

VANGUARD

JUNE, 1937

Vol. 3. No. 7

IN THIS ISSUE

WHO IS BETRAYING THE SPANISH REVOLUTION?

M. YVON

DOCUMENTS AND FRONT LINE NEWS

JOSEPH ZACK

STALIN AND TROTSKY

A FOLLOW-UP ON THE "OPEN LETTER"

DAVID LAWRENCE

PEOPLE'S FRONT FOR CHINA?

AUGUSTIN SOUCHY

G. MAXIMOFF

FROM I. W. W. TO G. P. U.

A REVIEW OF Wm. Z. FOSTER'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY

CAMILLO BERNERI

RISE OF THE C. I. O.

J. MORRISON

CONSTRUCTIVE ANARCHISM

ANARCHISM AND ECONOMICS

We will begin with what we consider the basic tenet of anarchism, with what appears to us as its cornerstone — with economics. "Economic emancipation of the proletariat is the great goal to which every political movement must be subordinated as a simple means" — proclaim the statutes of the First International. Bakunin, wholly and without any reservations, accepts this tenet and places it at the very basis of his system of anarchist doctrine. Those who summon the proletariat to conquer political freedom as a necessary preliminary to the complete emancipation of the proletariat, he answered with the following verses of Freiligrath:

"Speak not of freedom,
Poverty is slavery."

Bakunin, as no one else at that time, clearly understood that the proletariat can really enjoy political freedom only when it is also an equal member of society in the economic sphere. Otherwise, all political liberties are a worthless gift. It was on this plane that the struggle with Marx developed in the First International.

Economic emancipation before anything else, because political freedom results from this emancipation and not vice versa.

Here, Bakunin was more consistent, more Marxist, so to speak, than Marx himself, for Marx in this case abandons his position that economic forms determine political forms.

Economics, however, has two aspects — production and consumption. Which is the principal one to Bakunin? In other words: does Bakunin's communism lay special stress on consumption?

Bakunin never concerned himself in a special manner with problems of consumption and distribution. We do not find in his works an elaborated treatment of these problems, notwithstanding the fact that he attributed great importance to the bread problem. "The first step of the revolution", he said, "must be the assurance of bread to the population". The bread problem is to him the primary question. "To the mass of people . . . the bread question is the problem of intellectual emancipation, freedom and humanity".

Bakunin understood very well the significance of immediate satisfaction of the urgent needs of the rebellious masses, but no less clearly did he realize that those needs cannot be satisfied for any length of time if production is not placed in the center of attention of the revolution. To Bakunin the problem of consumption was solved automatically if the problem of production was solved in the right manner.

In order to consume one has to produce. In order to produce for the purpose of gratifying the needs of all the workers and not that of enrichment of a small elite, it is necessary to expropriate the bourgeoisie and the state and organize industry on a new basis. How can that be done? Bakunin's answer was that the "land should belong only to those who work with their own hands — to the village municipalities. Capital and all the means of production — to workers' associations; and it is necessary that the organization be nothing else but a federation of free workers, of agricultural as well as of factory workers and associations of craftsmen". Using modern terminology, it means that it is necessary to SYNDICALIZE production — something which was done unconsciously and impulsively by the Russian workers at the beginning of the 1917 revolution, and which now is being consciously put into effect in Spain by the F.A.I. - C.N.T.

The second problem of the revolution was to Bakunin the conquest of leisure. Those "syndicalist" ideas, as they are called now, run like a red thread throughout the writings of Bakunin. Seemingly, it was clear to Bakunin that the revolution will lead to an increase of consumption without being able to satisfy it to a sufficient degree. The prob-

lem is solved by Kropotkin in an almost identical manner. Like Bakunin, Kropotkin also held that the bread problem comes first during a revolution. "Bread! bread before everything else! The revolution needs bread!" Kropotkin realized the significance of this problem. He understood that during the revolution industry will lag behind increased consumptive needs, that it will have to be taken over and organized anew so as to be able to satisfy the needs of the entire population. But this will require years and in the meantime the people will have to starve. "What is to be done?" asks Kropotkin. His answer is: **Confiscate the supplies at hand to be able to pull through the critical period.**

Everything indicates that when Kropotkin wrote his book "Conquest of Bread", he well understood the primary importance of production; he did not, however, stress it, being convinced that we were so rich that our supplies were so great that the revolution would surely hold out through the entire "critical period" — or TRANSITIONAL PERIOD, according to my terminology — during which the reconstruction of industries will have been completed. It was because of this that Kropotkin hopefully affirmed: "we take it upon ourselves to affirm that everyone can be well fed" . . . "that the revolution can assure to everyone food, shelter and clothing".

Kropotkin did not suspect that by making those statements he introduced into anarchism alien consumptive notes, which soon became so audible within the anarchist movement as to impart to it the aspect of a movement which stresses exclusively the factor of consumption.

There were even anarchists who tried to place consumption, which they understood as a simple "sharing", at the basis of anarchism. As a result of this, until the Russian revolution, and even up to the last moment, one of the basic features of anarchism was considered the priority of consumption (taken in the primitive sense) over production. This circumstance led, and is still leading, the elements who were little versed in the basic ideas of the anarchist doctrine, to conceive of anarchist-communism as the simple process of "dividing up". The practical application of such a primitively conceived "anarchist-communism" took place in 1918, among some of the anarchistically-inclined Moscow workers and Moscow anarchist groups who seized villas and distributed articles of use and clothing to the poor people. Something similar seems to have taken place during the first few days of the Spanish revolution. This primitive anarchism can be regarded as anarchism only by ignorant elements and our avowed enemies.

(To be continued in the next issue)

G. MAXIMOFF

INTERNATIONAL PRESS OF BROOKLYN

PRINTING • PUBLISHING • JOB WORK

158 Carroll Street
Brooklyn, N. Y.

•
Union Printers
CUMBERLAND 6-8269

VANGUARD STUDENT UNIT

High School and college students who are interested in learning about or participating in the libertarian movement are invited to attend the weekly discussion meetings of the Vanguard Student Unit every Saturday afternoon at 5:30 P.M. in the Vanguard Hall, 22 West 17th St., N. Y. C.

Vanguard

Published by the Vanguard Group, 45 W. 17th St., New York City. Subscription in U. S. one dollar (\$1.00) a year (12 issues). Foreign \$1.25. Single copies ten cents.

Volume 3 - Number 7

June, 1937

BETRAYAL IN SPAIN

**"AS FOR CATALONIA THE PURG-
ING OF TROTSKYIST AND ANAR-
CHO-SYNDICALIST ELEMENTS HAS
BEGUN; THIS WORK WILL BE CON-
DUCTED WITH THE SAME ENERGY
WITH WHICH IT HAS BEEN CON-
DUCTED IN THE U.S.S.R."**

—Pravda, December 17, 1936

Stalin's latest step in his avowed program to liquidate all outspoken and militant revolutionists from the Spanish scene comes at a time when the need for anti-Fascist working class unity is greater than ever before — and therefore at a time when the Comintern's hypocritical mask of "unity" is shown in its thinnest transparency. With General Mola's hordes at the gates of Bilbao, the Communists push their political intrigues to a new low level of degeneracy.

Loyalist Spain's new cabinet in Valencia under the premiership of the right-wing Socialist, Dr. Juan Negrin, was formed on May 17th, after Largo Caballero's shortlived attempt to form a new one. The latter was to include all anti-Fascist sectors and representatives from the two trade-union bodies, the Socialist-Communist controlled U.G.T. and the Anarcho-Syndicalist CNT. The Communists threatened to withdraw cooperation if they did not have things their way. They scored another "victory" — of the kind they have been winning ever since the Soviet Union belatedly entered Spanish politics via the route of highly priced arms shipments which it constantly threatens to withhold if its political demands are not met.

What is the character of the new Valencia cabinet? It is purely political, having eliminated not only the Anarcho-Syndicalist representatives, but also any trade-union representation whatsoever, and is based on the *Cortez* (parliament) which it hopes to convene very soon. In this manner they plan to abolish all vestiges of functional political organization and make the working class subservient to the political and economic aims of the bourgeoisie. They do, indeed, want very much the cooperation, the sacrifices, the heroism of the working class — they

want our Ascascos and Durrutis — but the organized workers must have no say in running public life! The cabinet consists of moderate republicans, Catholics and right-wing Socialists with the worst labor records in Spain. The Stalinists cleverly utilized the personal struggle between the "left" Caballero and the right-wing Prieto to give to the latter (one of the most detested men in the Spanish labor movement, especially among the militant workers) the all-important position of Defense Minister. That this was done as part of a well-planned campaign to provoke the Anarchists, can be seen not only from their actions during the past few months of intrigue and provocation to squelch the proletarian revolution in Spain; the clear-cut aims of the new Cabinet to continue the drive towards counter-revolution are well stated by Herbert Matthews in his *N. Y. Times* dispatch of May 19, 1937:

Spain is now seeing the anomaly of Communists as well as Socialists, Republicans, Catholic Basques and Catalan Leftists supporting a government that under ordinary circumstances they would characterize as bourgeois. The simple explanation is that they want to win this war first and worry about social revolution afterward.

That is the primary meaning of this government. It intends to use an iron hand to maintain internal order and prosecute the war with every element in Loyalist Spain getting together and fighting for victory.

By so doing, the government hopes to win the sympathy of the two democracies that mean most to Spain — Great Britain and France — and to retain the support of the nation that has been most helpful — Russia.

The government's main problem now is to pacify or squash the Anarchist opposition. (Emphasis mine, S.M.)

To understand why the Stalinists and their bourgeois allies are willing to risk the dangers of a political crisis at the very moment when the military situation in the Basque country is very precarious, one must see clearly the basic nature of the Spanish revolution, and the failure of the recent provocative and bloody attempt of the Stalinist-bourgeois bloc to wrest from the Catalonian workers and peasants their revolutionary conquests, their socialized industries, their peasant collectives and their internal defense patrols.

The daily press made much ado over the al-

leged "squashing" of the Barcelona "insurrection" purported to have been instigated by "Trotskyist-Fascists" in league with the "uncontrollable" Barcelona Anarchists. But, as happens not very seldom, the wished-for results are denied in subsequent dispatches. Although at the present moment we do not know the exact outcome of the clash, we do know enough to realize that such a clash was to be expected. When the P.O.U.M. was ousted from the Catalonian Generalidad (upon the insistence of the Soviet ambassador who threatened to send back to Russia a desperately needed shipment of arms on its way to Barcelona from the U.S.S.R., if his wishes were not complied with) our comrades knew that Stalin's counter-revolutionary blackmailing was going to be tried on a grand scale and that they were going to be the victims. And they were right. In order to discredit the revolutionists, in preparation for the final blow, they sabotaged food distribution; they denied arms to the (predominantly libertarian) Aragon front; they gave speculating merchants unwarranted advantages which resulted in an almost ruinous rise of prices; they sabotaged openly the unity of the working class by preventing a unity pact between the C.N.T. and the U.G.T.; they attempted to legislate the workers patrols — the safeguard against internal counter-revolution — out of existence, and to put in their place the unreliable Civil Guards and Assault Guards; they incited a number of Fascistically-minded peasants to attack the collectives; etc., etc. (We could continue this list with numerous other instances but we lack sufficient space in the *Vanguard*. For complete details read the recent numbers of "Spanish Revolution", the U.L.O. bi-weekly paper.) It was the last-mentioned action which (following the Generalidad crisis of March-April that revolved around the issue of the abolition of the workers patrols, which still remained when the new Catalonian cabinet was formed) required our comrades to defend themselves. Premier Taradellas (of Catalonia) then ordered the dissolution of the patrols and demanded that the libertarian workers turn

over all their arms to the government. (This is preposterous in view of the fact that most adult males in Spain carry arms.) Government police were sent to attack the patrols. The ensuing fight — the heroic defense by the revolutionary workers of their elementary rights and liberties — resulted apparently in a stalemate: the C.N.T.-controlled telephone building in Barcelona was not taken by force — the fighting there stopped by agreement; the workers patrols still remain; the socialized industries and collectives are still in workers and peasants hands. Whatever the nature of the "truce", it is clear that it can only be a temporary one.

Having been unable to squelch the revolution in Catalonia the Stalinists are now trying to accomplish the same ends through the Valencia government. But they cannot succeed, for the libertarian revolution is rooted in the Spanish masses. The Spanish Anarchists and Syndicalists have displayed almost incredible patience and tact—all for the sake of unity against the Fascist counter-revolution. They have yielded and compromised; they have even participated in the government — and they will continue as heroically as ever to play the leading role in stemming the tide of Fascist reaction. But governmental power is not the stock-in-trade of Anarchism. The libertarian workers of Spain know that their salvation lies only in their own efforts. They have demonstrated this understanding in their latest response to the needs of revolutionary defense. And whatever temporary tactical shifts they have made they know where their real strength lies. Fascism was halted by the revolutionary rising of the workers and peasants and only they can carry on this struggle to its logical end.

The Spanish revolution will forge ahead to greater revolutionary conquests; to the final destruction of capitalism; to the socialization of wealth; to a free political and cultural life. Neither Franco and his foreign allies nor Stalin and his international political machine shall be allowed to stand in the way of the road to liberty.

S. MORRISON

Manifesto of Libertarian Youth of Catalonia

The moment has come to speak clearly and with firmness.

Concerning the openly counter-revolutionary activity of certain antifascist sections, to whose eagerness — openly confessed — to return to the Democratic Bourgeois Republic, and to whose activities in the National as well as the International field, is partly due the prolongation of this brutal struggle which we sustain against fascism, forcing us to the alternative decision of either abandoning the revolution or losing the war, the Libertarian Youth have decided to speak clearly to the people. To the people of July 19th, so that they can judge and decide what they consider relevant.

We, on our part, announce that we can no longer keep silent and tolerate such low counter-revolutionary maneuvers, such governmental injustice, and such cunning and destructive work, such political falsehood, in the name of war and of antifascist unity.

We want to point out that we do not speak just for the sake of speaking. That we have reflected and suffered much before speaking as we do, with such clearness and bluntness. We have more than sufficient motives and reasons, many of which are already known to the people. The counter-revolution has taken off its mask and is now working openly. The United Socialist Youth, who first assisted the revaluing of the Azana stock — fallen so low in the first days of the revolution, when he tried to flee the country — and who called to the Unified Catholic Youth and even to those who were sympathetic to fascism — are now openly opposed to unity with the revolutionary youth, with the libertarian, communist, syndicalist, federalist, youth, etc.

The revolutionary workers' alliance, opposed for so many years before the revolution, and so desired by the working class in general, cannot be realized because governmental socialism is more interested in an alliance with the republican bourgeoisie.

There is being prepared, secretly in the background, through certain antifascist parties, an armistice with our irreconcilable enemies, which would have the virtue of returning us to the "honourable" generals to our people, to the hands of the military traitors and oppressors of the working class, who have given to Hitler and to Mussolini pieces of our country.

While they talk incessantly about unity, party manoeuvres and political plots are the strong dish of every day. And while they are speaking about this unity they are declaring war to the death on other sections who are fighting with us in the trenches against fascism. We want unity, loyal and sincere unity, that will lead us to triumph in the war and in the revolution.

Provocations of Public Order are effected on the part of certain elements in Interior Security, so that our comrades fall into the trap and respond to the provocation, which is then made a pretext to disarm and imprison them, or for other political ends no less abominable.

In the international field they support openly all the lullutions of the English and French Governments to encircle the Spanish revolution. And, oh shame, all this in the name of democracy and socialism. Today in the Spanish revolution, as yesterday in the case of Abyssinia, the politicians continue their treason of the Noske-MacDonald, etc., type, following their profession of betraying the proletariat and harnessing it to the carriage of governmental capitalism, in order to make it impossible for workers to employ direct action in favor of their Spanish brothers, fighting for the social revolution.

In the Basque country our committees have been imprisoned and the anarchist militancy has been persecuted because they declared themselves to be opposed to the celebration of the Easter festival. And all this takes place while our brothers fight in the trenches against a black and inquisitorial Spain. In Madrid the publishing offices and the radio station of the P.O.U.M. have been assaulted. Comrade Maroto, chief of the column which bears his name, has been imprisoned for being true to anarchism, while Asensio, the traitor general who delivered Malaga into the hands of the fascists, is enjoying liberty.

Arms are denied to the front of Aragon, because it is definitely revolutionary. In order to be able afterwards to throw mud on the columns that operate on that front, sacrificing thousands of lives and endangering our victory.

The Central Government boycotts Catalan economy, in order to force us to renounce our revolutionary conquests.

They ask sacrifices of the people, and the workers and militiamen give freely of whatever they possess, but the national government is guarding its gold as a guarantee of the economy of the new bourgeois and parliamentary republic. The treasures and fortunes of the capitalists are respected — a thing that is not even done by the fascists — and they conserve the fabulous salaries and sometimes multiply them.

The sons of the people are sent to the front, but for counter-revolutionary ends the uniformed forces are being kept in the rear. Are these better sons of their mothers than the others?

While the people are suffering privations a criminal speculation is permitted in all sorts of commercial enterprise.

By the power of military bands, spectacular shows and carnivals, and speeches to the shop-keeping class, they have galvanized ground for a dictatorship — not proletarian! but bourgeois.

We consider that it is quite unnecessary to give further proofs. All this demonstrates that the counter-revolution is moving at full speed, and that so-called revolutionary parties serve as its motor. By means of treachery and acts of

betrayal, prelude to strong repression, they are betraying the international proletariat and committing a crime against conscientious and progressive humanity. And this is all the more painful as it is done in the name of liberalism and socialism.

The Libertarian Youth refuse to make themselves accomplices by tolerating silently these activities, which must in time create distrust in the minds of the revolutionary people. And without restrictions we shall truthfully reveal these actions which must cause the words to rise to their lips. "This is treason!" We shall raise our voices and say — Be on the alert! For we are firmly decided not to be responsible for the crimes and betrayals of which the working class is being made the object.

It is not possible that those things should go on for one moment longer. Either the conduct must be changed and the word of honor given be kept, or we shall make responsible, with all its consequences, and all the tragedies, the political deceivers hidden in the ranks of the antifascists.

We are ready to return, if that is necessary, to the clandestine struggle against the deceivers, against the tyrants of the people, and the miserable merchants of politics, who crave your support but condemn your sons to die of hunger.

Proletarian mothers! Your sons are of as much value as others. With them you must compel the uniformed forces of the rear guard to take their part in the struggle at the front.

People! People! Do not tolerate any longer injustice and effrontery. Be ready to defend your conquests. The libertarian youth, and with them all the conscious and revolutionary youth are on your side.

It is enough! We will never turn back until we have put a stop to the counter-revolution! —April, 1937

TOWARD A NEW JULY 19th

Syndicalism, in contrast to social-democracy demands the conquest of the economic power. Without bread no freedom. The syndicalists and the anarchists declined to form political (electioneering) parties. They organized the workers according to occupations and industries. To achieve higher wages, shorter working-hours, better social conditions, they organized strikes and street demonstrations, executed sabotage and exercised passive resistance. To prepare for the socialist order, they perfected their trade unions. These were to have the task of directing production in place of the industrial magnates, to regulate distribution in place of the lords of commerce.

Acts of parliament and governmental decrees cannot do away with the system of private exploitation, cannot bring about social justice. Society must be changed from the bottom up. This requires the dissolution of the old police and military units, the closing of parliament, the abrogation of rights of private ownership in agriculture, industry and in commerce. In place of the old we envision the creation of new organizations for production and distribution by the workers and peasants, by the producers and consumers. The old social forms must be replaced by new ones.

For these reasons the syndicalists and anarchists refrained from the political struggle centering around elections. The social-democrats spoke of our political backwardness. They said: The economic power cannot be won without previously taking possession of the political power. If a strike did not succeed, they blamed the anarcho-syndicalist doctrine.

In this argumentation of the marxists there was much demagoguery. We anarcho-syndicalists were never the opponents of direct participation in public life by the workers themselves. We preached and led the struggle against oppression

and exploitation. From the strike to armed insurrection, from the general strike to general revolt — we used every means to weaken the power of the entrepreneurs and of the state. However, we consider the destruction of the political power of the bourgeois social system more efficacious and more in accordance with our aims than the conquest of political power.

The 19th of July and the following days proved the correctness of the anarchist point of view. The parliamentary-political power disclosed its screen-like nature. Capital and army, property and the sword were the real powers. After the February elections 1936, the trinity: Clergy, Capital, Army, felt its power being threatened; to strengthen it, the military trained its weapons on the people. These resisted. **In order to defend our liberties**, and not to conquer the political power, we anarchists and syndicalists took refuge in arms. The participation in the parliamentary elections was of relative value only; to expect salvation from it seemed naive to us; to identify the struggle for political liberties with the struggle for the ballot seemed dangerous.

To the surprise of the world we succeeded in repulsing the first attack of the generals. The political power of the state was shaken. The general strike of the workers, together with the armed struggle in the streets, made the workers' organizations the masters of the situation. The antifascist militia committee in Catalonia was a revolutionary committee, a sort of government of people's commissars. To take part in it, was the demand of the hour. We syndicalists and anarchists did not thereby commit treason against our principles. We remain true to the traditions, which Bakunin handed down to us. For more than eight months we have taken part in "the power" We first of all removed the supremacy of the bourgeois parliament. The governments in Barcelona and Valencia are regional and national representative bodies of the antifascist organizations. Their task is, to organize the struggle against fascism. We cannot remain apart from the task of reconquering Toledo, Irun, San Sebastian, Malaga; the situation forces us, to cooperate closely with all the antifascist forces of our people.

However, we cannot be satisfied with sharing the political power. The proletariat expects more from us. It wants betterment of its condition. We enjoy its confidence, it is up to us to justify this confidence. The avowal of socialism must not remain only on our lips. On July 19, 1936 we won a great victory over fascism; **another 19th of July must bring us the final victory over capitalism.**

Upon us rests a heavy responsibility. The chaos of the coexistence of private and collective economy leads to confusion; the responsibilities are shifting. Our money is devaluated abroad by our capitalist opponents. Food is becoming dearer, speculation abounds, dissatisfaction is stirring.

The government in Valencia controls money; it is in a position to do something. But it must act quickly, for the people want to see action. Our antifascist struggle must be at the same time an anticapitalist struggle. We must improve the economic condition of the country, otherwise our fight will lose its meaning. That is difficult right in the middle of the war, but no stone must be left unturned. We prove the correctness of our view and the justice of our cause not only by the sharpness of the sword, but by our ability to bring about social justice and freedom in the social relations of our people.

We have today the possibility, unequalled in history, of winning for good the sympathies of the working population. Our government does not consist of political parties and parliamentarian groups alone. The economic organizations of the proletariat are represented in it. That represents progress. We have the possibility of avoiding the errors and missteps which tore Germany down into the abyss of fascism. The way out: **The government of the political**

parties must make room for a nation-wide representation of the Spanish people, which will rest on the two trade union organizations of the country.

Political liberties are valuable to us and we fight for them at the risk of our lives. But political power alone will not bring our people social liberation.

Of economic power we have won only half, collectivization does not extend to the entire economic life. A great part of our economy is still dominated by private capital. Half-solutions are none at all. For several months now we have been marking time as far as our economy goes. Our entire life suffers from that. Go back we cannot. We must go forward. Collectivization is the slogan of the day. Down with large salaries! Down with high prices!

We are in our own domain. Police and militia are with us. Workers and peasants want social justice. We are masters of our own fate and nothing can be in the way of the realization of our aims.

Political freedom must be supplemented by economic equality. Destruction and Construction are in our hands. We can give the world a new example, we can give the international workers' movement a great lesson, by giving reality to the legacy of the First International: The Economic liberation of the working class is the great aim to which every political movement must be subordinated.

A. SOUCHY, April, 1937

Why Malaga Fell

• GOVERNMENT'S CRIMINAL NEGLIGENCE RESPONSIBLE

Regarding the fall of Malaga, reports appeared from various sources which did not altogether correspond with the true facts of the case. Some went so far as to actually lay the blame for its fall on the heads of the Anarchists. The Communist and Socialist organs of the world press even did not hesitate to repeat these lies — lies which can only serve the interests of the Fascists and by no means those of the Anti-Fascist United Front in Spain.

We give below details on the fall of Malaga which were reported by persons actually engaged in the fight and belonging to the various parties.

As far back as August last, the representative of the C.N.T., R. Pera, as well as Giralt, the representative of the Popular Front and the U.G.T., reported that the Fascists were marching in the direction of Algeiras, and that it was imperative to strengthen the defensive forces.

A demand was made for 10,000 rifles, 16 machine guns, 3 cannons of 17.5 and 10.5. In October a delegation of the Popular Front waited upon Largo Caballero, to present the necessity for strengthening the defense of Malaga and to ask for more arms. Caballero's reply was that not a single rifle, nor a single cartridge could be given for Malaga.

There were no anti-aircraft guns available, although the town was being dully attacked by machine guns from the air and from as low a height as 200 metres. Colonel Luis Romero (a member of the Communist Party since 1931) communicated this fact daily, either by telephone or telegraphically, to the Government. Romero's reports were supported by the F.A.I. of Malaga. Yet nothing was done. The C.N.T. of Malaga established a munitions factory where 1,000 persons were busy manufacturing equipment for the troops.

In November, another deputation was sent to interview Caballero, to put full details before him, as to the position of Malaga and to impress on him the dangerous state of affairs. The Government's reply was again in the negative.

An Economic Committee was appointed in Malaga, composed of representatives from all parties. The Committee

again applied to the Government. They pointed out that this Committee, consisting of representatives from all parties, Marxists, Anarchists, etc., of the Popular United Front, was urgently in need of munitions in order to fight against Fascism. The C.N.T.—F.A.I. represented the majority of the militiamen in this region. Their request was left unheeded. General Jose Asensio (Caballero's Minister of War), the Deputy State Secretary-General, refused to supply any arms for Malaga.

At this juncture, the Defense Committee of Barcelona sent 500 grenades of 17.5, 600 bombs, and a number of cartridges to Malaga.

● MALAGA COMPLETELY NEGLECTED

The Socialist Government of Madrid had completely neglected Malaga. The War Commissar of Malaga took away even the last three cannons from the Federal Column, which cannons had been posted in the district of Estepona, and handed them over to the Marxist battalion Mejico. Also some machine guns were withdrawn from the Federal Column of Estepona. The Commandant Pelayo was relieved of his command, because he was under suspicion of being in sympathy with the Confederates, i.e., the C.N.T. As a result of this, Estepona fell into the hands of the Fascists three days later, and thereby they moved 25 kilometres nearer to Malaga.

After this defeat of our forces, brought about by the withdrawal of arms, the Government relieved Colonel Hernandez Arceca of his post and replaced him by Colonel Villaiba. The latter came from the Aragon Front, where he had by no means distinguished himself.

Between the fall of Estepona and the fall of Malaga there was an interval of twenty days. During that time the Government at Valencia was daily adjured to send munitions, in view of the fact that the imminent fall of Malaga became daily more threatening.

The scouting service of the Confederates' Column "Juan Arcos", informed the Government that 32,000 Italians and Moroccans, equipped with 150 tanks and a proportionate amount of other war material, were advancing towards Malaga. Colonel Cremen, too, supported this, and insisted on the demand addressed to the Government for immediate supply of arms.

● ONLY FOUR MACHINE GUNS

In the meantime, the Fascists continued their advance. Safarraya was hard pressed by them. On February 5th a conference was held of all the Anti-Fascist organizations and parties, where the dangerous situation was discussed. It was decided to put up resistance. They only had at their disposal 28,000 cartridges, a very inadequate quantity of hand grenades and 4 machine guns. They hoped for speedy reinforcements. Two days before the fall of this district, a battery of field guns and one anti-aircraft gun arrived, which, however, it was no longer possible to put in action. For fully five days this battery was lying at Aimeria inactive. As to the reason for this inactivity Colonel Bolivar, who was at the head of the Marxist Battalion at Motril, could give information, after the other Marxist Battalion "Mejico" had likewise suffered defeat. The case with these guns was similar to that which took place in Barcelona, where 11 tanks were stolen by the commander of the Karl Marx Barracks, which tanks did not therefore go to the Front, but which were designed to be used for party political purposes.

On Saturday, February 6th, another Conference took place at Headquarters, where the resistance was prepared. On Sunday, February 7th, the Syndicates of the C.N.T. proposed that resistance should be made at any price and carried out to the utmost. They wanted to gain a week's time, during which they hoped to get reinforcements. There were no more cartridges available, and the defence had to be limited merely to the use of hand grenades.

When at 2 p. m. on Sunday a delegate of the Confederates' Column called at the Commander's Headquarters in order to report and to receive new instructions, the headquarters had already been abandoned. The Marxist War Commissar Bolivar, too, was no longer there. All had fled, without having notified it beforehand. This flight had as a consequence the death of thousands of women and children. Safarraya had fallen; the routes were occupied by Fascists, who mowed down with machine guns the people who were trying to escape. The Fascists then entered the town. While this entry was going on, the inhabitants still believed that it was our forces.

● MILITIAMEN LEFT WITHOUT INSTRUCTIONS

Malaga fell on Monday, February 8th, at noon. Since the Saturday previous to that, the militiamen were left without command and without instructions. The Fascists still expected to meet with resistance and remained half a day without further advance. But nothing happened. It was only at a distance of 70 kilometres that four days later the resistance was organized.

When the War Commissar Bolivar had left the town, a general irregular flight ensued towards Aimeria. Colonel Cremen declared before witnesses, who met him on the high road, that he had been betrayed. During the second half of January he had been promised 8,000 rifles and 200 machine guns, also cannons and 26 anti-aircraft guns. Yet none of these arms came to Malaga. Cremen congratulated the Anarchist Column "Juan Arcos" on the desperate resistance it had offered while still in the mountains.

The C.N.T., with the remainder of the comrades who were ready to continue the fight, formed the "Machnow" Battalion. This Battalion was refused rations, although it fought alongside of the Battalion "Juan Arcos" up to the very last. They succeeded, however, in carrying away to Aimeria 800 rifles and 2 machine guns which the Marxist Column "Motril" had left behind.

This is the story of the fall of Malaga. It is not the Anarchists who are to be blamed for it, but the Government which had refused up to the last moment to supply the necessary weapons for the defense of Malaga.

A. SOUCHY

Open letter to Federica Montseny

(Ed. note: Camillo Berneri is the editor of "Guerra di Classe", Italian C.N.T. paper in Barcelona. The following is an excerpt from an open letter to Federica Montseny, former anarchist minister of Public Health in the Valencia Cabinet, printed in "Guerra di Classe" on April 14th.)

In your speech of January 3rd you said:

"The anarchists entered the government in order to prevent the revelation from deviating and to carry it on in spite of the war, and furthermore, to be on guard against any attempt to establish a dictatorship, whatever its origin might be".

Very well, then, Comrade, in April, after three months of collaboration, we find ourselves confronted by a grave situation which others plan to make even more serious.

In such places as the Basque country, Levant and Castille, where we do not have a vast mass base in the trade-unions, the counter-revolution is becoming menacing and threatens to wipe out everything. The government is in Valencia and from there come the Assault Guards who are sent to disarm the revolutionary nuclei formed for defense purposes. Vilanesat is spoken of as a second Casas-Viejas. The Civil Guards and the Assault Guards have the arms; and it is they who are left in the rear to control the "uncontrollables", in other words to disarm the revolutionary nuclei

that may have a few rifles or revolvers. This is taking place at a time when we still have to fight on the internal front (i.e., against Fascist stool-pigeons. Ed. note.) This goes on during a civil war where all sorts of surprises are possible and in regions close to the front which itself is neither well-defined nor **mathematically** precise. This! when it is quite evident that arms are being distributed on a **political** basis, so that only the absolute minimum... is given to the Aragon front, the armed escort of the agricultural collectives, the defenders of the Aragon Council and of Catalonia, the Iberian Ukraine. You are in a government which has offered France and England concessions in Morocco, whereas it should have officially proclaimed Morocco politically autonomous ever since July, 1936. I can conceive what you as an anarchist must think of this disgraceful and stupid business; but I believe the time has come to point out that you and other anarchist ministers are not in agreement as to the nature and purpose of such doings.

It goes without saying that (the governments' preoccupation with) annihilating the "uncontrollables" will not, indeed, help us solve the problem of eliminating the Fifth Column. The prime requisite for eliminating the internal front is consistent investigation and repression activity, something which can be accomplished only by proved revolutionists. An internal policy of class-collaboration and leniency towards the middle classes leads inevitably to tolerance of questionable political elements. The fifth Column is composed not only of those belonging to Fascist groups but of those dissatisfied elements (bourgeoisie) who hope for a moderate republic. And it is the latter who profit by the tolerance of those who want to do away with the "uncontrollables".

The liquidation of the internal front depends upon a widespread and radical activity of defense committees constituted by the C.N.T. and U.G.T.

We are witnessing the penetration into leading positions of the popular army of questionable elements...

The political delegates and committees in the militia

exercise a salutary control which is now being weakened by the widespread growth of systems of advancement and promotion on a purely military basis. The authority of these committees and delegates must be reinforced.

...I believe the time has come to establish a "confederal" (libertarian) army, just as the Socialist Party has established its own armed forces in the form of the Fifth Regiment of the Popular Militia. I believe the time has come to solve the problem of "single command" by effectively realizing a **unity of command** which will permit an offensive on the Aragon front. I believe the time has come when we must put an end to this business of keeping thousands of Civil Guards and Assault Guards away from the front because they are used to control the "uncontrollables" in the rear.

... "Pravda" and "Izvestia" carry on a campaign of slander against the Spanish Anarchists and accuse them of sabotaging unity. Let us call upon the masses to judge the moral and political complicity involved in the silence of the Spanish Anarchist press on Stalin's dictatorial practices, on the persecution of Russian Anarchists, the monstrous trials against the Leninist and Trotskyist opposition — a silence well compensated in the defamations by "Izvestia" of "Solidaridad Obrera".

Let us call upon the masses to judge whether certain food-sabotaging manoeuvres were not included in the plan announced by "Pravda" in December 17, 1936:

"AS FOR CATALONIA, THE PURGING OF TROTSKYISTS AND ANARCHO-SYNDICALISTS HAS BEGUN; THIS WORK WILL BE CONDUCTED WITH THE SAME ENERGY WITH WHICH IT WAS CONDUCTED IN THE U.S.S.R."

CAMILLO BERNERI

† Vilanosa is a small Spanish village where C.N.T. headquarters were sacked and a number of C.N.T. militants murdered several weeks before this letter was written. Ed. Note.

People's Front for China?

The monthly journal, *Asia*, communicates in its April issue that the Kuomintang, at its plenary session, voted for peace with the Communists. Chou En-lai, vice-chairman of the Chinese Soviet Government, said in an interview at Sian, that the Communists were ready to cease confiscation, to set up a democratic government in harmony with Nanking in the area which they occupy, and to call their forces the "revolutionary army" instead of the "red army". In turn they would demand civil liberties, national unity and defence against Japan, and immediate readjustment of living conditions among the Chinese masses.

In 1932 already the Chinese Communists declared war on Japan and they have always advocated a "united front against Japanese imperialism". The communication made by *Asia* is confirmed by an article in the English Stalinist paper *The Daily Worker*, in which Strachey wrote that the Communists had made the proposal to change the Communist armies into national revolutionary armies cooperating with, and obeying the orders of the Central Chinese Army Staff. The Chinese Soviet Republic should become a separate administrative district, under the same laws which are in

force in the remainder of China, provided the country as a whole got a really democratic constitution.

Meanwhile the reports, to the effect that an agreement has already been concluded between the Nanking Government and the Communist leaders, seem to be premature. The Chinese Communist Party, which considered the abolition of the Soviet districts and its own dissolution as unacceptable if Nanking did not promise to oppose Japan, seems consequently not to have been able to obtain this assurance.

Japanese reports speak of an agreement between China and Russia, in which Russia is said to have promised not to support the Chinese Communists, to have recognized Chinese sovereignty over Sinkiang (now under Russian influence), and both countries to cooperate in maintaining safety in the Pacific.

Although no confirmation has been obtained of these reports, they are quite compatible with the policy carried on by Russia to unite with all countries whose political situation brings them into opposition with the two states which she regards as her direct enemies, namely Germany and Japan.

The People's Front policy — a much better

name is truce policy — which the foreign agencies of the Comintern, incorrectly called Communist Parties, everywhere advocate, has no other object than that of preparing the war front against Germany and Japan. Likewise the intervention in Spain does not take place on the strength of sympathy with the revolutionary struggle of the Spanish masses but has as its object the prevention of the strengthening of the fascist bloc in Europe. Russia does not want a socialist, but a bourgeois-democratic Spain, and is exerting pressure in a counter-revolutionary sense.

The united front with the bourgeoisie, which the Stalinists are at the moment in favor of in all democratic countries — and in the propaganda of which they are everywhere more nationalist than the nationalists — will in the future cost the proletariat dearly, just as the whole foreign policy of the Soviet Union has already cost the proletariat dearly, in China too. What the Chinese workers and peasants think about the new united front which the communists want to effect with their tyrants is difficult to say. Clever propaganda seems to be able to attain the almost impossible in certain situations. One can otherwise hardly imagine that the Chinese revolutionaries have forgotten what the Stalinist policy brought them in 1927.

In 1926 Stalin declared in the Executive Committee of the Third International that the weakness of the Chinese bourgeoisie justified the formation of the bloc of the "four revolutionary classes": for this reason the Chinese Communist Party had to form the left wing of the Kuomintang and renounce its own organs and independent organization. The violent suppression of the strikes in the South was not paid attention to, the arming of the workers prohibited, the formation of soviets opposed, the risings of peasants checked — all in order not to break the united front. Souvarine tells in his book "*Staline, Aperçu historique du Bolchévisme*", that when Chiang Kai-Shek carried out a military coup d'état in March 1926 to kill the Communists, the Soviet papers received order to maintain silence about the matter and Bubnov gave instructions to his Chinese subordinates to submit. According to Borodine, another Russian adviser of the Chinese Communists, the latter had to play the part of the political coolies of the Kuomintang, which was admitted to the Third International as a "sympathizing party". On March 21, 1927 the workers of Shanghai drove out the garrison — five days later Chiang Kai-Shek made his glorious entry. Stalin who, on April 5, 1927, had told the Russian party leaders that Chiang commanded the army and could not do otherwise than lead it against the imperialists, saw himself belied a week later when the same Chiang destroyed in Shanghai the mass movement which had placed the power in his hands. On April 21, 1927 Stalin maintained in the "*Pravda*" that the revolutionary Kuomintang was waging a decisive battle in Wuhan against militarism and imperialism. A month later, according to Harold R. Isaacs in an article in "*The New Leader*" (Britain) of May 22nd, 1926, workers and peasants were massacred in this province. On July 15 of the same year

Communism and the trade union movement were forbidden, and a few weeks later the Wuhan government joined up with the government of Chiang Kai-Shek in Nanking. Radek, who had warned Stalin of the danger threatening the workers from the side of Chiang's machine guns, saw his views justified; later Stalin's confidence in Wang Ching-wei, head of the Huhan Government, was again put to shame. Nevertheless Stalin had not yet learned his lesson: now he backed up the Christian general Feng Yu-shang, who soon followed the footsteps of Chiang. Tens of thousands of workers and peasants killed, thousands in the prisons, the mass movement of the workers and peasants suppressed, the country completely in the power of the generals and the Kuomintang — these were the results of the Stalinist policy in China, a result which was foreseen by the opposition, among others by Trotzky.

"The power of the Kuomintang" — wrote Isaacs — "which was the result of the united front... has now lasted nine years. Nine years of a merciless reign of terror against workers and peasants... of uninterrupted capitulation to imperialism. Nevertheless at present the Comintern has hastily and without looking back again returned to the same course which led in 1927 to this most monstrous catastrophe of our times: the destruction of a powerful revolutionary mass movement, not by a stronger enemy, recognized as such, but by forces which this movement had learned to regard as its leaders.

"The 'anti-imperialist united front' is being infused with new life. All the old opportunistic phrases and slogans, hastily buried on the day after the catastrophe, are being unearthed from the past and polished up for renewed use. The lessons of the events... are allowed to remain carefully buried with the victims".

The present rulers of Russia have no longer the task of learning revolutionary lessons: for them peoples and movements are pawns on the chess-board of international politics, and they are staked and sacrificed according as the interests of the Russian state, that is to say the interests of the clique ruling there, demand it. Regarded from a revolutionary socialist viewpoint, the Soviet Union turns out to be a more dangerous enemy of the laboring class and of all fighters against political, economic and intellectual oppression, than the national-socialist and fascist states, because the latter are at least clearly recognized as such, and Russia, on the other hand, is still glorified by many as a guiding-star. A guiding-star she is indeed — a guiding-star to the mass grave.

I. A. C.

JOIN THE VANGUARD GROUP

While the libertarian movement has many sympathizers whose cooperation is a valuable asset to the cause, we are sorely in need of active workers who are willing to share the responsibility of our tasks. Any comrade who would like to cooperate in the work of the **Vanguard Group** should write to us at 45 West 17th St., N. Y. or visit us at our hall any evening 22 West 17th St., N. Y. Comrades outside of New York can write us for information about groups in their locality.

Regarding Trotsky - A Rebuttal

The open letter to Leon Trotsky which appeared in our last issue provoked quite a flurry of comment. People actually troubled to write to us or get in touch with us at the office. It appeared that everybody (everybody, that is, with the exception of Leon Trotsky and his ordained ministers in America) had a word or two, or a volume or two, to say about our "Open Letter".

All the comments had one thing in common. . . . their pungency. Apparently you feel STRONGLY about Leon Trotsky (pro or con) or you don't feel at all.

The comments can be divided roughly into three classes: Class I: (who have our undying gratitude) thought that it was a perfect gem of an open letter and the best writing since Dante and if only they lived closer than 'Frisco or Denver they would blow the Editorial Board to a whopping big dinner and wouldn't we please write more of the same. Class II: - chose the middle of the road and although they liked the piece, this was hardly the time or the place to write it and wasn't Stalin the greater danger and shouldn't we concentrate all our energy on attacking the self professed leader of the world proletariat.

Class III: minced no words. Not only was the article historically incorrect in every detail but it was written in a tone that reeked with malice and was I not a stooge of the Third International attacking Trotsky via the circuitous route of the First International and would we please go to Hell but first cancel their subscriptions.

Class I is easily answered: Thanks, Comrades and if you ever come to New York drop in and tell us what excellent fellows we are because by that time our present popularity (sic) will have worn off and having had a taste of fame we shall be doubly lonely in our accustomed neglected state.

Class II, the middle-of-the-roaders, have a very weak position indeed, for if you once grant the correctness of our accusations against Trotsky it should be a comparatively easy matter to convince you that this is the best of all possible times to remind Trotsky that the gangster-Socialism that controls one sixth of the world's surface is not the product of an immaculate conception. Its role was mapped out for it in 1917 and Trotsky was godfather at the christening. Now, should such an article appear in the Vanguard? Where else. . . if you please. We believe in a number of ridiculous abstract principles like freedom, equality, revolutionary morality, justice, etc. The Marxists assure us that this is due to the petty-bourgeois origins of Anarchism. Regardless of the cause, the disease is there, and only *we* have the right to attack a man who builds his life and political doctrines on amorality and expediency. Comrades of Class II, negate yourselves, and either jump back one class or forward into the ranks of the forthright antagonists of our open letter. Your present position lacks logic.

The weightiest and most outspoken communications came from our Class III. They were almost unanimous in assuring me that what I knew about history could be conveniently placed in the corner of one eye. But when it came to *pointing out* exact mistakes not one could take issue with any of my statements except that section which treated of Trotsky and his role at Brest-Litovsk. The way I fashioned my remarks about Trotsky at Brest-Litovsk was unfortunate. I neglected to mention that Trotsky, on principle, had fought bitterly against signing the Treaty and for this omission I owe him an apology. His eventual disregard of his principles and his capitulation to the wishes of his political boss, Lenin, is to my mind almost as base a deed. However, for the sake of accuracy and fairness be informed that Trotsky abstained from voting against the Treaty although his better judgement told him it was a betrayal.

Then there was much ado about the *tone* of the article. Many of my own comrades felt that it was a bit too strong. Apparently I am at odds with the majority of Anarchist opinion in America in my attitude toward Trotsky. Anarchists have always been in the forefront in the fight for the rights of political asylum and fair trial and several Anarchists may be found in the American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky. I wonder what their attitude would be if Stalin, Hitler or Mussolini were to be deposed and as political refugees come seeking asylum? Apparently the line must be drawn somewhere. . . and I draw it at Leon Trotsky! For the part he played in detouring the Russian revolution; for my comrades who died in Kronstadt; for the thousands of beautiful men and women he condemned to a living death in Russian prisons. . . . I reserve the right to *detest* Leon Trotsky. It would be laughable for me to demand that he be given shelter or a trial.† If some of this bitterness crept into my open letter, although I strove for a maximum of objectivity, I would not be greatly surprised; nor will I make excuses for it!

Am I a stooge of the Third International? In regard to this matter a gentlemen whose brilliance I admire and whose ethics I distrust called me in to see him to tell me how rotten he thought the article was. I listened, faintly amused, to his criticism until he assured me that the Stalinists were buying up copies of the *Vanguard* and sending them to people whose faith in Trotsky they wanted to shatter. The thought of this horrible possibility brought me up short and had me in a state of jitters for days. That my article should be used as ammunition for Stalinist activities caused me more real distress than I have felt in years. After checking up I found that my informant was quite correct. A small number of copies had been purchased by Stalinite zealots and mailed out to people whom they suspected were in danger of being bitten by the Trotsky bug. Such an act is so typical of the great

Communist rank and file, the imbeciles for whom Stalin is the Lord and Trotsky the current Anti-christ, that it should occasion little surprise. The world is a very simple place to live in for these nitwits. . . . it is divided into two hemispheres, one half occupied by those who defend bourgeois democracy and the Soviet Union and the other half composed of Trotskyites who spend their lives in plotting how to dispose of Comrade Stalin, Earl Browder, Israel Amter and proceed to the nationalization of Gurley Flynn. Starting with this simple premise it follows that anyone who takes issue with Leon Trotsky must in one way or another be in the employ of Joe Stalin. Hence their glee about the open letter. One could hardly expect them to read the letter (illiteracy among the C. P. adherents must be at about the same level as among Kentucky hillbillies). Stalinites read only what is prescribed by their beloved leaders. Let us only hope that those to whom they sent copies of the *Vanguard* will really read the letter, for if they possess the intelligence of the average grammar school tot they must realize that the letter is not only a condemnation of Trotsky and his principles but is also a damning document against Stalin who is a caricature made up of all Trotsky's worst faults, with a number of gruesome additions of his own invention (such as shooting all one's lifetime comrades in respect for the ancient dictum "there is only one crown but it would fit many heads") at the same time lacking the saving grace of Trotsky's amazing intellect.

To those who complained that my criticism applied only to the Trotsky of two decades ago and that the present-day Trotsky had lived and learned by his experience I recommend a perusal of the testimony of the recent commission of inquiry in Mexico. The sections that interest us are not those

that deal with his refutation of Stalin's puerile accusations; no reasoning human being who knows what Trotsky stands for believes him to be in league with Japanese and German Fascism to return the old, less subtle form of exploitation to the Soviet Union.† To believe that sort of thing one has to be the type of person who would send out copies of the *Vanguard* hoping to convert the consignees to Stalinism. But his statements still reveal the old opportunist Bolshevik: it appears that for Trotsky the Soviet Union is still a "Worker's Republic", he advises in case of war that the workers of the world take up arms in its defense; if given the opportunity he would collaborate with Joseph the First in governing the Russian workers (he has no quarrel with personalities, you see), the good old dictatorship of the proletariat is still dear to his heart, etc.

Sorry we had to be so rude to Trotsky, and sorry indeed are we that so many took offense. It has never been our policy to compromise with truth to win a friend or to lose an enemy.

Trotsky would be amused to know that Anarchists in droves rose to his defense, and not one of his followers had the guts to attempt to answer our accusation although they were invited to do so as individuals and as a group.

DAVID LAWRENCE

† It is not to defend Trotsky's opportunist Bolshevism that most Anarchists favor asylum for him and an impartial inquiry into the Moscow trials. Precisely because Stalin's charges are not true and do not reveal the real nature of Bolshevism, because we want to shed as much light as possible on the truth regarding the Russian revolution, we desire to bring all available facts into the open. On the question of asylum to political refugees the editorial board of *Vanguard* is in agreement with "the majority of Anarchist opinion" in differing with comrade Lawrence. Ed. note.

Rise of the C.I.O.

On the heels of an almost devastating economic crisis that shook American capitalism came a series of popular political movements — the symptoms of disintegrating forces in capitalism. These new movements, some of them foreshadowing possible future developments, have by now either found refuge in the New Deal of Roosevelt or have been disintegrated by his "new capitalism". Though the President's policies have brought a sort of temporary stability, a sharp cleavage has come about between the proponents of the old rugged individualism and the muddled New Dealers of State Capitalism.

Our trade union movement has naturally divided along the same lines. The leaders have become partisans of the old against the new, the new against the old. The A. F. of L. represents the old deal in capitalism; the Committee for Industrial Organization personifies the New Deal.

The breaking up of the old capitalist economy has served to ruin the farmers, small capitalists and skilled workers. These groups were formerly its

main base of social stability. A decaying capitalism must face the problems germane to decay — economic and political problems of widespread unemployment, of floods and dust-bowls in regions where great natural resources once existed and the constant shifting of masses and institutions in pursuit of some adjustment. And these problems can be handled neither by individuals nor by individual corporations. The state alone can hope to cope with them and only at the cost of throwing the entire nation behind prearranged plans and dictatorial authority. The problems which in the upward climb of capitalism were solved "automatically", in spite of individual buccaneering capitalists, can now only be made more difficult by these people.

The C.I.O. has its reason for existence in the fact that a labor organization is needed which may be used for these new purposes, that is, for the purposes of the "new" capitalism. Accordingly, to understand the C.I.O., one must understand the "New Deal" and conversely, the "New Deal" cannot be grasped without perceiving the all-important role of the C.I.O.

And when the "New" capitalism is spoken of, it is not meant that it has fundamentally changed its characteristics as a system. The old landmarks of the capitalist mode of production continue to exist on the basis of wage-labor, the essential economic characteristic of capitalism. The market and money exist for purposes of realization of profit and distribution. By the "New" capitalism can be meant nothing but the superstructural manipulations of capitalism for the purpose of defending its base from which profits and private property arise. Because they are indispensable for the purposes of priming the road to State Capitalism, the New Deal has sponsored, besides the C.I.O., mass organizations among the farmers and middle classes.

The economics of State Capitalism is pretty generally known. It consists in government regulation of wages, prices, working hours, of "social security" legislation and monetary manipulation. These features of state control are present, in more or less pronounced form, in all countries affected by the crisis. They were and are at the root of all New Deal measures, past and present.

The New Deal introduced its program in the best possible light, soon winning over labor, the farmers and large sections of the professionals. Concessions were given to the masses, prices pegged for the farmers and middle class; cash and work relief extended to the unemployed — even wage increases to the workers came with paternal good wishes to organize to their hearts' content. Then came the deflation of the dollar, the masses taking the brunt of taxation via the continual rise in the cost of living. A Supreme Court decision wiped out the regulatory clauses of the N.R.A., etc., all of which factors were in no small measure responsible for the present strike wave. This social discontent is utilized by Roosevelt to push the New Deal anew. The stage is rapidly approaching when the government will be supreme and absolute arbiter in matters of wage settlements, hours, and working conditions. In short, all those economic matters that essentially concern the workers, and which capitalism had permitted the old unions to regulate more or less, are now to be directed by the government. The specific role of the C.I.O. in collaborating with the government to achieve this aim, is to speed up the mobilization of the masses in basic industry for controlled mass pressure in order to effect these changes.

The aim of the C.I.O. leaders is to get an expanded, well implemented and regimenting N.R.A., in the operation of which the new union bureaucracy will be the important and well paid servants of the new capitalism. Then, the collective capitalist, the government, is pictured all hearts and flowers, while the individual capitalist is the economic royalist, the bourbon; the Jolly Rogers against whom the spirit of our revolutionary forefathers join in a new crusade.

How hot this fight between the old and the "New" has become may be glimpsed in the utilization of the sit-down by the labor "New Dealers", and Roosevelt's benevolent impartiality toward them.

Actually it would not make much difference if they did not sanction the sit-down strike. The workers will not let go. They cannot revoke this method of striking. This strategy, it is noteworthy, of all new developments in recent years, promises to be as much of a fighting instrument on the part of labor as the system of state capitalism is for the capitalist.

To be sure both the New Deal and the sit-down technique are still embryonic. Unless war precipitates the rapid development of each, they may take some time before reaching maturity. But already perceptible forces reach out of the class struggle and tell history to move on.

The sit-down is a product of desperate resistance against excruciating economic pressure. How well it fits into the armory of proletarian class instruments is seen by the its rapid spread from one country to another. The sit-down is bound to take much of the power that was presumed to reside with the union bureaucracy and place it with the mass of workers. It may be said also that before long the workers will recognize that what appeared as the economic fortress of the capitalists is in fact vulnerable. The workers will contemplate their temporary possession of the means of production and hunger, literal and figurative, will whet their appetite for these means. Nor can the realization of their economic strength fail to add to their political weight and consciousness. This method of easy self-mobilization will bring the workers in regimented capitalist countries likewise into motion. And logic cannot work against this proposition that if the workers are attacked they will use whatever arms are obtainable for self-defense. Efforts to coordinate such a defense must necessarily follow.

Even if the first cannonade of the automobile sit-down was not fully successful the indices, nevertheless, are that the "Old Dealers" will be driven under the "New Dealers'" roof for protection. This must be especially so in the camp of labor. The C. I.O. will swallow the A. F. of L. in one form or another.

The approval of the Wagner Act by the hard-boiled reactionaries of the U.S. Supreme Court, formally registers Old Deal capitalism as capitulating to the New Deal. This surrender was already foreshadowed by the settlements made between the C.I.O. and the steel and automobile trusts. It took an unprecedented crisis and two strike waves for the economic royalists to see the wisdom of Roosevelt's New Deal. From now on the old dealers may be expected to fight only rear guard engagements until such time as they find their bearings in the new set-up.

Roosevelt will get his Court plan in substance if not in detail and regimentation via "democratic" methods. The social landscape of capitalism is scheduled for far-reaching changes. The establishment of the new set-up delayed for the past three years, can now look forward to an ephemeral permanency. The trade and industrial unions, the farm organizations, etc., can be expected to grow and so will the organizations of the middle classes, new and old, with big capital presiding. The new balance

of class forces is already fairly discernible but it is to be fully revealed by the new amalgams. Right now, even when the liberal phase of the New Deal still rolls on, the reaction in the offing makes itself felt. John L. Lewis speaks of "cooling off" or taming the malcontents and of putting them out of his C.I.O. unions.

As reaction consolidates on the New Deal basis its first drive will be the attainment of social peace. Acceptance of the New Deal by the dissenting capitalists is a prerequisite for the imposition of such a "peace" upon the masses. The mounting budgetary deficit of federal, state and municipal governments, the nearness of the next crisis either in the form of war or another economic crash, requires a solid united front against the masses. It is such unity that the N.D. and its C.I.O. are heading for in this early day of their history.

The heat that was generated by the fight between the capitalists around the sit-down strike showed the persistence of the trends towards state capitalism. The New Dealers condoned and even encouraged the workers to fight. The Old Dealers had eventually to give in.

The fight between the capitalists is not yet completely over. There are too many conflicting sectional interests for that. The question as to whether the N.D. should be applied to the right or to the left will keep the fires burning. Various factions will fight for the control of the N.D. and its enormous powers. The stray uncontrolled votes in the unions are likely to be reduced as a result of the very power of the organization and the power-psychology it will create. The United Mine Workers and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers have been precursors of such power. Naturally such robot type of unions are best established without a fight and by agreement between the corporation and the union bureaucracy. This keeps the unions mushy and dependent on the two tops, the union leaders and the corporation leaders.

Such a combination can keep the masses down for some time even with heavy economic pressure against them. This might well be done under "democratic" conditions. But democracy cannot survive for very long. The conflict which accumulates under the lid must break forth.

Capitalism may repeat its past actions by further mortgaging its future and by squeezing this or that class through taxation but the final accounting between the two major classes in society cannot be postponed indefinitely.

The approval of the Wagner Act by the U.S. Supreme Court and the further approval of similar measures to come, introduces the union card as a component part of the open shop; gives collective bargaining, etc., etc. But such measures will not give the masses the one thing they need; economic well-being and security. That cannot be arranged from the top; it must come by class conflict from the bottom, for the masses are the fountain from which all progress flows.

JOSEPH ZACK

Communists and the Marine Unions

(Ed. note: The failure of the U.S. government to regiment marine labor through the Continuous Discharge Book system is to be credited to militant spirit of the class-conscious elements among our seamen, especially the Sailors Union of the Pacific (S.U.P.) Independent union expelled several years ago from the A. F. of L. for strike actions not approved by the bureaucracy. The following is part of a letter sent us by a seaman who is in the thick of it. The Vanguard invites correspondence from workers on trade-union problems and developments.)

Mr. Weaver, Director of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, commenting upon the Copeland Continuous Discharge Book, known as the Fink Book among the seamen, said: "To meet the situation which has recently become alarming" — referring to "radicalism" in the industry — "the Continuous Discharge Book was designed".

Right off the reel, the Communist Party fell for that measure. It was so much like the Communist Party to fall for a thing like that. Through their fractions and openly, they were telling the seamen to accept it and everything was running smoothly. Many seamen were accepting it and were not any the wiser. And then unexpectedly the IWW and the SUP had to come out, denounce the Fink Book and expose it as a blacklist system. It was easy work. The seamen took to the SUP and IWW argument with facility and now, anybody with a Book is a Fink and the Communist Party, because it advocated it, is a party of Finks — and the waterfront red circles have developed a theory that the American Bolsheviks are the stooges of Roosevelt. On the waterfront the Communist Party is on the spot. So what can they do? How can they right themselves with the marine workers? Bridges is comparatively discredited; at least he doesn't draw much water on the West Coast any longer, and he can't do anything. And so long as the Sailor's Union of the Pacific stands as it is, apart from the rest of the A. F. of L. marine unions, the Communists cannot go ahead with their measures, which have even roused the derision of the old line ISU and ILA bureaucrats.

"The SUP militancy and the syndicalist ideas must be snuffed out, comrades, Lundberg, Mayes, and the rest must be discredited, and we can do that only with the slogan of 'UNITY'; — Bring the SUP back into the ISU by branding them as 'union splitters', 'enemies of the working class', 'the allies of the shipowners'. And that's exactly what Curran and Simpson are palming off. The slimy line shown by the following couple of lines from a letter censuring Lundberg, by a Philadelphia rat, a radio operator and chairman of the District Council, Mr. Mort Barrow: "Onward, onward, onward to a National Maritime Federation... but please Brother Lundberg don't obstruct".

But this war isn't confined to slander. That's only the surface of it. Communists are, under cover, everyday being shipped to the West Coast. The West Coast is notified beforehand who they are, and some of them as soon as they get off the gangway are being dumped and deprived of their rights as union men; with such measures as fining them a thousand dollars or suspensions of 99 years. And to counter the communist influx, East Coast IWW are being shipped also. So there is a war on the waterfronts now, far more important than the latest IMM strike or the inter-union pre-emption squabbles. It's fostered by a gang of aspiring Communist-led upstart trade union bureaucrats, who don't seem to have any regard at all for labor principles, against a sort of syndicalism, the result of years of the IWW agitation, and the militants that represent it. And, fortunately, it is that very thing which exposes the inefficiency of American syndicalism.

(Continued on back cover)

The State and Classes in the U.S.S.R.

Ed. Note: The following is a condensation of sections from M. Yvon's book, "What Has Become of the Russian Revolution". The author is a French worker who spent eleven years in Soviet Russia, not as a agent of the Comintern or the Profintern, but as an ordinary worker in all parts of Russia. His book contains a wealth of factual material on the life of Soviet workers as well as on the workings of the government. Yvon returned to France in 1934, so that some of the following paragraphs refer to conditions that existed prior to the adoption of the new constitution. But one may be quite sure, judging by the way the new "democratic" constitution was so undemocratically thrust upon the people, that the manner of elections, bureaucracy, party organization, etc., remains, in effect, exactly as before.

Just as in capitalist society there is an unseen real power, that of the financiers and industrialists, so in the U.S.S.R. there is the real as well as the official power. But when one says power, one must also speak of classes. And there are classes in Russia. But first let us examine the official, the fictitious power, then the real, and finally the classes.

A tentative social organization by the workers themselves existed for the first time in the Paris Commune of 1871, District Organizations, committees composed of workers in arms, elected their officers and undertook to create a workers militia. They were the first soviets. These spontaneous popular organizations came to life again in Russia in 1905 and then again in 1917 when they seized all power. In 1917 the Russian soviets included all tendencies in the workers movement, from Social-Democratic to Anarchist. But the soviets of this revolutionary period disappeared quickly. The soviets which the French workers demonstrations urge "everywhere" (Soviets Partout!) do not actually exist. What carries that name in Russia are organisms which officially are the source of all power, but which really wield less than do the Municipal Councils in France.

The power of the soviets is a comedy, as are the Soviet elections. The same speeches are retailed all over during the campaign by the government. Elections are held in the factory auditoriums where "those who are opposed" to the party candidates are asked to raise their hands. Thus unanimous elections are everywhere recorded. In the same manner the Soviet Congress "elects" to the Central Executive Committee about 600 people from whom a presidium of 30 is named. These 30 and the various peoples commissars are charged with the legislative as well as executive power.

● THE BUREAUCRACY

The superior authority in Russia exercises its power by means of a bureaucracy, not elected, but administratively selected. This bureaucracy is therefore responsible to the electors in no degree whatsoever. The display of soviet delegates is solely to provide the democratic illusion, for the true soviet principle calls for power from below. But in the present Russian system the power of these superior organs is absolute. Each law, each decree, every decision of the bureaucracy does not come from the masses, does not need the approval of the Central Executive Committee or of the Soviet Congress. They come into effect immediately and will be, perhaps two or three years afterwards, approved automatically, en bloc, by the proper official authority when it happens to meet.

● THE REAL POWER

The most important organization in Russia is the Communist Party — called the "Party" for short. It consists of 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 active members out of a total population of 178 millions. The old bolsheviks of revolutionary days are few in number and they play a simple role as honorary members provided with sinecures. The youth compose, since 1924, the majority of the party — soldiers who obey without a murmur. The great majority is composed of workers, or former workers, but the chiefs, today as heretofore, are intellectuals. Whether by accident or not, the party is the image, greatly reduced, of soviet society as a whole. One part — the initiated, the chiefs, the possessors of Reason, Science and Power; the other part — regular troops, submissive to a strict discipline.

Just as the soviet power is pyramided, so likewise is the party. At the workshop there is the communist cell with its secretary. One step ahead is the village committee which directs the work of the cells in its locality; then the regional committee of the Republic; above that yet is the Central Committee and finally the Political Bureau. These are the various organisms which wield the effective power, the real power, in the various localities and under cover of a corresponding official soviet organization. All this is based on an hierarchical system. One may be named only by a superior body and not elected by a lower body to a higher. In all cases, secretaries, who are the important elements in each of these committees are "proposed" by a higher body.

● THE NEW CLASSES

The following classes can be distinguished in Russia:

- 1) The manual worker, industrial or agricultural.
- 2) The white collar employee.
- 3) The specialist, the responsible and high functionary.

1) The field worker is also a salaried employee or is rapidly becoming one. The land does not belong to him. The slogan of "Land to the Peasants" has changed to **land, as well as the factories, to the state**. He works on a piece work basis like the industrial worker. What formerly was most detestable in the factory, now exists in the field. There are the "norms" to be achieved at any cost, the penalties for bad work, the losses, the lack of respect for the chiefs.

The laborers of the field and the village are the real serfs. Their lives are miserable, food closely measured, they have no freedom of action, of speech, nor can they go where they please.

2) As a whole, the white collar clerks constitute an intermediary class of people who are part of the regime, privileged as compared to other workers. They act as buffers between the state, for which they do the basest work of the bureaucracy, and the workers whom they direct. They are the bureaucrats who transmit the orders from above. Through their wickets they distribute the cards for food which give a worker his rights to the slender rations permitted. They hand down the norms, set them, and keep a lookout for workers who do not show proper respect for the state. These clerks are detested by the workers who see them as non-producers, innumerable and as a constant personification of parasitism in the regime. It is against them that the workers hold grievances, for they are seen daily while the real masters are as invisible as they are in capitalist countries. The chiefs cleverly escape the hate of the masses, for when one hears of the faults of the bureaucracy, its errors, its nonchalance, it is the clerks who are blamed. And in such a planned soviet society the extent of this

class is unimaginable. Out of 21,000,000 workers (not counting peasants) there are 8,000,000 of these clerks!

3) There are in Russia a great variety of specialists. Besides engineers, architects, doctors, officers, etc., a new type of specialist has been created by the new regime. These are the agitators, the organizers of the masses, the state writers, the propagandizers of the latest line, in a word, the "engineers of the soul." The planning economists are also a new type of specialists.

The responsible specialists have charge of important works: as directors of factories, managers of large establishments, magistrates, high officers, editors of newspapers, heads of syndicates, of soviets, etc. They are recruited from among the younger elements, those who are the products of the Stalinist regime. They are full of energy and develop a spirit of decision that would make them the envy of American business men.

The class struggle goes on!

M. YVON

From I.W.W. to G.P.U

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER. - From Bryan to Stalin. International Publishers, New York, 1937.

When a man after a number of years in the radical movement loses his enthusiasm he has several roads open to him. He may withdraw into the limited circle of his family life. He may use what energy he has still left for making money and achieving his "individual emancipation". He may drown his disappointments in liquor. Or he may sell his accumulated experience to the enemy by becoming a stool pigeon. The Russian Revolution has opened still another avenue of escape which, at bottom, is a combination of all the aforementioned patterns of life of a tired and retired revolutionist: Entering the services of the Communist Party and thus becoming a pensioner of one of the richest and most powerful governments of the world.

In his sketch of William Foster's career, published several years ago, the present writer tried to spread the cloak of Christian forgiveness upon this ex-rebel's evolution. He even reserved him a place in the future Pantheon of American working class heroes "in spite of his failings, weaknesses and inconsistencies". Foster's early eclipse as the leader of the American Communist Party and the many humiliations he had to undergo at that time had inspired that charitable attitude on my part. His "autobiography" has convinced me, however, that I was wasting my efforts. For the book shows that Foster has always been worthy of his present association.

There is no denying that Foster's criticism of I. W. W. dual unionism is largely correct. The "boring from within tactics" was more appropriate in every respect. However, there was also much truth in the objection of the "wobblies" that once you start "boring" within the A. F. L. there are more chances of yourself becoming contaminated with the spirit of the organization you have gone out to conquer. To which, in turn, one could reply that had the I. W. W. attained its aim of organizing the millions of unskilled workers, it would have eventually become a sort of C.I.O. — with the same reformist potentialities. There seems to be no way out from this dilemma...

Foster is now a member of the Communist bureaucracy, and so he has to write his biography strictly in accordance with the rules established by his superiors in the present Russian State Church. One of these rules demands that one's non-conformist past should be declared reformist, utopian, counter-revolutionary. And so Foster repeats the old story of the "folded-arms-general-strike" conception held by the syndicalists. Even though he knows better than anybody else

that this childish "theory" was only a passing phase of the infantile period of syndicalism.

He is somewhat uncomfortable in dealing with his attitude during the War. He denies he was selling Liberty bonds, though it is a matter of common knowledge to all contemporaries. Now, having been pro-Ally or pro-German during the War does not exactly disgrace a man forever. Peter Kropotkin has remained the foremost revolutionary gentleman of all times in spite of his war time enthusiasm; and the fact that Max Nettlau, the famous anarchist historian, sided with the Central Powers, has not made him a political leper avoided by all true revolutionists. But Foster, twenty years after all this sadness, not only admits the incorrectness of his attitude then, but tries, in true Stalinist fashion, to find a scapegoat for his sins — by placing all the blame upon his "false syndicalist conceptions", even though at that time he had been as much remote from "syndicalism", as an A. F. L. or G. P. U. bureaucrat is from the working class at large.

The book contains nothing about the factional struggles within the American Communist Party, which played such an important part in the last fifteen years of his life. At present all of this dirt would not have been good propaganda — and the 350 pages of the book are nothing but orthodox communist preaching. The Moscow party line — ever since Russia's conquest by Stalin — having always been right, Foster endorses without a word of criticism all the abrupt changes of policy — even the instructions demanding the foundation of dual unions in the United States — an idea which had always been abhorrent to him.

The reader who has the tenacity to stick it out to the end will be rewarded by occasional flashes of involuntary humor. Nestor Mahno, one of the greatest heroes of the Russian Revolution, is called a "bandit". Leon Trotsky is an "assassin" and "renegade" — in a book that purports to be "history" and not mere Billingsgate of the Daily Worker and New Masses type. Norman Thomas' intellect is depreciated because he has remained "almost untouched" by the "basic theoretical work of Lenin and Stalin!" In his desire to show off his erudition Foster tells us (on p. 48) that he "read widely in Pelloutier, Griffuelhes, Pouget, Herve, Sorel, Bergson and many other syndicalist writers". Herve, now a Pasdist, and then a sort of Blanquist near-Bolshevik, was of course never a Syndicalist; and as Bergson's name was often mentioned in some of Sorel's writings, so Foster — who apparently spent ten minutes on the author of the *Reflections on Violence* — drew his extremely amusing and revealing conclusion about the famous philosopher's syndicalism...

Yet, after all Foster is neither an ordinary charlatan nor a common lickspittle of the G. P. U. He is the official chairman and venerable grand old man of a party which is going to emancipate the American working class and whose powerful ramifications spread both to such sterling "religious leaders" (an expression of the Daily Worker) as Father Divine, and to the Park Avenue and Greenwich Village crowd that is anxious to do ordinary and literary business with the greatest market of the world.

MAX NOMAD

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW

In the June number:

- Roberto - Recent Developments in Spain
- Yvon - What has become of the Russian Revolution
- Martov - Materialism and Metaphysics
- Other timely articles

Price 15 cents

Box 44 Sts. O, N. Y.

A STARTLING OFFER YOU CAN'T AFFORD TO MISS!

Your choice of either of these outstanding novels with one year's subscription for the *Vanguard* at the combined price of \$2.50, plus 25 cents postage.

These newly-published books, recognized as two of the best novels of the year, sell for \$2.50 alone!

Your choice -

- **SEVEN RED SUNDAYS** by Ramón Sender — a story of the 1934 General Strike in Madrid by one of Spain's greatest anti-Fascist novelists.
- **BREAD AND WINE** by Ignazio Silone — a vital novel of Fascist Italy today by the greatest Italian novelist of this generation.

Fill in the coupon below today and mail to:

The Vanguard
45 West 17th Street
New York, N. Y.

I enclose \$2.75 for which please send one year's subscription for the *Vanguard* and a copy of
() Seven Red Sundays - () Bread and Wine.
(Please indicate preference.)

Name

Address

.....

FROM OTHER CITIES

The ranks of the libertarian movement are steadily growing throughout the country. Below are listed activities of a few libertarian groups:

■ Chicago - Free Society Group

Activities are under way to make November 11, the 50th Anniversary of the Haymarket Tragedy, a nationwide affair. Present plans include a mass meeting in Chicago and the printing of literature. The Chicago Federation of Labor is lending its cooperation.

\$1400 has been raised for comrades in Spain through bazaars and theatre benefits.

■ Philadelphia - Radical Library Branch 273

A series of English lectures is being conducted by Dr. Barkas on social, political and economic problems. The group is continuing its assistance of comrades in Spain and its support of Anarchist publications and a new English-speaking group is now being formed.

■ Toronto - Libertarian Group

In conjunction with the I. W. W., a new youth group has been formed.

A debate was recently held and won against the Revolutionary Workers' League. It was presented before an enthusiastic audience of 700. Many new contacts were made.

Publication of Berkman's "ABC of Anarchist-Communism" is being held up by the need for additional funds. An urgent request is made for contributions. Address: Dorothy Giesecke, Chine Drive, Scarsboro Bluffs, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

■ **Mohegan, N. Y.** - Under the auspices of the United Libertarian Organization the Mohegan comrades are running a series of lectures on "Fundamentals of Anarchism" for the youth. They are held every Friday at 8:30 P.M. in the Mohegan School.

To the Italian-speaking comrades: A monthly periodical "IL SEME" is being published by some well-known and active comrades, in the Italian language, for the purpose of reaching the workers who are unacquainted with the libertarian movement. It fills a gap long existing in the Italian public. It is to be distributed as a 4-page leaflet. It will be mailed in packages of no less than 10 copies. Write to: IL SEME, 175 Fourth Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

COMMUNISTS AND THE MARINE UNIONS

(Continued from page 13)

The marine workers know what the IWW is and want it. But the IWW does not understand the men. I mean it doesn't know how to do it. With all the recent developments and its experience, yet it keeps on the old line, pitting its small membership against large and resourceful organizations. Should the IWW have dissolved its branches, right from the start — when the ISU came back in the industry — and put the members into the ISU — by now the old line officials and Communists would have been kicked out and the IWW would have an industrial union made of an element which seems to be "born dissatisfied", the seamen; and through that it could be able to expose the CIO for what it really is. The IWW had enough and more capable men than the Communists, to do it with.

A SEAMAN

PROTEST THE ORDER OF DEPORTATION FOR FERRERO AND SALLITTO!

Vincent Ferrero and Domenick Sallitto, residents in the United States for 30 and 15 years respectively, have been ordered deported to Fascist Italy for anti-fascist activities in this country.

They are men of high moral character and clean record. They were accused of no overt act. They were given no public trial. Yet they are to be deported and their probable fate is a jail sentence or Island confinement, or secret death.

You can cancel the order of deportation against Ferrero and Sallitto. You can stop the drive of the Department of Labor against the free expression of opinion.

Flood the Secretary of Labor with letters of protest. She has the power to cancel the orders of deportation.

Join and support the Ferrero - Sallitto Defense Conference. Address correspondence and donations to P. O. Box 181, Station D, New York City, 6 6

Attend the lecture to be given by

DOMENICK SALLITTO

on "THE MENACE OF DEPORTATION"

Friday, June 4, at 8:30 P. M.

at VANGUARD HALL

22 West 17th Street

New York City