	25	8
Columbus, Ohio	10	—
Davenport, Iowa	10	—
Detroit, Mich.	25	1
Dickson City, Pa.	5	—
Fargo, S. Dakota	10	—
High Point, N. C.	5	—
Kansas City, Mo.	10	—
Los Angeles, Cal.	25	2
Minneapolis, Minn.	75	1
Mount Carmel, Pa.	5	—
Newark, N. J.	20	—
New Castle, Pa.	10	—
New Haven, Conn.	10	—
New York City	400	100
(Branch 1	90	37)
(Branch 2	40	6)
(Branch 3	75	28)
(Branch 4	30	4)
(Branch 5	20	12)
(Branch 6	15	1)
(Branch 7	15	1)
(Branch 8	10	7)
(District	100	13)
Northampton, Pa.	5	—
Paterson, N. J.	10	—

Philadelphia, Pa.	25	5
Pittsburgh, Pa.	20	—
Plentywood, Mont.	10	—
St. Louis, Mo.	10	—
Salt Lake City	10	3
San Francisco, Cal.	20	—
San Diego, Cal.	10	4
Springfield, Ill.	10	—
Toledo, Ohio	25	—
Utica, N. Y.	5	—
Washington, D. C.	10	—
Williston, N. Dakota	10	—
Youngstown, Ohio	10	—
Received from cities not listed above	11	—
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>164</b>

Some contributions to the eight-page weekly have also been received since our last report. Comrade Harvey Walton made a donation very welcome because of its substantial size. The sum of \$100 contributed by him aided materially in bringing us nearer to the total amount needed. A friend in New York City contributed an additional \$5.00 and from Branch 1 we received a contribution of \$2.00. This brings us to a total contribution so far of \$946.70. To this we add the amount received in the special drive for 1,000 new subscriptions and we can say that the reaching of this particular goal will assure the launching of the eight-page weekly.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, December issue, now on sale, lives up to its usual high standard. Comrade Trotsky discusses in this issue the present position of the I.L.P. in relation to the struggle for the Fourth International. In another article he discusses an assignment executed by Romain Rolland regarding the Kiroff assassination. And of special interest to the readers of the NEW INTERNATIONAL this issue carries a review of "Stalin" by Henry Barbusse and "Stalin" by Boris Souvarine. This issue also contains a reply by John West to Max Eastman and other interesting and educational features.

"That is why, too, we must wherever possible, fight for a policy of unity. But not unity at any price. We won't purchase unity at the cost of breaking up our organizations and of giving up our fundamental rights. We must, wherever possible, go into the A. F. of L. and fertilize it while there is still time with genuine militancy. We must inspire the unions not only to fight for a loaf of bread but to conquer the world or else the world will be taken away from them as happened in Germany.

"In the days of reaction, the Gompers and Green policy of weeding out radicals worked like a charm. But now the workers are disoriented. There is no hope of inciting them against radicals. If you go to a worker and say to him, 'A radical is the leader of your union,' he will answer, 'I'm damned glad to hear that.' The sentiment of the masses has changed. I predict with absolute confidence, for example, that Meyer Lewis will be a complete flop. The victory of 574 is due not only to its own strength but to the favorable national situation. But it will be so decisive that it will put steel and courage into the movement everywhere else. The reactionaries' hands are too full—they have too many irons in the fire. There are too many issues at stake here and elsewhere.

### Conquer the World

"We must take advantage of this favorable objective situation. We must push the industrial union struggle forward. But at the same time we must inspire the workers with the revolutionary idea that they must establish themselves as masters of the whole world." (Applause.)

During the questioning period, comrade Cannon, in reply to a query as to what form the cooperation between the revolutionists and the conservative industrial unionists would take, replied that it was dangerous for radicals to make the mistake for one moment that Lewis was a true progressive. It was great folly to believe that salvation could come from people like John L. Lewis. Although our interests coincide to a certain extent, there would not probably be much direct cooperation between us. Rather each side would play its own end of the game for the realization of its own aim. What was important, was for the radicals to press forward their own ideas and to retain their independence. "Certainly, the Workers Party would not do as the Communists were doing. The C. P. is trying to build Lewis up into a second Jesus Christ. They publish front page interviews with him in the Daily Worker. We have no such illusions. We are for industrial unions because they gave us a larger field within which to work. The larger the unions, the more honest workers there will be within them. The better for us. Take 574, for example. It took a lunge when nobody was looking and built up a real organization. It took in workers who had never been in any union before. Now suppose you did the same thing from town to town. It is significant, too, that the same leaders who thus organized the drivers, went ahead and organized the unemployed. The typical American labor leader has no interest in half-starved unemployed workers. That is John L. Lewis' position. The sign of the genuine labor leader is his interest in all the workers. It was no accident that 574 organized the unemployed; and the unemployed recruited by rallying to 574's support."

"INTELLECTUALS AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE"  
Speaker:  
MAX NOMAD  
Author of "Rebels and Renegades"  
FRIDAY, DEC. 20, 8 P.M.  
at Branch 1 Headquarters  
320 E. 14th St., N. Y. C.  
Discussion — Admission free

PARTY AND DANCE SATURDAY NIGHT, DEC. 14 at the headquarters of BRANCH 1, N. Y. C., 320 East 14th Street. All the proceeds will go to the up and coming Newark Branch.

## WORKERS

Protect Yourself Against the Hazards of Life. Join the WORKMEN'S SICK & DEATH BENEFIT FUND OF THE U.S. 1884-1935  
Organized, managed by and for workers with only one purpose: to render protection to members and their families, and to support all endeavors and struggles for the improvement of toilers.  
About 50,000 members organized in 350 branches. Reserves \$3,400,000.  
Death benefit graded according to age at entry. Sick benefit payments from \$30 to \$600—to men and women, according to classes.  
Monthly assessments from 45c to \$2.20.  
For further information apply to Main Office:  
714 Seneca Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

# Profiteers Clear Decks For Big Drive on Labor

Continued from Page 1

Sloan, Jr. of General Motors gave the lead at this point: "We who have the prime responsibilities of the major policies of industry must first convince ourselves as to fundamentals. Then we must convince the organizations of industry. This applies particularly to the workers within industry. Their welfare is at stake. We must also inform our stockholders—those who own industry. American industry is not selfish. It would be far more just to say it has been preoccupied—preoccupied in producing; but I am convinced that industry's responsibilities cannot longer be adequately discharged by mere physical production." The employers must now get busy and save the country!

They went further in making this clear at the N.A.M. convention by announcing that under "the American System" they were going to fight against various measures by which the government is "hampering recovery," namely: efforts to regulate and control production; efforts to regulate the financing of business (regulation of banks, stock exchange, sale of securities, etc.); governmental measures to regulate hours of work and rates of pay; and governmental efforts to regulate relations between employer and employee which will "lead to political rule over both management and labor."

### "Soak the Poor"

When the N.A.M. becomes still more concrete as to what it is going to fight for under the banner of "The American System" it speaks of cutting down the taxes on big incomes, levying an income tax on the lower incomes, extending various forms of sales taxes; in other words, a tax policy of "soak the poor." It speaks also of the need of drastic reduction of government expenditures, particularly for the unemployed in order that "the budget may be balanced" and the intolerable burden on business which, Mr. J. P. Morgan indicated recently, would soon make him a poor man may be lifted. And it attacks the Wagner-Connelly Labor Relations Act and all other measures

which even in the slightest degree give or appear to give support to labor in its efforts at unionization. To put it bluntly, there is a temporary "recovery" under the capitalist system. That means a chance to make profits. And the industrialists announce that they are going to make them all they possibly can. They are going to remove every obstacle in their path if they can. And they are in a determined, fighting, enthusiastic and pliant mood about it. For the moment American capitalists have recovered their morale.

### Lewis Also for Roosevelt

Space permits only two practical observations: The announcement that the industrialists were going to fight Roosevelt's New Deal policies was greeted by William Green with a notice that this would itself mean that all liberal and labor forces would rally to Roosevelt's support, and John L. Lewis, who at certain points is conducting a spectacular fight against Green, on this matter solidarizes himself with the A. F. of L. president, announcing that he too would support Roosevelt wholeheartedly. Thus these trade union leaders once more try to give to workers a lesson in how not to do things. Industry has indeed, in the words of one of its spokesmen "much against its will been forced in sheer self-defense to enter the political arena or be destroyed as a private enterprise."

But Alfred P. Sloan is careful to explain just what this means: "It is important that we recognize that industry as an institution must not concern itself with promoting the fortunes of any political agencies." In other words, Sloan as well as other intelligent leaders recognize that they can use both the Republican and Democratic parties, especially as long as American workers think they can find salvation by turning now to one and now to another of these parties. Roosevelt saved them in 1933, among other things by persuading the workers and the trade union bureaucrats that he was going to give them a genuine New Deal. He is

even now giving fresh help to the industrialists by stating that there will be a "breathing spell" from social and regulatory legislation.

For the present what the industrialists want is to bring still more pressure on Roosevelt in order that they may get a larger and deeper breathing spell. They will by no means decisively or unanimously repudiate him as long as he gives them this and also keeps on building the military and naval establishment of the United States in preparation for that war with the imperialists of other nations which American imperialists clearly foresee. The workers can find salvation not via the proposition of Green and Lewis but by complete repudiation of all capitalist parties, by building up their own independent political strength, by organizing their power for the overthrow of the system which each in his own way, Sloan, Roosevelt and the trade union bureaucrats, seek to maintain.

### "Smash the Unions"

Secondly, the main immediate object of the industrialists, hidden behind all the verbiage about "The American System," attacks on the New Deal, etc., is SMASH THE UNIONS. Not the Roosevelt administration, not the Wagner-Connelly Act, not the Labor Relations Board, or any of these agencies but the unions above all stand in the way of the profit-grabbing crusade on which the industrialists have entered. The organized workers can offer resistance to the breakdown of their standards. Besides, if the organized power of the workers grows they can shake the very foundations of the system from which the industrialists derive their profits and their prestige.

The main immediate answer to the employer offensive is labor's offensive: Organization campaigns in the basic industries; strikes for union recognition and against all attacks on labor standards; intensification of labor militancy; to answer employer militancy; the building up of a leadership in the unions which breaks forever with the philosophy of collaboration with the profit-grabbing employers and stands on the basis of struggle against them.

# N. Y. Socialist Party Splits

Continued from Page 1

leader of a faction." It is possible to draw certain conclusions on the basis of these developments. First of all, the split will not be confined to New York but will be a national split, involving the National Committee and the state organizations. Second, the Thomas-Hoan-Militant coalition, which has a majority on the National Committee, seems to have at last decided to conduct a struggle against the Old Guard and even to throw them out of the party. Peace-pacts between them, especially against the genuine lefts in the party, are still by no means excluded. Third, the leadership in the present struggle comes from Thomas and Hoan, rather than from Militant chieftains.

Information from additional sources confirms these conclusions. The initiative in the entire struggle has been given by Thomas and his group. The Militant leaders have tagged along behind him and Hoan. They had made few, if any, preparations for conducting the fight against the Old Guard. The Old Guard's declaration of war took them by surprise, as did the necessity and suddenness of the split. In their lack of preparation for the inevitable struggle and in their passive trailing behind Thomas, the Militant commanders-in-chief again show their weaknesses as political leaders.

### Danger of Reconciliation

It is possible that further attempts at reconciliation will be made by the Old Guard or others. What will be the attitude of the Militant leaders to such proposals? Will they once more fall into the trap of submerging their political differences with the Old Guard for the sake of a fictitious unity with them? This is a danger to be guarded against.

The Militants have finally taken a necessary and inevitable step forward in their evolution. The issues of struggle against the Old Guard have been brought to a head. It is necessary that these issues be fully clarified and settled, if the development of the Militants is to continue. These cannot be clarified by temporizing with the Old Guard, but only by waging a war to the death against them.

Are the Militants ready for this struggle? How clearly do they see the necessary conditions and consequences of the political conflict they are engaged in?

The Militants have already wasted many precious months in vain attempts to conclude peace with the Old Guard and to form unprincipled blocs, composed of politically antagonistic elements, within the S.P. The time spent in maneuvers and creating contradictory combinations could have been more profitably used in discussing the main political issues facing the working class, in elaborating a comprehensive

and correct political program; and then in carrying forward the struggle for organizational control in the basis of such a program.

After a long delay, the Militants have finally taken certain steps in this direction by the publication of their Draft Program for the coming S.P. convention. We have already pointed out in a series of articles the extremely serious weaknesses, errors, and ambiguities in this statement of principles.

These deficiencies are particularly glaring on the most important of all questions, the war question. The position taken on the war question is the touchstone of every political grouping in the labor movement today. It is the one question on which there cannot be the slightest reservation, confusion or ambiguity. This is the question which sharply separates the proletarian revolutionist from every shade of centrism and reformism.

In their opposition to the policy of sanctions and in their criticism of the Bauer, Dan, Zyromski resolution, the Militants have attempted to deal with this question. We have already criticized the shortcomings of their position. In the meantime they have retreated farther than gone forward. It is essential that they review their efforts to clarify their position. For only a clear revolutionary line on the war question can give adequate guidance to the organizational struggle within the S.P. and to all the efforts at the regroupment of the revolutionary forces going on around it.

Social-patriotism is the main danger, from whatever quarter it may come. The Old Guard have always been outright chauvinists and always will be. The most dangerous source of social-patriotic poison, as the Browder-Thomas debate indicated, however, comes from the Stalinists and their new line. These people, who clamor for the application of sanctions, who support the imperialist League of Nations, who defend the Soviet shipment of oil to Italy while calling for an international working class boycott, who, as in France, Czechoslovakia and elsewhere, assert that American revolutionists must demand that the United States enter the war if the Soviet Union is attacked, are the most pernicious social-patriotic influence in the working class today.

The struggle against social-patriotism should be supplemented by a struggle against pacifism, represented in the S.P. by Thomas. Pacifism and the advocacy of neutrality legislation is as much part of the ideological preparation for war as social-patriotism and the call for sanctions.

The Workers Party has just published a pamphlet containing its views on the war question, entitled "War and the Workers." We ask every honest Socialist to read it carefully and reflect upon it. Let the Socialist Call, the organ of the Militants, review and criticize it. We will welcome such full and open discussion. Complete clarity on this question is an indispensable

prerequisite for the regroupment of the revolutionary forces.

Clarity is equally essential on other matters. Yesterday, the Militants believed that they could live at peace in the same party with the Old Guard. At that time we issued the warning that such an arrangement was politically impossible. Today, the Militants cherish the illusion that they can solidify their bloc with Thomas, Hoan and their like. Even more do they cultivate the illusion that the Socialist Party can be transformed into the revolutionary party of the American workers.

One illusion is as dangerous as the other. Revolutionists cannot remain for long within the same party with municipal reformists like Hoan; opponents of pacifism cannot remain for long in the same party with pacifists like Thomas and Allen. Such antagonistic elements will sooner or later collide with each other as the struggle within the S.P. develops, and fly apart.

The regrouping of the revolutionary forces on a national and international scale should be the fundamental task of all sincere Socialist workers. These forces can be reconstituted only on the basis of a clear and uncompromising revolutionary program. The duty of all Militants, who are revolutionists, is to work out such a program and to fight for its adoption. Only in this way will the split which has just taken place be a progressive one. Only through this road will all the revolutionary elements be united.

## TO THE READERS OF THE NEW MILITANT

We beg your indulgence for having missed the last issue. However, this omission will, we believe, hardly be felt since this issue will be in your hands after a lapse of hardly two days. Various obstacles of a purely technical nature compelled us to take this course. Nevertheless we propose to turn the evil into a good by introducing a sorely needed reform. In the future the NEW MILITANT will be mailed on Wednesdays and you will receive it prior instead of after, as was the case until now, the date of issuance. New York branches will have it for week-end distribution and out of town branches before the week-end is out.

—The NEW MILITANT.

## OPEN FORUM

"WHAT NEXT IN FRANCE?"

Speaker: JOHN G. WRIGHT

THURSDAY, DEC. 12, 8 P.M.

107 MacDougal St., N. Y. C.

Questions and Discussion

Ausp: Branch 3, Workers Party

PAUL LUTTINGER, M.D.

DANIEL LUTTINGER, M.D.

5 Washington Square North

1-2 and 6-8 Except Sundays

and Holidays.