

vanguard

a libertarian communist journal

in this issue:

- DO WE NEED A FARMER-LABOR PARTY?
- MENACE OF FEUDAL SOCIALISM
- THE "BLACK BELT"
- THE A. F. of L. AND THE PROGRESSIVES
- WHAT NEXT IN SPAIN?
- CLASS WAR IN AMERICA
- TROTSKY'S HOLLOW APPEAL
- INTERNATIONAL NOTES
- BOOK REVIEW

Published by VANGUARD GROUP, 45 W. 17th St., N.Y.C.

Vol. III. No. 1.

APRIL-MAY, 1936

10 Cents

On the Eve of the Spanish October

Five years ago the political regime of Spain was swept out of existence by a tremendous wave of popular revolt. Although directed in its first phase against political institutions, this revolt had much deeper roots than mere dissatisfaction with the monarchical regime. It was caused by the decay of the entire social structure which closed all avenues for progressive improvement along the lines of peaceful development. An agrarian feudalism of the most backward type, a parasitic, semi-colonial capitalism based upon governmental grants and subsidies, an archaic system of education controlled by an obscurantist clergy and catering to the select few of the nation,—such were the salient features of a disintegrating social system, which began to totter as soon as its political pillar fell to the ground.

But as it already happened in Central Europe, in the period following the war, the social-democratic party jumped into the breach, saving the situation for the tottering social system. The influence acquired by those parties with the masses of people as a result of half a century of socialistic propaganda was used not in order to further the cause of the revolution, but to stem the forces of popular revolt, to impound them in fruitless parliamentary activity and petty reforms.

It was a fatal policy leading inevitably to the defeat of the revolution. For the only forces possessing the necessary energy to effect any political changes were the very ones which could not be set in motion unless the prospect of deep going revolutionary changes in the social structure were held out before them. To close that prospect, to thwart the drive of the revolutionary masses for an

immediate social reorganization was to deliver the revolution into the hands of its worst enemies.

That is what happened in Germany and Austria and would have happened in Spain, had the socialists found themselves in sole control of the mass movement. But fortunately for the cause of the Spanish and International revolution, there asserted itself from the very beginning of the political upheaval a factor of great, dynamic power which succeeded in keying up the forces of popular revolt to a high pitch of aggressiveness. True to its Bakuninist tradition, the anarcho-sindicalist movement of Spain took a definite course upon a Libertarian Social revolution fighting resolutely against limiting the upheaval to purely political purposes.

And it was the presence of this factor that was mainly responsible for the fact that the logic of the defeatist course pursued by the Socialist party was not worked out to its bitter end. The triumph of the reactionary forces proved to be of short duration not because of adroit parliamentary combinations, but because of the ever growing ferment of social rebellion which the successive anarchist revolts carried into every nook and corner of the country. The great masses of workers and peasants of Spain have become permeated with the faith that the real revolution is yet to come, and it is this conviction, instilled into the common man by the heroic struggle of the Spanish anarchists, that gives us the hope that this time the waves of popular revolt will sweep away the decaying social institutions, turning an even greater page of world history than the October revolution.

Do We Need a Farmer-Labor Party?

All the ballyhoo of the Communist Party and its newly acquired "progressive" friends to the contrary notwithstanding, the proposed Farmer-Labor Party is nothing essentially new in the history of the labor movement. If it materializes it will follow the same basic pattern of the Social-Democratic and Labor parties of the past which accepted the principle that socialism was a thing of the future, that workers could share the advantages of bourgeois democracy by having their own representatives in the government enact laws for the advancement of the working class and that the socialization of the means of production would eventually result after the government had assumed ownership and control of a sufficient number of the basic industries. The idea that the social economy should be taken over by the workers through their trade unions and cooperatives was gradually shoved into the background by these parties and was left solely to the anarchist and syndicalist sections of the labor movement. The tragic failures and betrayals resulting from these policies of the social-democratic movement are indeed very well known to our Socialist and Communist contemporaries. But the lessons to be drawn from these events still elude their comprehension, especially the communists. The latter, although agreeing with the Socialists that the taking over of State power should be the goal of the working class, differed with the Socialists in that they were bolder and more realistic about it, and envisioned the possibility of a coup d'etat by the Communist Party. However, their present change in line to the pro A. F. of L. and Farmer-Labor Party attitude has compelled them to lie low on the question

of the establishment of socialism and the seizure of State power. We should not be surprised to find soon very little mention of these questions in the columns of the "Daily Worker" and the "New Masses."

The present movement for a Farmer-Labor Party has two basic roots: first, the feeling of some of the more "progressive" sections of the organized working class, liberals, intellectuals and sections of the petty bourgeoisie that they must have a new political party to express their needs; second, the change of line of the Communist international.

It can be seen that the working class is stiffening itself against the effects that the decline of the capitalist system is having upon it. Conscious of the mass movement of the people, several astute "leaders" of the working class, not wishing to be left behind, being ambitious and anxious for positions and privileges, moved along with this rising tide of disaffection. Mc-Mahon and Gorman, who betrayed the great general strike of the textile workers, thereby breaking up the organization and leaving little more than the name to commemorate it, seeking for something to lead, set up a call for a *National Labor Party*—and it is important to bear in mind that their call was not just for a Labor Party but for a *National Labor Party*. A knowledge of the make-up of the present leadership of the A. F. of L. should convince anybody of the futility of expecting a Farmer-Labor Party with the A. F. of L. as its labor base to achieve any gains for the masses of workers and farmers in America. The movement for the Farmer-Labor Party, in so far as its labor leaders are concerned is only an attempt to control

and head off the steady radicalization of the masses and, in effect, the Farmer-Labor Party, no matter who its leaders may be, can only serve this end.

The cry for a Farmer-Labor Party is also a part of the world movement for a so-called popular front of the "progressive" working class and middle class elements against the forces of reaction and Fascism. Let us see how this political popular front works out elsewhere.

The French popular front has been significantly unsuccessful where it has resorted to parliamentary action instead of direct action. Has it prevented Laval's decrees from lowering the standard of living and cutting wages? The workers of Toulon striking against wage cuts as a result of these decrees were called "provocateurs" by the C. P. It was not the policy of the popular front to engage in strikes against the State. In the struggle for peace, Leon Blum, so widely hailed now, writes in "Populaire" that not only a defensive war is worthy of the workers blood but also a repressive one. The popular front in France has a parliamentary majority, but nevertheless it voted for the tremendous military budget. Nor were they able in spite of this majority to disarm the illegally armed Fascist parties. The *New Masses* (April 7, 1936) now places its hopes in Premier Sarraut who "is shortly to convene the prefects and it is understood he will order the suppression of all groups engaged in provoking violence." Such is their victory!

Until recently it was the policy of the Communist International to ask for a united front from below, to form dual "revolutionary" trade unions and to try to elect only C. P. candidates to government offices. Their right-about face in these respects is considered by many people as just another Comintern change in line. But

we must not view this change of line superficially. Although it is a change in tactics it is not, indeed, a fundamental change in principles or policy. The Communists have always adhered to the old marxian dogma that socialism will be the outgrowth of capitalism in its highest economic stage. It was only as a temporary expedient that they adopted the extreme revolutionary methods which led to the establishment of a soviet regime in Russia. And the subsequent Bolshevik policy of constructing a State-controlled, industrialized economy as the alleged transitional form of their advance to socialism is ample proof of the persistence of this dogma. The inevitable requirements of such a national economy placed the Soviet Union in the position of a national power among other national powers in the complicated international set-up. About a year and a half ago, they realized that their leftist slogans did not bring them much support from workers of other nations, that the menace of Japanese imperialism and German Fascism required the establishment of closer relationships with some of the bourgeois nations. Thence followed the last step in the Bolshevik abandonment of the international struggle for revolution. The fight against Fascism is no longer a conflict between the forces of revolution and of capitalist reaction; it becomes a struggle for the maintenance of bourgeois democracy, especially in those nations with which they had established or hoped to establish friendly relations. And so we now witness the tragic spectacle of the majority of Communists swallowing, hook, line and sinker, the same social-patriotic ideology which only yesterday they had denounced with the utmost fanatic bitterness.

The Social-Democrats in Germany, too, opposed fascism and talked of socialism in the future; they supported

the policy of the lesser evil as do the Bolsheviks today. Yet this policy, demoralizing and devitalizing the proletariat, led directly to the victory of Fascism. The words of Palme Dutt in his book "Fascism and the Social Revolution" page 299, still hold as good today as when written in Oct. 1935. "The more the workers place their trust in legalism, in constitutionalism, in bourgeois democracy, the more they make sacrifices to save the exploiting regime as the 'lesser evil' against the menace of Fascism, the heavier become the capitalist attacks and the more rapid the advance to Fascism... That is the lesson of Germany and Austria.

"The workers fight and need to fight for every democratic right of organization and of agitation within the existing regime... But they cannot afford to be blind to the fact that bourgeois democracy is only a cover for the capitalist dictatorship, and that *within its forms the advance of Fascism is steadily pushed forward.*"

And no less correct was the Third International when it said in 1920, "The capitalist state is built to serve capitalism and that is all it can do, no matter who is running it."

A Farmer-Labor Party, even if it could succeed at the polls, (and the possibility of such a success seems as remote as the millenium) would serve the workers and farmers in precisely the manner indicated by the above quotation. And the capitalist class will not yield any major concession without the pressure of a direct economic attack from the workers. Can such an attack possibly be made by a political party? Obviously not. Any attempt to achieve these concessions by Farmer-Labor party inspired laws

will be met by the well known, legal and illegal armed forces of the bosses. Where, then, does the Farmer-Labor party fit?

The Farmer-Labor Party fits in perfectly with the conception that the way to reach socialism is through the achievement of State power by the working class and middle classes. The formation of such a party would instill and intensify among the radicalized workers this illusion and render them incapable of relying upon their own strength, the trade unions and cooperatives, for the building of the transitional form of the new society which is the only alternative to the decaying social system of today. And those who think of socialism as a far-off, utopian dream and therefore want to advance their interests as much as possible under the present order should take heed of the simple but profound lessons that working-class history teaches us: During the expanding periods of capitalism it was only the comparatively small upper crust of the working class that was benefited by parliamentary reforms. Whatever economic gains the vast majority of workers made were the result of direct action fights of trade unions and other mass organizations and not of the wise statesmanship of their parliamentary representatives. In fact it was the latter who, in the present period of capitalist decline, helped pass the many laws in various nations lowering the standard of living of the working masses. If the workers want the wealth they have created, they must take it themselves and not expect to have it handed down to them by the government whose real purpose is to keep the workers separated from the products of their toil.

S. WHITE.

Feudal Socialism: Is it an historical possibility?

The current conception of national socialism is that of a contradiction in terms, an historical absurdity fashioned by a monstrous twist in the regular course of social development. It is generally held that any program of socialization of wealth carries with it progressive implications and that it is incompatible with the reactionary policies of an extreme nationalism.

Those views are based on one hand on the historical associations built around the idea of socialism and on the other upon the plausible lessons afforded by the unfoldment of the Nazi policies. The Socialist movement was associated from its inception with the most progressive aspect of our civilization. It came to look upon itself as the only heir of that glorious tradition of humanistic values and internationalist aspirations which imparted to our civilization its living power. The very existence of the Socialist movement was brought about by the discrepancy developed between those implicit end-purposes of our civilization and the capitalistic form of economy. Socialism came into being with the attempt to overcome this discrepancy by translating the values of humanism into the language of a new economic order. And throughout its long course of development the Socialist movement remained true to this initial impulse, having built around the bare idea of social ownership a complicated scaffolding of values derived from the great humanistic source upon which our civilization was fed. The democratic idea was given further development; the libertarian impulse of the older liberalism was broadened and made more relevant to social realities; internationalism became woven into the

outlook and aspirations of the common man.

So finely have those values become integrated into the texture of the socialistic ideal that many a socialist came to deny their independent existence, regarding them as mere concomitants of the process of socialization of ownership. Internationalism, democracy, liberty were bound to be put forth whenever a serious attempt was made to expand the sphere of social control in our economic life,—such was the prevailing view among socialists, which even the "Socialistic" turn of the modern reaction could not shake. This "Socialistic" turn was ascribed to mere demagoguery, lacking any historic validity.

And, indeed, the course of the Fascist policies seemingly confirmed this view: their socialistic planks were dropped immediately after the Fascist assumption of power, leaving behind the starkest realities of a most rapacious capitalism. The reactionary nature of Fascism, we are told, is a result of its insincerity in regard to its socialistic program, and were such a thing as sincerity in this field possible on the part of Fascists, it would lead to the abandonment of their reactionary policies such as an inflated nationalism, anti-humanism, obscurantism and worship of the dictatorship idea. In other words, Fascism is but a camouflaged dictatorship of an unrestrained capitalism and as such it is incompatible with a genuine social control in the economic field.

Generally speaking, this view gives a rough picture of Fascist realities as they have been unfolded until now. It does not, however, take into account the more ominous implications of the

Fascist movement, revealed by those tendencies which have not yet succeeded in gaining the upper hand, but which worked as a ferment of considerable power within the Fascist movement. Those are the tendencies to sever the idea of socialized ownership from the humanistic and internationalist context into which it was framed by the long historic associations. That a genuine drive for socialized ownership asserted itself in the Nazi and Fascist movements is an undeniable fact. It is known to everyone that, although this drive ran second to the official course of social demagoguery, it imparted a real power to the Fascist movement and that it may yet assert itself with an astounding force in the coming social struggles. But that drive was associated at the same time with as repellent and reactionary an ideology as the official Fascism. The "left wingers" among the Nazis did not give up their pathological anti-semitism, their glorification of the nailed boot and mailed fist, their barbarous attitude toward womanhood and education. And is there any doubt that a "socialism" realized by that element will be any less repulsive than the pro-capitalist dictatorship of the official wing of the Fascist movement?

But can Socialism be brought about by an element permeated with the reactionary ideology of Nazism?

The answer to this question depends upon whether we take socialism in its wider historical connotations, signifying the abolition of class rule, the expansion of the liberty of the individual, internationalism, or whether we confine it to its narrow economic meaning. Viewed in the latter aspect, that is as an economic order that is planned and regulated by the State, socialism is not only compatible with the counter-revolutionary ideology of Fascism, but was adumbrated and given theoretical development by a number of writers

who contributed a considerable share toward the working out of the economic doctrines of socialism. The monarchial socialism of Rodbertus built upon caste and Prussian regimentation anticipated much of the present day tendencies in Fascism.

But Rodbertus was mild in his reactionary prognostications as compared to the actual tendencies of today. He lived in a liberal epoch which regarded feudalistic relationship and ideologies as things of the past. We, however, are witnessing the emergence of a new type of feudal relationships growing out of the present form of economic organization. And it is the tie-up between the industrial feudalism of today and the older feudalism still surviving in Germany and Japan as a rudimentary, but by no means negligible, force that is liable to produce a new social order corresponding in its purely economic aspect to what goes by the name of socialism.

It will be an order in which the general economic activities become subject to governmental planning, production correlated with a regimented consumption, ownership divested of its supreme rights. But withal it will be as monstrous a system as can be conjured up by our imagination, the entire social structure resting upon an utter perversion of the basic principles of human solidarity. Class rule will go . . . to give place to caste based upon conquest and racial domination. Feudal status will become the dominant form of social relationships, the individual will be flattened out by the combined power of a totalitarian state, a coordinated economy, mass drilling will take the place of education, and a savage, self-devouring nationalism will become the official ideology and religion of a regimented society.

Such an economic order will be even less stable than that of competitive

capitalism. No economic order can survive if it is not based upon equality, the recognition of the rights of the individual, the expansion of international solidarity. It is the perversion of those values that creates the so-called contradictions of our present social order. By accentuating and inflating those perversions to the point of absurdity, the social-fascism of the coming day will create but a short lived monstrosity which will be blown up by its inner contradictions no sooner that it will have had time to establish itself. But with the very possibility of such a monstrosity coming to life we have to reckon in a very serious manner. The long historic associations of humanistic values with the socialist movement is liable to weaken in some spots, and it is into these crevices that the reactionary forces are liable to rush

with the mad impetus of a dislocated social mechanism.

And that is why the most effective weapon against such a danger is the strengthening of the great humanistic traditions of socialism. Bring out clearly the libertarian demands of the new progressive order in the name of which socialism speaks; base it upon the recognition of the worth and inalienable rights of the individual, and above all emphasize the international aspect of the socialist ideal without which it is bound to degenerate into some sort of Fascism,—and the haunting possibility of a feudal socialism based upon caste rule and conquest will become as much of a chimera as when it made its first appearance upon the historic stage.

SENEX.

The Role of Progressives in the A. F. of L.

For over fifty years the American Federation of Labor has more or less peacefully played its role in the American drama. The organization shared with the capitalistic world the profits of prosperity and the losses of depression. It would rarely happen during periods of dire misery among the masses that the A. F. of L. would be found organizing them, giving them leadership, and consequently increasing its own strength at such opportune moments. More likely such periods would give rise to new, more militant organizations that reflected the needs of the working class and its willingness to battle. A virtual collapse of the A. F. of L. would often seem imminent. Fierce internal struggles of jurisdictional character would shake and rend it apart. Small wonder then that whatever brilliant history the American masses could write took its shape under

the banner of independent militant organizations or outlawed A. F. of L. locals. Small wonder that at this late date the "official" labor movement of America has scarcely three million members!

It is generally believed, however, that the A. F. of L. has tremendously increased its strength in the last few years. The Communists justify the liquidation of their own trade unions by pointing to this new growth. But despite government aid the actual new membership in the A. F. of L. does not exceed 500,000. One could better comment on the fact that the organization has lost tremendous membership and, moreover, lost its most experienced and militant sections. Textile workers left in flocks after the debacle of 1934 under the "progressive" leadership of Francis Gorman. Lumber

workers, old union fighters of I. W. W. days, have also left their organization. Whatever one might think of the Progressive Mine Workers of America, here is the first instance where an independent mine union has been able to exist for five years outside of the powerful Lewis' U. M. W. A. The Pacific Seamen's Union has been just expelled. These unions constitute the honorary roster of American labor.

It is in these fields that the new independent unions are growing. It reflects a reawakening of the working class and gives evidence of the fact that the A. F. of L. does not fulfill their revolutionary demands. The Gorman, Lewis, Howard combination—gentlemen not noted for enlightened leadership in their own unions—can scarcely reform the organization, not merely from craft to industrial unionism, but from class collaborating to revolutionary unionism and to democratic unionism. The growth of independent unions reflects the lack of faith in the belief of the workers themselves that the A. F. of L. can be reformed. This feeling is so widespread that the "progressives", Gorman, Lewis, Dubinsky, etc., have repeatedly warned the Executive Committee that independent unionism constituted the greatest threat to the A. F. of L.

From a revolutionary point of view, the A. F. of L., even those sections under the personal tyranny of the new progressive heroes, is an impediment in the path of working class emancipation. Bureaucracy, racketeering and class collaboration remain the pivots upon which the organization rests. The organization cannot be reformed from within as many of our naive progressives think. The oldest lesson the A. F. of L. bureaucracy can teach has just become the newest for the expelled West coast seamen. The wave of in-

dependence has thrown reform overboard. The organized masses must be freed from the shackles of Lewis, Howard, Gorman, etc. as well as those of Green. To support such men merely for their industrial union stand is to mislead workers and increase the power of a new bureaucratic machine.

Thus, if there be any progressive movement in the A. F. of L. it must be built upon the recognition of these facts. As libertarian communists, the role of our progressives in the A. F. of L. must be to take with them to a revolutionary union the masses of the A. F. of L. Progressivism for us is not merely the holding of offices by benevolent gentlemen, but the building of a revolutionary union movement, necessarily outside of the A. F. of L. This is a task which must be begun today. The duty of our members in the A. F. of L. is to prepare the workers for the moment when the explosion within that organization arrives. Progressivism must realize that just as capitalism cannot be reformed because of vested interests, so the A. F. of L. remains as it is, until the masses rend it asunder under the banners of revolutionary unionism.

"Progressive leadership" thus far (i. e. the Communist, Lovestonite and S. P. type) has not based itself upon any recognition of these facts. Reformism has been attempted only. Its failure is noteworthy. Workers are driven up the blind alley of supporting corrupt leaders because these men pretend militancy for a while. In New York several thousand locked out building service workers put their complete faith in a man who, the progressives told them, would lead them to victory. Today, these workers have been betrayed by the idol of the progressives. The progressive leadership of the dress trades in New York has also done little to challenge the position

of the old-time leaders. Its work will continue to be sterile. A real attempt to control the union will teach them, and not the entrenched bureaucracy, a lesson.

Excellent groundwork for the formation of revolutionary unions exists today. The workers of many indus-

tries are ready to join and build outside of the A. F. of L. With coordinated progressive work in the A. F. of L. the task of building a revolutionary labor movement becomes easier. The goal of libertarian communism is hastened.

R. WINTERS.

On the Class War Front

The class struggle is assuming a deeper and more militant form than at any time since the inception of the N. R. A.

Strikes take place not only in the long established unions but in the mass production industries where unionism never gained a foothold. Millions of workers are determined to organize and are demanding better conditions. In the main this tendency toward organization is fostered by the realization on the part of the workers of the need for unionism. The established labor movement has done little to develop the solidarity of the workers, to organize the workers in the steel, rubber, auto and other industries. It is the spontaneous action of the workers themselves, more than the efforts of the labor movement which are now writing a brilliant page in history of the labor movement of the present period.

The great wave of organization applies not only to the bona fide union men but also to the company unions as well. The company unions in the steel empire have established contact with each other and are demanding industrial unions of their own. So alarming is this revolt among the slaves of the steel trust that Thomas H. Girder president of the Republic Steel Co. is urging higher wages for the company union men in order to stop them from organizing. Company

unions are turning out to be a boomerang to the employers. Undoubtedly this is a sure sign of the extent to which class consciousness is permeating even those who were considered the most backward and the hardest to organize.

The idea of the general strike is becoming more and more widespread. This indicates a growing sense of solidarity among workers. The fact that the labor movement of a city will undertake a general strike in support of a group of workers shows that the principle of solidarity often transcends the struggle for better conditions.

The general strike in Pekin was called in order to back up the strikers of the American Distilling Co. The industries of Pekin were tied up solidly; the whole country was watching this demonstration of solidarity and then the usual unfortunate ending occurred. The strike was called off. William Schonenberg, A. F. of L. representative, gave the order and the strike was killed. The workers of the distilling plant continue to fight alone.

One of the most remarkable episodes of the present wave of strikes took place in the domain of the rubber barons of Akron, Ohio. In the plants of the Firestone Rubber Co. two thousand men went on a sit-down strike. They sat at their machines and refused

to budge until their demands that a wage cut be rescinded and certain objectionable features of the speedup practices be stopped were granted. They won and the strike spread to the Goodyear Rubber Co. where another two thousand men went on a sit-down strike to support the workers in the tire curing room who refused to take a wage cut. The tirebuilders at the Goodrich plants also went on strike. In one hour the strike committee pulled out the huge plant. These strikes gave the workers confidence in their ability and developed their solidarity. The strike assumed wider proportions. Six thousand men walked out in the Goodyear plants. The workers themselves organized a picket line twenty-one miles long and so effective was the picketing that the company gave up trying to open the plants. The strikers defied the vigilantes, the police and the company. The threat of a general strike caused Secretary of Labor, Perkins, to declare that the situation was ominous, and used all her influence to end the strike.

Despite the titanic efforts of the workers the immediate results of the strike were meager. Much against their will the workers were induced to go back. Some slight concessions were made by the company. Those who believe that the workers won't fight, that they don't know how to manage things will change their opinion when they will see how efficiently the strike was conducted. The heroism of the workers and the feeling of solidarity displayed inspired millions of others.

These things are more important than the immediate results. The workers are learning to fight. These strikes are the means by which the workers get the necessary experience and self confidence to undertake the much greater and more vital struggles which are bound to come as the class struggle

takes on a sharper form. It is noteworthy that this strike was the result of the spontaneous action of the workers themselves. They wanted action and took the initiative. What the A. F. of L. could not accomplish in fifty years, that is, organize the mass production industries, is being done by the workers themselves.

While the rank and file of the proletariat is becoming more militant the official labor movement as represented by Green, Lewis, McGrady, McMahon, Olander and the others, far from generating militancy and solidarity are doing their utmost to break the morale of the workers. Strikes are either sold out, arbitrated to the satisfaction of the employers or allowed to peter out due to lack of support. When a union defies its leadership and tries to be more progressive, then the charter of the union is revoked and the union is expelled from the A. F. of L.

The situation of the seamen's union of the Pacific is a case in point. They carried on a fight against the open shoppers of California. Contrary to the wishes of the shipping bosses and the International Seamen's Union, they tied up many ships; they committed the heinous crime of refusing to accept the dictatorship of Paul Scharrenberg, one of the most despicable labor fakers in the world, a man who took a part in framing Mooney and Billings; they violated the sacred contract; they chose their own officials by a referendum ballot and refused to accept the hand-picked machine men of the I. S. U. Therefore they were expelled. Thirty thousand dollars of the union funds were impounded by the officialdom of the I. S. U. and a dual union, a miserable minority of the seamen, was recognized by the I. S. U. and the vast majority of the sailors were denounced by the officials. Victor Olander secretary of the I. S. U. in a telegram sent to the

Ship owners denounced the oil tanker strike of the seamen's union on the Pacific and declared that the I. S. U. would man the ships. As this is being written the same tactics are being used against the seamen who are striking against the International Mercantile Co. in N. Y. The officials of the I. S. U. have outlawed the strike and assured the company of its loyalty.

Six organizers of the I. W. W. went to Lorain, Ohio from Cleveland to organize the Dangler stove plant of the American Stove Co. The plant was moved to Lorain in order to escape the I. W. W. The organizers came to Lorain at the request of the workers. They were arrested, held for forty-one hours and beaten up by sluggers. This did not intimidate the organizers for the workers are determined to organize. The mayor declared that while

he had no fault to find with the A. F. of L. he wanted to "protect" the workers from the terrible I. W. W.

Those who wish to gauge the temper of the workers will not find the sentiments of the proletariat reflected in the conservative leadership of the A. F. of L. nor in the sychophantic attitude of the so-called "radicals" who are supporting the A. F. of L.

A rebirth of the labor movement is taking place. The feeling of solidarity, the spirit of struggle is taking hold of vast masses of workers. In this struggle the workers show signs of developing revolutionary tactics and principles which will find expression in the establishment of revolutionary industrial unions on a wider scale than at any time in the past.

S. WEINER.

Self-Determination for the Black Belt

About a half century ago, when people spoke of a "Negro Problem" they usually referred to the fear of the dangers inherent in the propagation within the United States of an "inferior" race. The spread of such a race, they thought, would endanger the supremacy of the white man. In this respect at least, things have changed somewhat. We have begun to tear down the veil of race prejudice that has been, among other factors, a serious obstacle in our progress toward a society based upon rational thought and practice.

Today we face quite a different Negro problem, not merely that of removing from the shoulders of the Negro the leaden weight of racial hatred but to awaken both in him and his white fellow toilers the realization

that never in the existing social order will it be true that "all men are created free and equal." For it is plainly to the direct advantage of capitalism that there be race enmity among the workers who, united as one class, might separate the exploiters from a considerable portion of their booty. Any revolutionary workers movement must, therefore, be acutely conscious of the American Negro and must, furthermore, take decisive steps towards encouraging the active participation of the class conscious Negro in that movement and actively assist the development of unity among Negro and White toilers.

Taking its position on the Negro question as a criterion for the evaluation of a revolutionary movement, let us analyze the program of the Com-

munist Party for the liberation of the Negro. The latter states that inasmuch as there exists in the United States a continuous area in which, according to Clarence Hathaway, there is "an overwhelming Negro majority" and inasmuch as, by an "historical Marxist-Leninist" approach, the Negroes compose a nation in its formative period, the struggle today must be for "self-determination for the black belt."

Let us consider first their argument that the Negroes in the United States constitute a nation. Using almost any interpretation of the term "nation" this is a decidedly moot point—one upon which not even the Marxist-Leninists themselves are agreed. Conceding the point, however, for the purposes of discussion, is such a stand consistent with communist principles? Assuredly not, for the very essence of communism is opposed to the existence of artificial national partitions. The encouragement of nationalistic tendencies thwarts the very purposes of current working class struggles and instills illusions detrimental to the further progress of these struggles. Confirmation of this can be easily found in the Soviet Union where those national groups which were previously aided and abetted by the Soviet government have now reached such a stage as to necessitate the wholesale transfer of entire villages from one place to another by the government—this being but one of the many methods used in the "Russification" of the peasant.

As for the first argument of the communists, it is a deplorable fact that although the communists are in possession of the true statistics involved they do not use these statistics but make such irresponsible statements as Hathaway's. There are some twelve million Negroes in the United States, out of which number but six and one-half millions are contained in the rural population

of the South. The remaining five and three-quarters millions are in the urban population of both the North and the South, New York City alone having one-third million. In the area which the Communists designate as the "black belt" there is a total population of 9,500,000, of which 4,790,000 are Negroes, who thus constitute 50.3% of the total population of the "black belt"—an "overwhelming" majority of three tenths of one per cent! Besides, from the year 1910 to the year 1930, about three million Negroes migrated to the North. The primary reason for such a tremendous redistribution of the population obviously lies in the increasing mechanization of agriculture which has been going on throughout the South. If under the present capitalist system such a change in the concentration of Negro population could occur, what could not be done in a socialistic society?

In view of these facts, what can be the meaning of the demand of the communists for self-determination for the black belt? It is a meaningless, opportunistic slogan which we, as libertarian communists, and indeed which any intelligent worker, black or white, must reject. The fight for the equality of Negro and White must be carried on in those same organizations upon which the entire revolutionary struggle of the workers against the capitalists is based, namely, the trade unions and the co-operatives. In drawing the Negroes into these organizations we shall certainly encounter great difficulties, for, the Negro worker of today has suffered so many betrayals at the hands of both White and Negro leaders that many, in spite of their intense desire for a freer and better life, have become somewhat pessimistic as to the efficacy of any struggle against their exploitation. But we certainly should not attempt to overcome this disillusionment by fostering such dangerous na-

tionalistic notions as self-determination for the black belt; for even if such slogans can be used as temporary propaganda weapons (the efficacy of which

we deny) they will inevitably develop into a serious setback for the entire working-class movement.

STEPHEN CRAIG.

A Hollow Appeal

The NEW MILITANT of February 1st contains an appeal by Leon Trotsky on behalf of the persecuted revolutionists of Soviet Russia. The appeal is based upon the startling revelations made by Dr. Siligia*—one of the victims of the terrorist policy of Stalin's government.

As is to be expected by all those familiar with Trotsky's writings his appeal has great stirring power, conveying in simple language the depth of revolutionary indignation of one who is aroused by the fascistic methods employed by Stalin's government in crushing the party opposition. But, strangely enough, while making his appeal in the name of general revolutionary principles and directing it to all revolutionists, Trotsky fails to make even a single reference to revolutionists outside of his camp. He omits entirely the numerous cases of maltreatment of anarchists and social revolutionists so frequently cited by Dr. Siligia in his disclosures. The impression given is that only members of the Communist Opposition are persecuted in Soviet Russia.

Is it just a case of narrow loyalty,

* Dr. Siligia was one of the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. Together with a number of other foreign communists suspected of Trotskyite sympathies he fell into the clutches of the G. P. U. with the consequent chain of sentences condemning him for a life term in the various prisons and concentration camps of Soviet Russia. He succeeded in getting away from this living hell only because of the threat of an international scandal raised by his attempt at suicide.

stopping short at the gates of one's party? But why then appeal in the name of universal principles of revolutionary democracy? Or is it the troubled conscience of one who was chiefly responsible for inaugurating the reign of terror and persecution against the revolutionists outside the Communist Party that inhibited Trotsky from extending the range of his appeal? But a troubled conscience can be easily allayed by acknowledging one's guilt. Why not take the opportunity of openly declaring that it was a political error to persecute revolutionists of such heroic stature and unquestionable revolutionary integrity as Maria Spiridonova or numerous others who devoted their whole lives to the furtherance of the cause of social revolution. Or is their case of finding themselves savagely persecuted on the second year of the October revolution by those very people with whom they fought side by side to bring it about, less stirring and ominous than the hounding of Communist oppositionists on the eighteenth year of October?

In vain would we seek in Trotsky's later writings even an inkling of a change of heart in this matter. Contrary to the expectations of many a liberal the years of political adversity have not taught Trotsky any new principles of revolutionary toleration. (And that, of course, holds true of his followers as well. The same issue of the NEW MILITANT contains the report of a meeting of protest held by the Workers' Party against political

persecutions in Soviet Russia. Again we have the same complete silence about the many revolutionists in the prisons of Soviet Russia who do not happen to belong to the party opposition.) And this is not only due to the notions of infallibility which are inculcated into any communist leader of importance or to a mere, humanely pardonable, reluctance to acknowledge one's mistakes on such a serious matter. There is a much more important reason for this inhibition in regard to making an appeal that would be on a par with the issues raised in it. And that is the underlying premises of Trotzky's political philosophy, the idea of party dictatorship upheld as the cornerstone of his tactics and policies in a revolutionary period. This is the logic of the seemingly illogical procedure of appealing in the name of universal principles of revolutionary tolerance and shamefacedly ignoring the most crying outrage of those principles perpetrated by him when he was in power.

For to accept the principles of party dictatorship is to renounce any right to protest against the logic of such dictatorship embodied in the persecutions of revolutionists. It is Stalin's policies in that matter that exemplify the true spirit of party dictatorship and not Trotzky's protests against such a policy. Revolutionary democracy and party dictatorship are incompatible. The pure idea of socialism and the will to realize it, allegedly embodied in the Communist Party, do not stand in need of any democratic channels of expression of the revolutionary will and opinion. Hence follows the self-assumed right to persecute and terrorize any form of revolutionary opposition, whether it goes by the name of communism or any other consecrated name.

Trotzky did not reject this fundamental idea. He talks of Soviet dic-

tatorship, but he still conceives it in the form of an inverted pyramid such as took shape in the first period of the October revolution as a result of a configuration of forces incidental only to the Russian situation. The familiar model of an all powerful Central Committee of the Party forming the base of the new power, with the party serving as the transmission link from that source of power to the obedient mass organization—this dictatorship pattern still hovers before his eyes whenever he broadcasts his ringing appeals on behalf of political prisoners. Can there be any room in such a political system for collaboration of revolutionary forces? And where such a collaboration is rejected on principle, even though admitted here and there as the temporary political expediency, what validity, what power of conviction can there be to any protest against political persecutions? That is exactly why, all the brilliance and convincing power of language notwithstanding, Trotzky's appeals leave the revolutionary world cold. The impression gotten from reading them is that Trotzky speaks with his tongue in his cheek. The principles of revolutionary democracy in the name of which the appeal is made sound hollow and flat, and the deliberate omission of mention of other persecuted revolutionists takes on the same ominous character as the united front appeals of the official wing of the communist movement.

SENEX.

Subscribe to VANGUARD now!

Only One Dollar for a Year's
Subscription.

■

Send monies to VANGUARD,
45 West 17th St., New York City

International Notes

SPAIN

(EDIT. NOTE: We are giving here a resume of a manifesto published by the federation of local syndicates of Cadiz. The document is of more than local significance. The attitude revealed here is typical of the entire C. N. T. which is dominated by revolutionary realism, a sober evaluation of the tactical problems of the moment and an unrelenting drive toward its major aim—that of a libertarian social revolution.)

The manifesto begins with pointing out the decisive role played by the C. N. T. in the electoral triumph of the left. It also relates of the overtures made by the rights to the local C. N. T., the attempt to bribe the organization into launching an abstentionist campaign. In view of the imminent danger of Fascism and the temporary respite the movement might gain from the triumph of the lefts, the policy adopted was that of participation (read Malatesta's opinion on such a contingency printed in this issue). But, the manifesto continues, this is only a point of departure for an immediate policy of revolutionary assaults upon the system. It forecasts an inevitable split within the ranks of the United Front as a result of the failure of the bourgeois faction to meet the radical demands incorporated into the program of the United Front. This inevitable split will lead to the formation of a new united front—that of the socialist and anarchist unions which almost embrace the total population of workers and peasants. It is toward such a united front, which will mean the beginning of the social revolution and whose first step will be a thorough demolition of the entire social structure,

that the C. N. T. unions are going to work now. This is no time, the manifesto concludes, to dwell upon old wrongs and grievances. A new revolutionary unity must be forged, one that is based not upon the abandoning of any of the revolutionary positions of the C. N. T., but which will incorporate them in its starting points. Not the merging of the differences, but recognizing the supreme necessity of common action in overthrowing capitalism!

MALATESTA ON ELECTIONS

(EDIT. NOTE: The attitude of the Spanish anarchists during the last election is now being eagerly discussed by the international anarchist movement. It is therefore of interest to read the opinion of the great, uncompromising revolutionist, Malatesta, delivered on a situation which had much in common with the one with which the Spanish anarchists were recently faced. This passage is taken from a letter he wrote to Fabbri.)

Rome, May 18, 1931

I'm beginning to receive some Spanish papers and would like to be there but unfortunately I cannot.

Regarding your remarks on the fact that the collapse of Spanish monarchy was accomplished by means of an election, may I point out that although it is true that this fact will give electoral struggles, a certain prestige which will certainly be exploited by the electionists in their propaganda and in their discussions with us, this will in no way weaken our thesis if the facts and theories are properly explained and understood.

In reality the type of elections we are combatting, that is, those which

serve to elect our rulers or tend in their preparatory periods to discredit or paralyse the action of the masses, are not the same sort of thing that is going on in Spain now. The Spanish municipal elections were the explosion of the anti-monarchist sentiment of the population which used the first chance it could get to express those sentiments. The people flocked to the ballot boxes just as they would have flocked to a demonstration if they weren't sure that they would be shot down by the Civil Guards.

That does not mean, of course, that the ballot boxes determined the outcome, for, if the King hadn't felt that the ruling classes had deserted him and if he were sure of the army, he would have laughed at the elections and would have put things in order by means of numerous arrests and a few good massacres.

It would, indeed, have been better had the monarchy fallen by some other means, such as a general strike or an armed insurrection, because the fact that the movement took electoral forms has a bad influence of the nature of its probable future development. But nevertheless, this is better than nothing. We may regret that there were insufficient forces to effect the triumph of our methods, but we should be glad that the masses are trying, by any means whatever, to conquer more liberty and more justice...

There are some comrades who consider it un-anarchistic, when at a meeting, to raise their hands to register their approval of an agenda which they favor...

The question of election of a Constituent Cortez is, of course, quite another thing. Here we are dealing with a legislative body which the anarchists should not recognize and in whose election they should not par-

ticipate. Naturally, if there is to be a Cortez, it is preferable to have one which is republican and federalist rather than monarchist and centralist; but the task of the anarchists remains that of showing that the people can and should, by themselves, organize the new mode of life and not submit to the law...

(EDIT. NOTE: Complete reports of the latest events in Spain have reached us too late for publication in this issue of Vanguard. Suffice it to say that the amnesty for the 30,000 political prisoners was the result, not of the left victory at the polls, but of the direct action in the streets, the general strikes (in Zaragassa and other places), and the united front action of the socialist (U. G. T.) and the anarcho-syndicalist trade unions (C. N. T.). And it is this united front of two trade union movements which is now preparing in Spain the offensive against capitalism itself. While the Communist Party prates about completion of the bourgeois revolution in Spain, the workers and peasants are busy with the preparations for a social revolution.

In our next issue we will give a detailed account of these events).

THE UNITY CONGRESS OF FRENCH TRADE UNIONS

At the beginning of March a congress of French trade unions took place. The main point on the agenda was laying the foundation for the unification of both trade unions.

The congress was represented by 1709 delegates of various trade union organizations of the country, embracing more than a million organized workers. Not since the Amiens Congress of 1906, which brought out the "magna charta" of French syndicalism, was there ever such an important congress. The old *Confederation Generale du*

Travail was based upon this "Charte D'Amiens" which declared the autonomy of the French trade union movement in regard to all political parties or philosophical schools. The Communist controlled C. G. T. U. was of course based upon the idea of party hegemony, and it stands to reason that the Communists attempted to place the same principle at the basis of the new unified organization. The importance of the last congress lay in defeating this attempt on the part of the communists (they lost by a two-thirds majority voting against them) and declaring anew the independence of the trade union movement.

The Communists were also defeated upon the very important issue of centralization versus federalism. The draft of a centralized constitution submitted by the communists and ardently defended by the all too familiar arsenal of attacks against Proudhon's federal ideas, was defeated by a majority of 2569 syndicates as against 1031 voting for the Communist proposals.

Another victory for the syndicalist idea was scored by the acceptance of the proposal to forbid any trade union secretary to hold a position of leadership in a political party, to become a member of parliament or a municipal councilor. This also passed against the opposition of the Communist fraction.

The weakness of the Communists showed itself most clearly at the discussion of the question of international affiliations. The Communists did not even dare to introduce a proposal favoring the affiliation with Moscow. Their position was very lame: that of "staying out," not joining any international organization. This was also overwhelmingly defeated in favor of joining the Amsterdam International of Trade Unions.

The victory remained with the old

C. G. T. But it is not yet the victory of revolutionary syndicalism. The latter—the adherents of the old traditions of Pelloutier and Iveteaux—are by no means a small minority in the French Trade union movement. They are hardly organized and therein lies their weakness. The task of the C. G. T. S. R. (an independent anarcho-syndicalist organization) is to organize this minority, collaborate with those revolutionary syndicalists that work within the newly united trade union organization, who can exercise a powerful influence over the latter since they have the traditions of the French trade unions on their side.

Out of such collaboration might come a new revival of the French labor movement in the sense of libertarian socialism.

A. SOUCHY.

SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION IN THE U. S. S. R.

A significant perspective of the emerging class structure of Soviet Russia may be had by comparing the workers' average wage with that of the higher-ups in the bureaucratic machine. The officially computed average wage is about 190-200 roubles a month, while that of the so-called responsible worker, begins with 1500 roubles going up in some cases to 30 and 40 thousand roubles a month. The latter income is of course comparatively rare, but 7000 a month is not unusual.

What that sharp difference in income means in social terms can be easily guessed. The slight improvement in economic conditions goes mainly to benefit this new upper layer. Private automobiles, house servants, (there are 70,000 servants in the socialistic Moscow), higher priced restaurants, exclusive rest houses and

sanatoria—such visible signs of inequality are becoming increasingly evident. And if all the former tendencies of social differentiation were explained away as mere landmarks on the road toward a classless society, the rapid consolidation of social power by this emerging class undoubtedly indicates that we are only at the very initial phase of this process of social differentiation.

One of the foremost signs of such a monopoly of power is the continued elimination of workers' organizations—even those State created, bureaucratic machines that pass in Soviet Russia for labor organizations—as a factor in the economic life. Of late the drive upon those organizations has become intensified in the attempt to deprive them of such modest functions as some measure of defense of workers rights within the enterprise.

And along with that there has come a new wave of persecution of the various opposition elements. The cult of Stalin is not merely a culmination of certain processes implied in the legacy of the Party dictatorship. It is the political weapon of the new ruling class just like Bonapartism was the political weapon of the newly risen bourgeoisie of revolutionary France. The so-called "popular" manifestations of love for the Great Leader are not altogether trumped up. It is a fact well recorded by all non-partisan observers that Stalin is very much beloved in those very circles whose income reaches the upper brackets. They lean upon the Bonapartist dictatorship the more trustingly, the further they become removed from the great masses of people by their privileged economic and social position.

And while the economic plan for 1936 follows to a great extent the line of a necessary development of a socialized economy, it still bears the

visible imprint of the class needs of this rising ruling group. That the enormous military budget of this year (swallowing up 19 per cent of the national income) is not altogether dictated by the strict demands of self defense is becoming evident even to such ardent pro-Soviet writers as Louis Fisher (See his "Soviet Journeys"). The role of the military apparatus is making itself more and more heard in the final drawing up of economic plans and military apparatuses generally follow a logic of their own.

Still more does the class nature of the budget reveal itself in the heavy reliance upon the tax on turnover of commodities which constitutes the source of income of the socialized economy (68 per cent). This tax falls upon the impoverished consumer, upon the great masses of workers whose proportionate share of burdens is much greater than that of the groups in the higher brackets. Nor are the workers the only ones that bear the burden of such indirect taxation. The buying of a considerable produce of the peasant at artificially set, low prices in order to resell it at almost tenfold prices (thus grain is bought at 7-12 kopeks a kilo and resold at 80-120) yields a good proportion of the income of the socialized economy, out of which are financed not only the expanding industries (the lag between the rate of development of heavy and light industries has not yet flattened out in the economic plan of 1936) but also the "surpluses" that go to reward the successful man of the new Soviet formation.

LETTERS FROM READERS

Lack of space prevented us from including in this issue our "Mail Box" column. Beginning next month, however, we intend to enlarge it and include letters on controversial questions.

Alexy Borovoy

Very often we hear the communists say that the deportations and imprisonments of revolutionists in Russia do not exceed the needs of social defence and that those measures are always tempered by the humanitarian manner in which they are being applied.

In the meantime, however, the list of militants of left tendencies (anarchists, syndicalists, left communists) who fall victims to this policy of persecution becomes longer from day to day.

Alexy Borovoy, one of the most prominent figures of the anarchist movement of Russia, is the latest victim on this list. Torn away from his scientific labors, from his friends and the familiar surroundings of an academic world, subject to the incessant surveillance of the G. P. U., he had to spend the rest of his days in a small provincial city, not being able to leave that place without the permission of the police.

His name is known and esteemed even in the official circles. This is, for instance, what the "Soviet Encyclopedia" said about him as a thinker and a man of letters: "Alexy Borovoy. (Born in 1876). An anarchist writer. Graduated the law faculty of Moscow University in 1898. Became an instructor in the same university in 1901, having taught administrative law, political economy, labor problems. Advocated in numerous talks at first the ideas of anarcho-individualism and then anarcho-syndicalism. Persecuted by the government, he emigrated to Paris where he taught in the free University of Social Sciences and in the Labor University created by the Emigrees. In 1913 he went back to Russia where he took to journalism as a means of livelihood.

"From 1918-23 he taught in the various educational institutions of Moscow. From 1924 to 1925 he was the economic expert of the State Exchange and Marketing.

"The list of his works consists of: The Social Ideal in Modern Society, The Revolutionary Idea, A Course in Political Economy, The History of Individual Liberty in France, Revolutionary Creation and the Parliamentary Institutions, Anarchism—Individual and Society in the Anarchist Conception."

Those lines pass in silence the great work conducted by Borovoy among the revolutionary, and even communist, youth, in which his marvelous talent as a speaker and educator manifested itself at its highest. Nor does the official homage mention his activities in the first years of the revolution, his journalistic work, his attempt to create a confederation of intellectual workers acting in harmony with the revolutionary workers.

The outstanding personality of Borovoy, his influence over the youth made the government feel uneasy about his activity. From 1928 he follows the Calvary Road upon which thousands of recalcitrant revolutionists are driven in Soviet Russia. Sentenced without trial, without charges preferred against him, he was forced to spend the last days of his life in exile. He was of a much nobler metal than the Radeks, Preobrashenskys, and Rakovskys. He did not want to purchase his freedom at the price of "recantations" and "retractions" and so persecutions were heaped upon him, leading to a premature death in some obscure provincial city.

Book Review

NATIONS CAN LIVE AT HOME

By P. O. WILLCOX.

(W. W. Norton & Co., 1935)

Among the many fertile ideas developed by Kropotkin none was ignored to a greater extent than the idea of the possibility of a small territorial unit (such, for instance, as Paris and the adjoining two departments) maintaining a self-sufficient agricultural base under conditions of progressive economic development. The majority of socialist writers, lacking the special training possessed by Kropotkin, was not capable of following up the line of research into the potentialities of scientific agriculture which led Kropotkin to his seemingly paradoxical conclusions. And as to the small minority which did have the proper qualifications in that respect it showed a reluctance, typical for that generation of socialists, to concern itself with problems of building up socialism. Anything going beyond the narrow confines of a minimum program was relegated to mere utopianism in which only men of a presumably visionary frame of mind could indulge.

Nor did Kropotkin's ideas produce much of a stir among the agricultural scientists. Even much less than the socialist theoreticians were they inclined to concern themselves with the revolutionary potentialities of a few advanced economies serving as the basis for Kropotkin's studies. The largely empirical state of agricultural science of that period confined the attention of scientific thought to the progress of agriculture as a whole. And it was the slow tempo of such a progress that drove the scientific thought of a generation ago to the pessimistic conclusions of a revived Malthusianism.

How rapidly modern science is out-

growing these self-imposed limitations is shown by the last book written by P. O. Willcox, one of the most outstanding agricultural scientists of today. Like his previous book "Agriculture Reshaped" this last one "Nations Can Live at Home" has for its aim to acquaint the intelligent layman with the striking conclusions reached by modern science as to the potentialities of agricultural production. And were it not for its puerile, and at times reactionary, sociology this book would read like the continuation of the first chapters of Kropotkin's book "Fields, Factories and Workshops", re-edited in the light of the enormous strides made by science since that time.

Like Kropotkin, Willcox begins his book with an attack upon the Malthusian premise of an inevitable lag between the growth of population and the progress of agricultural production. Possessing the more modern weapon of a later day science, Willcox disposes of those premises in a much more effective manner. For to speak seriously of those premises is, according to Willcox, to betray an utter ignorance of modern agro-biology. With the latter the potentialities of agricultural production are not a matter of rule-of-thumb measurements. They are mathematically calculated for every plant, or rather agro-biological type, with as much precision as it is done in any other theoretical science.

Not only are the potentialities calculated beforehand, but the theoretical limit toward which they tend is also predetermined by a comparatively simple mathematical formula. But so greatly does this limit exceed the present day requirements of even the densest population that it is only as a purely theoretical possibility that one can envision the reduction of the standard of

living as a result of the growth of population. The density of population of the most crowded countries is 2,000 per square mile, while the theoretically determined point of saturation is 65,000. (That of New York City is 25,000 per square mile, which means that nearly thrice the population of New York City could maintain itself agriculturally on the same territory.) This theoretical limit embraces the entire range of agricultural production. That is, a population of the density of 65,000 per sq. mile can obtain from its territory all the necessary agricultural products, including most of the raw material for its industries. Prof. Willcox goes as far as to maintain that, given a truly scientific agriculture, we could dispense with coal and other forms of extracted fuel, it being cheaper to obtain the necessary fuel by cultivating the proper plants. Nor would this imply a greater expenditure of social energy. The labor time spent now by the average farmer is much above that required by scientific agriculture for the production of results which may seem fabulous compared with the present day yields. And taking only the present density of the population in the most crowded countries, beyond which it is unlikely to grow, (that is judging by the statistical conclusions of modern demography), we have the possibility of a population of a comparatively small territory obtaining all its necessities through agricultural production with a suprisingly low expenditure of energy. But that means that an enormous quantity of social energy will be released for industrial purposes, which only confirms Kropotkin's profound idea that a scientific reorganization of agriculture along communal lines will lead to the decentralization of our economic life, to the gradual emergence of the integrated economy of anarchist communes.

In the book reviewed here the author

does not pose the question of how far the agricultural production of today lags behind those ideal limits. But in his previous book, this question is taken up in a thoroughgoing manner. He shows that while the general agriculture of today is hopelessly behind the potentialities held out by modern science, a small number of highly advanced economies rapidly approach such limits. Given a reorganization of the entire agriculture along the lines of those advanced economies we could secure such an abundance of agricultural products as would shatter our entire price system. But, as our author has to admit somewhat ruefully, "in order to effect such a reorganization a great deal of social and political rubbish must be cleared away," which, of course, brings us back to Kropotkin.

SENEX.

LIBERTARIAN LIBRARY REOPENED

The Vanguard Group has a fairly good collection of libertarian literature in its new library at the Free Workers Center, 122 Second Ave., New York. Our Library contains many worthwhile books, pamphlets and periodicals which cannot be secured any other place in the city; and our collection is growing steadily. In order to enlarge and improve it we should like to request our readers and friends who have libertarian books, pamphlets or periodicals which they can spare to donate some of these items to us or to lend them to our library for a specified time. We will take good care of anything given or lent to us.

The library is open on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday evenings. Anyone interested in doing some reading on anarchism should not fail to visit our library at 122 Second Ave., New York.

TO OUR READERS

The response to our appeals on the part of our readers shows that the Vanguard is making a name for itself. In the field of radical publications, the Vanguard occupies a unique place. The Vanguard is the only magazine in the field that clearly expounds the principles of Libertarian Communism in relation to the events of the present period. This is pioneer work. More and more intelligent people are becoming interested in our ideas and there is no doubt that the Vanguard can become one of the most influential papers in the radical movement.

The Vanguard has from the very beginning emphasized the fact that it can succeed only if it receives the support of all who wish to have a Libertarian Communist movement in this country. We therefore must have the support of all our readers. We must insure the regular appearance of the paper. To do this, we must rely upon the contributions, subscriptions, and sales made by our friends. Up till now, the paper has come out due only to the sacrifices and labors of a few devoted comrades.

We contemplate increasing the size of the paper, to make room for our contributors and correspondents. This we can do very easily if you will do your share.

We wish to stress the fact that the Vanguard is not the private property of a group but intends to become the voice of a movement. The Vanguard is your paper as well as ours. We believe that you are responsible as well as we are for its success. The next few months will be especially trying, but we must keep the paper going and assure its regular appearance. If all our friends will contribute regularly, get subscriptions, and sell the magazine, if more groups will undertake to raise

money for its support, the Vanguard will shortly become independent and we will not have to weary our readers with constant appeals.

Comrades and friends, rally to the support of your organ; help to build a movement in America! We expect an influx of subs, contributions, and sales.

Send all correspondence to:

VANGUARD,
45 West 17th St., New York City.

THE FERRERO-SALLITTO CASE

V. Ferrero and D. Sallitto are now out on \$1000 bail each awaiting a hearing on a writ of habeus corpus in the higher courts. The sole charge against these two Italian workers is that they rented some space in their restaurant to "Man," an anarchist journal. The only thing preventing their deportation now is an appeal for a writ of habeus corpus which the lower courts have refused. If deported to Italy, Ferrero and Sallitto will surely receive long prison terms or death sentences. This monstrous frame-up must be spiked. The united front Ferrero-Sallitto Defense Conference needs funds to carry on the work of freeing these two men. Send your contribution to A. Alleva, P. O. Box 181, Station D, New York City.

EMMA GOLDMAN'S "THE TWO COMMUNISMS"

The money for Comrade Goldman's pamphlet is coming in rather slowly. This lack of funds has caused us to delay publication. Will those comrades who can spare a few dollars for a short time please communicate with us so that we can begin printing this valuable pamphlet as soon as possible.

COURSE OF LECTURES ON LIBERTARIAN COMMUNISM.

Beginning in a few weeks the Vanguard Group is giving a course of four lectures on the principles of Libertarian Communism. This course will be of great value not only to those workers and students who are new in the movement, but will also be helpful to those comrades who want to get a rounded picture of our philosophy and principles in the light contemporary social developments. The opening date for these lectures has not as yet been set, so you still have time to enroll. There will be a nominal charge of about fifty cents for the whole course in order to cover expenses.

All those interested should write us immediately at 45 W. 17th St., N. Y.

PLEDGE LISTS

One of the best forms of support the Vanguard is receiving is that of monthly donations from the members of several groups. The members of the groups pledge a small sum each month which is collected by the treasurer

and sent to Vanguard. Among those groups whose response has been particularly gratifying is the Free Society Group of Chicago whose members pledge twenty-five cents per month each. They also ran a dance for the benefit of Vanguard. We should like to urge other groups to follow their example. We have on hand a number of mimeographed pledge lists which we will be pleased to send to groups or individuals on request.

BAZAAR! ≠ BAZAAR!

We're all going to the

FREE WORKERS CENTER

122 Second Avenue, N. Y.

on

MAY 1ST, 2ND AND 3RD

PRIZES DANCING DINING

Bring your family and friends and make the first Annual Bazaar of the FREE WORKERS CENTER a great success.

Admission only TWENTY-FIVE CENTS for the
Three Evenings.

SATURDAY NITE, APRIL 25, 1936

Keep this date open

for the

DANCE and ENTERTAINMENT

given by the VANGUARD at the

FREE WORKERS CENTER

122 Second Avenue (near 8th St.), New York City

Food and Fun Galore!

Excellent Dance Orchestra!

Bring Your Friends and Have a Good Time.

ADMISSION THIRTY-FIVE CENTS.