# We Must Prepare For Our 'M-Day'

By BERTRAM D. WOLFE

*(This is the last of the series of articles based on Betrtram D. Wolfe's report at a recent meeting of the National Council of the I.C.L.L.—* The Editor.)

* * *

A few words in conclusion. It is high time that we ourselves began drawing up our own "M-Day plans." I pointed out before that the ruling class has spent a decade in preparing, down to the finest details, its plans for the day war is declared. I don't want to be an alarmist—one of the comrades here told me after my October 16th report on the war situation that he thought I was exaggerating the situation in sounding the cry of alarm—certainly, he must realize by now that that was the moment at which the moral mobilization of the American people for war was beginning—I do want to point out that the preparation of our M-Day plans, while it does not need to take a decade and a half, is something that cannot be done overnight without previous thought and planning. I know that this is not an appropriate thing for discussing in a large committee but I want to give some idea of a few things that can be considered by our organization as a whole, and that should be worked out in detail by the Executive Committee or a sub-committee.

I counted the number of women present in this plenum chiefly because I have been studying the M-Day plans of the government. I discovered that, while those plans give the war dictators important powers over women and children by setting aside child-labor laws and women's minimum-wage laws, that nevertheless only men are subject to conscription, to being drafted into either the factories or the army. That means that, at any moment, any number of our leaders, of our spokesmen, of our trade-union functionaries of the male sex, can be effectively stilled either by being thrown into jail or by being put into military discipline and I think that we must begin now an intensive effort to train more women in our ranks to write for our press, to learn how to speak, to draft programs, to organize, to do all of the things the bulk of which have been done only with very little participation and very little leadership on the part of women. That is one thing.

A second: I notice also from the M-Day plans that workers in basic industries are, in general, going to get deferred classification. That is important to us. That means, for example, that our auto workers will not be drafted with the same rapidity that our miscellaneous workers will be. And, in any other basic industries in which we have many members, we will have some relative deferment. Therefore, we must consciously begin to develop in the ranks of the basic industries people capable of taking over the leadership and the tasks of the entire organization on every field that the organization will have to respond to. I don't mean merely on the top, people who get to plenums, like this for instance, for our top people in all fields will be marked men. But we have to prepare second and third and fourth and fifth-line reserves, with general political education, with practise in many-sided analyses on all the concrete problems in the light of our general aims.

We have to develop a great deal more of the capacity for independent leadership and initiative in every unit of the country because it is obvious that the separate regions may be cut off from the center for a while.

I am deeply impressed by what I saw happen in Spain, the example of the P.O.U.M. Its best leaders both taken— Maurin and Nin. Then its entire leadership was arrested—I mean the entire leadership not the top leadership—every well-known, active P.O.U.M.ist in the land. Scores and hundreds of leaders of the P.O.U.M. in every region are in jail. And despite that, the P.O.U.M. is getting out a regular underground press that is very effective. It is functioning as an underground party thanks to the initiative and self-leadership of militants of the lower ranks. I don't believe we have developed to that extent the capacity for self-initiative in our own ranks.

Next, I want to repeat what I said in the October 16th report, that today in a very different sense than at any other time during our organization's life, it is not any longer a question of long-time political aim, but today recruiting and mass explanation of our stand on the war question are the burning necessities of our existence. We and the working class will pay very dearly for our complacent dullness, our routine laziness, our "let-George-do-it" attitude on the recruiting question. And that applies to everyone of us without any exception.

I am convinced that we will pay very dearly with the prolonging of slaughter, with the cutting to pieces of our best and most precious elements, for each day's delay in the mass recruiting and the mass explaining of our organiation's position on war. We will pay with months of anguish and torture in an inferno that even our imagination does not suffice to contemplate and understand. Today each day is precious, not one moment must be lost.

---

ernments. . . . Action "in support of the League," therefore, means action—war—in support of a body representing in the main capitalist governments. . . .

Except for the few, now very few, leaders of the Labor Party who remain pure pacifists, almost all of them believe in one or other of the schemes for preventing war described as "collective security" or as "an international police force." . . . Each of these schemes, each of the existent or proposed organizations embodying them must, in fact and action, help the war-makers if . . . they draw working class attention away from a real way to prevent war and concentrate it on an unreal way. And each of these schemes is doubly dangerous if it can be adopted in part or whole by a capitalist government and twisted into a cover and an excuse for a capitalist war.

Contrast these quotations with a speech by John McGovern, M.P., a member of the Independent Labor Party. . . . Here are two different conceptions of war and of society. In one conception, there is a united "collective" world, . . . bound together to resist a "peace-breaker." In the other, there is a world divided by class war in which "defense" means primarily defense of ruling-class property. These two views clash within the whole labor movement. . . .

The importance of this change of policy (of the Labor Party) cannot be overstressed. It means that war is near . . . and it means that, in this war, the official machinery of the labor movement will be at the disposal of whatever government . . . wages that war. For it is always easy to make this war **appear** to be against the foreign "peace-breaker," a war for "collective-security," a war for peace.