

VANGUARD

A LIBERTARIAN COMMUNIST JOURNAL

THE G. P. U. IN AMERICA

AN EXPOSE OF POLITICAL GANGSTERISM AT WORK

IS CANADA GOING FASCIST?

FIRST-HAND REPORT FROM OUR CANADIAN CORRESPONDENT

SEAMEN FIGHT GOVERNMENT CONTROL

By JACK WHITE

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

By RUDOLF ROCKER

WHY AUSTRIA WENT NAZI!

By PETER GROOT

INTERNATIONAL LABOR MUST SAVE SPAIN

By SENEX

VANGUARD

A LIBERTARIAN COMMUNIST JOURNAL

Published by the Vanguard Group, 45 West 17th Street, New York City. Telephone: CHelsea 3-9567. Subscription in United States one dollar (\$1.00) for twelve issues. Foreign \$1.25. Single copies ten cents.

Volume 4, Number 3

April, 1938

LABOR SOLIDARITY AND THE SPANISH TRAGEDY

JUDGED by its immediate effects upon the course of European life, the present betrayal of the Spanish Revolution by the labor movement of Western Europe will rank as one of the major tragedies of our time. It has already marked the lowest ebb of proletarian solidarity and fighting vigor and in this respect, as well as in its historic efficacy, it is comparable to the two other dismal failures which have left their tragic imprint upon the proletarian struggles of the last quarter of a century—the breakdown of the international labor movement during the European war and the fatal impotency displayed by German labor in face of the most ghastly reaction of our time.

What is likely to be the immediate effect of the collapse of Spanish resistance to the aggression of international fascism is clear to everyone who has the least knowledge of the European situation. The encirclement of France effected as a result of Franco's victory will throw the latter upon the mercies of the pro-fascist government of England, whose hatred of the Popular Front Government is no more a matter of mere journalistic conjecture by the Chamberlain Government, will be made full use of in order to manoeuvre the present French Government out of existence. The formation of a "strong national" government, that is, one which is as fully representative of the 200 families as Chamberlain's Government is of the City bankers, will be insisted upon by the latter under the pretext of "urgent needs of common military defense." The threat of letting down France in the future conflict will be sufficient to force the self-effacement of the Popular Front Government in favor of a semi-dictatorial regime which will open wide the door to fascist plots and conspiracies guided and financed from Berlin and Rome.

"After Spain comes France"—this is no mere boast on the part of the victory-intoxicated fascists of Spain and Italy. In the light of the recent revelations concerning the financing of fascist movements of France by the Laval government, the suspicious pro-Nazi manoeuvres of the right wing of the Radical Socialist Party headed by Flandin, the flow of armaments through the Pyrenean and Alsatian borders to the underground fascist

organizations of France—in view of all those well-known facts the boastful assertions of Mussolini agents acquire an especially ominous significance. The fate of the Spanish workers is now being prepared for the proletariat of France by the same dexterous hand, with the connivance, and, perhaps, active participation, of the same gentlemen from Downing Street whose diabolical scheme of non-intervention in Spain proved so effective in thwarting the manifestations of international solidarity with the Spanish struggle for freedom.

The danger facing the working class of France—and of Great Britain too, for that matter—as a result of the Spanish debacle is so obvious that no one active in the labor movement of France and England can claim that it escaped his attention. It became evident as soon as British diplomacy began showing its hand in abetting the criminal intervention of international fascism in Spain. And if the proletariat of Western Europe did not answer in kind the attack of international reaction against the vanguard of European working class—the heroic proletariat of Spain—it was not because it did not realize the full significance of the Spanish struggle, but because like the German proletariat of 1932, it found itself parilized by the same fatal impotence which led to the greatest catastrophe of our times—the advent of Hitler to power.

It is an impotence imposed upon the proletariat by castrating effect of parliamentarianism on one hand, and the demoralization produced by the Moscow influences, on the other. The combination of both those factors was sufficient to efface completely the German working class as an independent force in those fateful days of January 1932. And it is the same influences that have led to the repetition of the same suicidal policies on the part of the French and British proletariat in face of the supreme historic task facing it as a result of the Spanish struggle.

For it is only the politicians in the labor movement that take seriously the excuses advanced by way of defending the position of drift adopted by the working class of France and Britain in face of the fascist invasion of Spain. The excuse is that under conditions where the British Government, which was unfriendly to the loyalists, had the final say, it was nigh impossible to hazard a policy of open provocation of the fascist powers who were threatening war over the issue of Spain. The alternative to the non-intervention scheme, it is alleged, would be war into which France could not be rushed against the will of England and its own bourgeoisie.

But, granted the key position of the British Government in this situation, there is still the tremendous economic power of the British working class which has remained untapped during those days when the basic lines of the Spanish policy were taking shape. The chamberlain Government could brush aside contemptuously whatever opposition the Labor Party minority in the parliament raised to the infamous mockery of the non-intervention scheme. The elections are far off; and by that time a lot of manoeuvring can be done by skilled politicians backed up by the most powerful financial and economic

support a ruling party ever had in England. But how different would be the reaction of His Majesty's Government to a wave of strikes sweeping the country under the slogan of "Arms for Spain!" It does not take much of political acumen to foresee one positive result of such direct pressure exerted by the British working class in the economic field. *The liberty of action now enjoyed by Chamberlain, in order to betray the democracies of Europe into the hands of Hitler and Mussolini, would be greatly curbed.*

The same may be said as to the probable effect of a similar course of direct action entered upon by the French working class in answer to the infamous policy of closing the border to shipments of arms. Perhaps, this policy would remain the same as far as the official course went. But in practice, the pressure of an aroused working class, manifesting its desire for an open frontier through strikes and street demonstrations would render powerless the government prohibition of arms shipments. Arms would flow—with or without the government's consent. The government would have to close its eyes to the infraction of its rules, even if it feared international complications. Domestic complications are very often as valid as foreign complications, and where every attempt of the government to halt shipment of arms is met with strikes and street demonstrations, the distant considerations of foreign diplomacy recede into the background, giving place to the anxious desire of maintaining domestic peace even at the price of seeing some of the government orders set at naught.

It is when we take into consideration this possible course of effective intervention in the Spanish struggle, which by now might have changed the political and social map of Europe, that the failure of the working class of Western Europe, to rise to the historic occasion assumes its tragic proportions. Like in Germany of 1932, the proletariat holds in its hands the destinies of the civilization,—and this time, of the most advanced part of Europe. If he lets it slip as he did in Germany the civilization of the entire continent will be buried under the avalanche of the new barbarism which is now engulfing one country after another as a result of a self-imposed limitation upon the fighting strength of the international proletariat.

SENEX

WHAT THE MOSCOW TRIALS MEAN TO US

The latest of the Moscow public "trials" is over. Eighteen of the twenty-one defendants have been announced executed. The other "mad dogs" are preserved—probably for other trials. Stalin's attempt to convince the doubting world of the alleged crimes "disclosed" in the earlier trials has miserably failed. The doubts have now become convictions.

The details of the "trials" have been examined by other publications but their inner significance has been barely touched. We shall devote ourselves to this aspect.

The basic political philosophy of the Marxists from Marx to Lenin, from Trotsky and Stalin is the firm belief in dictatorship. Stalinism is the direct outcome of the methods of dictatorship, and does not differ from Leninism or Trotskyism. The "plots" which Trotsky exposes as pure fabrication are made of

the same stuff which he himself manufactured in the good old days. Maria Spirodonovna, one of the great figures in the Russia of 1917 writes from a Bolshevik prison where she was incarcerated in 1919: "Plots of Right Social-Revolutionists and Mensheviks are being invented wholesale. While still cooperating with the Bolsheviks I often quarrelled with them furiously, pointing out these 'plots' are lies of hysterical Tchekists. And later, after we left, these 'plots' assumed a mass character. I am confident they were invented on purpose, that they were not panicky visions but systematic fabrications. The best proof of this is the latest 'plot of the Left Social-Revolutionaries,' . . . from their own (Bolshevik) statements of the case it can be seen that there was no such plot. . . ."

A protest by the anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists of Russia against the oppression and dictatorship of the Bolsheviks was answered by Trotsky in his typically brilliant "revolutionary style: "The welfare of the revolution is our supreme law. This law takes sometime a stern form. The advance guard of the workmen of Europe and of the whole world will only then triumph over the bourgeoisie when they will learn to place the stern law of revolutionary expediency above all other considerations." With such words liberty and socialism were outlawed.

The corroding aspects of power assert themselves unmistakingly and irresistibly. The monopoly of power can never co-exist with democracy. Dictatorship can never be an instrument in the hands of the working-class for it cannot, organically, manipulate it. Dictatorship can only be the means of control exercised by a single party, and not even the party, but the central committee of the party, and eventually an individual who becomes the power and the godhead of the system. Instead of constant increments to the political and economic freedom enjoyed by the masses in a socialist democracy, dictatorship must unceasingly extend its oppressive and death-dealing clutches everywhere in life.

We have before us now the task of lifting the ideal of socialism out of the mire of Red Fascism into which the Bolsheviks have dragged it. Our task is to show the workers of the world that it is not socialism which has failed, but the marxist method of dictatorial socialism. Socialism can succeed; it must succeed! But only if it is free socialism!

THE PERSECUTION OF MARCUS GRAHAM AND "MAN!" MUST STOP

For nineteen years now, Marcus Graham, editor of the anarchist journal *Man!*, has been the object of repeated attacks by the United States government. Under the "liberal" Secretary of Labor, Frances Perkins, this attack has been intensified in an attempt to deport Graham. At present Marcus Graham is out on bail pending appeal on his six months jail sentence for contempt of court, for refusing to testify against himself. The persecution of Graham is a deliberate and undisguised attack against *Man!*. Previously, an attempt was made to deport the two anti-Fascists, Ferrero and Sallitto to Italy—the underlying reason being that they rented space in their restaurant to *Man!*

This frontal attack against freedom of the press must be squelched now. To allow it to succeed is to pave the way for deeper inroads and the wholesale deportation of foreign born. And, until the deportation proceedings against Marcus Graham are dismissed, we must raise our voice in the most vigorous protest. The *Marcus Graham Freedom of the Press Committee* has been formed with the leading figures in the progressive social life of America. The *Vanguard* urges everyone of its readers to give all aid to this committee, especially by sending it badly needed funds to enable it to carry on its work. Address all funds to *Marcus Graham Freedom of the Press Committee*, P. O. Box 971, Los Angeles, California.

SEAMEN FIGHT STATE CONTROL

by JACK WHITE

SPURRED on by the insatiable greed of the shipowners, and faced with the problem of preparing for war, the Maritime Commission has begun a determined attack against the seamen. Proverbially militant and a vital cog in the system of transportation and communication, the maritime workers present a barrier to the intensified war preparations of American capitalism. The question of wages and working conditions is only an element, although an important one, in this drive. The point that is raised by the Maritime Commission is that the seamen must be "disciplined," that is, must be placed under government control through mediation and training boards. This plan must be viewed as an aspect of the world-wide drive by capitalism towards totalitarianism and intensified exploitation through successive stages of labor control and regimentation. It is only along these basic lines that the problems facing the maritime workers can be understood.

The tons of front page newspaper articles carrying attacks against the seamen reached a sort of climax in the recent letter which Joseph E. Kennedy, ex-chairman of the Maritime Commission, sent to the labor-hating Senator Royal S. Copeland, chairman of the Committee on Commerce. Irrefutably Kennedy pointed out that a strike in the port of New Orleans would lower the price of corn for the Illinois farmer which would, in turn, affect the purchase of machinery in Chicago or the meeting of mortgage payments in Philadelphia, etc., etc. Thus the strike of seamen is a matter of national concern. It is necessary, he argues, for the government to step in and prevent strikes—that is, prevent the workers from exercising their only means of bettering their conditions. But so far as the seamen are concerned the government has always been in alliance with the reactionary shipowners. It was not until the bloody maritime strike of 1934 that the seamen, against the combined forces of the racketeering leadership of the International Seamen's Union, the owners and the government, were able to improve their lot. The recent imprisonment of the ALGIC seamen, on charges of 'mutiny', for striking in sympathy with the longshoremen, is a grim reminder of what can be expected at the hands of the government.

But Kennedy's letter has far-reaching implications: Then the agricultural worker also must be put under government supervision. Kennedy is voicing the drive towards state capitalism, towards the regimentation of the workers, towards the totalitarian state.

Viewed from these basic lines the roles of the various labor groups which form part of the maritime industry become clear. The blasts against Curran and Bridges as dangerous "reds" are a mere blind to put the leading sea-faring union men on the spot. Harry Bridges, leader

of the West Coast longshoremen and C.I.O. director, and Joe Curran, president of the National Maritime Union (N.M.U., East Coast) have in effect backed the Maritime Commission in attempts to subdue the seamen and have asked that they but be given a chance first to control them and if they failed the government could then step in. Attacks against them come from the old-line Bourbon capitalists who also attack Lewis, not realizing in their stupid way, the tremendous services these labor lieutenants render them.

Stalinists Side with Government

In 1936 when the government tried to foist the Copeland Continuous Discharge Book (Fink Book) upon the seamen, Curran advised the membership of the N.M.U. to accept it. He and the Communists cried, "Let us take the book now and then let us burn it on the First of May on the Capitol steps in Washington, D. C." Bridges attitude was, "You can't fight the government." But the Sailor's Union of the Pacific (S.U.P.), backed by the rank and file Firemen, and Cooks and Stewards refused to take the Fink Book and tied up the ships and thus finally defeated the law! Further aid was given the government in laying a hand on the seamen when Bridges, in December 1937, wired the LaFollette Committee, "Have every reason to believe and evidence to point that our ranks are infested with government spies and provocateurs Stop Request that your committee make arrangements to investigate situation in Maritime union on this (West) coast." This would play right into the hands of the reactionary Committee on Commerce. The Communist press at the same time began a campaign for government interference in union affairs. Bridges' purpose was to clip the wings of the militant S.U.P. which he is attacking bitterly and poisonously.

The deception behind the attack by the anti-seamen forces against Curran becomes even more apparent when Curran's attitude toward government training ships in the proposed compulsory arbitration bill is known. He says that the N.M.U. is "—not against the establishment of training ships. In fact, we are in favor of them—if the union is represented on the training board." Thus the N.M.U. officials, the shipowners, the Maritime Commission line up together on the issue. The opposition finds itself in the S.U.P. whose secretary, Harry Lundeborg, pointed out that the Sailor's Union "would absolutely fight the law to the bitter end—that if such training ships were established they could and would be used to train and furnish scabs during a strike—the Union would not even collaborate with the government in the training through the medium of government school ships, even though Johnny-come-lately Curran thinks that it would be a good idea, if the unions could furnish the

instructors—. If the government has \$1,443 to spend to train a man for a year, let (the money)—be used for wages and improving working conditions. We will guarantee to do the training—and the government will not be paying and armed branch of the government service to cripple the union—” When Kennedy, in his letter, demanding legislation to discipline these men, attacks a union leader who “feels so confident of discipline in union ranks that he challenges the power of Congress to enforce this legislation, stating that the employees will not ‘accept it,’ he refers to Lundeborg who is voicing the sentiment of the Sailor’s Union as well as the great majority of seamen.

One cannot say definitely whether Curran* and Bridges are members of the Communist Party because one cannot easily lay hands on membership cards, but this can be said—the line is the same, the attacks against the S.U.P. and the rest of the maritime militants are synchronized, and though both disclaim membership in the party both have fulsome praise for it. It was the “Western Worker” (organ of the C.P., now the “People’s World”) which declared that the deportation proceedings against Bridges were started by the S.U.P. The “Western Worker” was forced by the S.U.P. to retract this statement in a front page apology. However, the WEST COAST FIREMEN, organ of the progressive sea-going firemen, places the issue squarely: “The beef (quarrel) of militant maritime workers against Bridges is not his citizenship—a longshoreman is a longshoreman and a brother, regardless of race, origin or government papers. It is not that Bridges is a ‘red’—his patriotic statement that he has ‘read and believes Lincoln, Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt’ ought to end all color blindness on that score. Bridges is for the capitalist-politician-presidents of two wars and would-be president of a third. He is for sanctity of contracts, moving perishable cargo, and dickering with committees—He has been against all job action (‘plots’—he calls them) to improve working conditions and labor militancy of every kind for the last two years. No, far from ‘red’, Bridges’ boss-consciousness seems to be outstripping his class-consciousness. That, and that only, is the beef of genuine militants among maritime workers. But it is a beef that we can settle without any interference or help from the shipowners or their government stooges.

“The most important principle on which all workers should unite is that labor’s house and problems are labor’s own, and that labor stands united against alien interference.”

If the government expects to silence the S.U.P. in its bitter fight to maintain union democracy and militancy against the Lewis-Stalinist combine it will find that the tactic has failed. For the Sailors and other militants know who the enemies of the labor movement are, and instead of wavering, are deepening and widening their militant unionism. In Seattle the Marine Firemen, the Marine Cooks and Stewards, the Masters, Mates and Pilots, the Sailors Union, Deep-sea Alaska Fishermen, and United Fisherman of Alaska, have initiated a Sea-

farers Federation to fight government control, pointing out that “affiliation with the A. F. of L. or the C.I.O. can do nothing but aid labor fakers in their fight for control of the labor movement” and that “unscrupulous politicians (Curran and Bridges, etc.) are attempting to control West Coast seafaring men by forming a so-called National Seamen’s Union.” It was resolved “that this seafaring Federation shall keep all political organizations and politicians from meddling in the affairs of seafaring men—” Within a few days the Seattle resolutions were concurred in by the Sailors Union and the Marine Firemen of Portland, the Marine Cooks and Stewards, the Marine Firemen, and the Sailors Union of Aberdeen, the Sailors Union of San Francisco, and the Sailors Union and the Marine Firemen of San Pedro.

Politics vs. Militant Labor

The battle’s lines and objectives are thus drawn. On one side are lined up the following forces whose differences are hardly fundamental and can be reconciled: 1) The shipowners and the government, greedy for profits, and preparing for war, whose problem is control of the workers. 2) The Lewis machine; Lewis, ambitious for power, supporter of capitalism, business dealer in labor, herding labor towards state capitalism, out manoeuvring the C.P. for control of the C.I.O. 3) The Communist Party; Preparing for war to defend the bloody Russian dictatorship, hypocritically using working class slogans, condemning the automobile workers for opposing war, supporting the Lewis U.M.W.A. for favoring collective security (war alliances).

On the other side: 1) The S.U.P.; militant veterans of many a successful struggle against the bosses and the government. 2) The Marine Transport Workers (I. W.W.); small in numbers but looked up to by the seamen. 3) M.F.O.W. (Marine Firemen); recent voting resulted in the kicking out of office of practically every C.I.O.-C.P. satellite. 4) The rank and file on the West Coast and a large and growing section of the N.M.U. whose members are rebelling against the Curran leadership and its sell-out tactics (e.g. the phoney tanker agreement).

The methods followed by the latter—economic direct action, repudiation of political methods and their advocates, the anti-government attitude, the essential and practical democracy within their ranks—are the surest signs that if victory is to be achieved against their powerful and resourceful opponents they will achieve it. At the same time it sets the pace for American labor to follow if it is to satisfy any of its basic needs. A most vital section of American labor has, surely if however unconsciously, chosen the path for labor victory—anarcho-syndicalism.

**As we go to press we learn that Curran has launched an attack against the Communist Party. But even more loudly he attacks the rank and file, going to the extent of expelling Loones from the N.M.U. for editing the “Rank and File N.M.U. Pilot.” The attack by Curran against the C.P. appears to follow from the great discredit that the C.P. has undergone among the maritime workers. It seems that Curran is leaving a sinking ship.*

WHY AUSTRIA WENT NAZI

by PETER GROOT

GERMANY has sprung two new surprises on the world: The public was made aware of the opposition between the officers' corps of the Reichswehr and the ruling party ideology—a question of internal politics—and immediately upon that followed a coup in her foreign policy—the annexation of Austria. And Hitler's unspeakable barbarians have been given another slice of Europe to turn into a living hell of suppression, poverty, goose-stepping.

The first, an internal crisis, whose significance had been strongly exaggerated anyway, was soon forgotten, to the chagrin of those who had fondly believed that Hitler might stumble over the conflict with the Reichswehr. The same people had believed, in their naivete, that Hitler could fall by the struggle with Rome or with a few Protestant clergymen.

The history of the rule of the bourgeoisie has been a continual struggle of the various vested interests among each other, from which the more robust always rose triumphant. But never have these struggles reached that point at which they might endanger the class rule of the bourgeoisie.

Germany's Prussian tradition has made the officers' corps an important factor in all important political decisions. However, by means of continued propaganda, and by the method of choosing all young officers from the ranks of absolutely reliable Nazis, the influence of Hitler in the army grew daily. And the public altercation which broke out between these two factors was merely a test of strength on Hitler's side. That he was able, without endangering himself, to pension a few generals, and soon thereafter to undertake the coup against Austria, is a proof that Hitler can rely upon the army, in other words, that he has come out of this conflict a victor. The totalitarian state has become a little more perfect.

We need not go into a detailed description of the events which have just occurred in Austria; the daily press has treated them extensively enough. If we are looking for the sources of these events, we must recognize as a point of departure the fact that Austria, although politically an independent state, economically had no chance to exist on her own. Having been dismembered, she was forced into the role of a vassal state, living by the alms of those to whom she gave a vassal's service. Interchangeably that was England, France, and finally Italy, upon whose alms Austria subsisted.

While the politicians and diplomats played their game, the Austrian economy was increasingly approaching exhaustion. The existing great powers were quite ready to buy the little ruling clique, but they could not, in the long run, support the entire population. As the misery grew, the "pan-germanic idea" gained an increasing

influence. If that found no external expression, it was due to Mussolini's orders to keep this movement suppressed. However, the idea of *Anschluss* has become so firmly rooted, that Hitler has been able to move the Austrian "national soul" to rebellion against the ruling clique around Schuschnigg, which had been sold to Mussolini. That in the secret barter between Hitler and Schuschnigg the Austrian Ministry of the interior was handed to the Nazis, is a proof of the fact that Hitler definitely had the upper hand in Austria. The prohibition and the partial suppression of the Nazi demonstrations in Austria were only a farce by means of which Schuschnigg tried to mask his capitulation before Hitler.

What effects on the German and Austrian working-class are to be expected from the annexation? It is an undeniable fact, disputed only by those who are conscious of their guilt in the matter, that the entire German workers' movement has dissolved into atoms. This development was logical, for in a totalitarian state no organization based on parliamentary ideology can exist. And the German workers' movement absolutely stood on the premises of parliamentarianism and the hysterical slogans of the agents of the Kremlin. The attempted conspiracies of the underground groups, rumors of which reached the public after Hitler's ascent to power, were doomed from the first, for they acted on the orders of the illegal German Communist Party, now directed from centers outside of Germany, whose leaders continued to issue their orders safely in exile, without consideration of how many workers had to risk their heads in their little game. The conspiracies were as a rule of short duration, for the Communist Party had not a few Hitler spies in its ranks, at whose disposal Moscow placed the money and the necessary addresses for the anti-Hitler work. In this fashion it required relatively little time for the best workers to be sent to prison or the gallows.

If the suppression of the workers was not quite so brutal in Schuschnigg's Austria as in Hitler's Germany it is still effective enough to prevent the reorganization of the proletariat on a new basis, corresponding to the changed times. The various skirmishes in which the Austrian workers engaged were nevertheless always designed more for the return to the former bourgeois-democratic set-up than against the capitalistic economic order as such. The Austrian addition to the ranks of the German working-class by the annexation of Austria is therefore no asset. And for the Austrian workers the union will unquestionably be a debit. Hitler said years ago, when he wrote his book "Mein Kampf" that the union of the two countries must come, even if it were not an economic boon for Germany, in fact, even if it were a distinct economic disadvantage. For the bourgeoisie of both countries it is undoubtedly an advantage,

since the German ruling class is augmented sufficiently to give it a decided advantage in the European balance of power, while the Austrian bourgeoisie is no longer the pawn which it has been due to the helplessness of the little country. The total result will be that Germany will be more overbearing and insolent than ever, that it will force further concessions from the other powers. During this development, however, Hitler's reservoir of political slogans is becoming exhausted. He will no longer be able to hide his rule behind the catchwords of "national honor," "national liberty," and "unity of all Germans."

The German and Austrian workers, through much bitter suffering, will have learned that socialism and freedom do not come through "socialistic" constitutions and ballot boxes, nor from central committees or distant leaders. In the testing ground of experience, they have

seen that parliamentarianism has been a snare, as it can only be, and that tied to the capitalist machinery, they could not destroy it. The methods of struggle are thus born of their experience and can only be that of anti-parliamentarianism and direct action. This means the weakening of the State power through constant hammer blows at it. It means the building up of an economic organism controlled by the rank and file. It means the destruction of the centralized, marching spirit that so destroyed the creativeness and independence of the members of the German and Austrian labor organizations. And only when the working class victims of Fascism understand it and take it to heart—and if the workers of those lands which have not yet been swallowed up by the totalitarian quagmire learn these lessons—only then will the working-class find the will and the organizational form to overcome its suppression, any suppression.

A NOTE ON LIBERTARIAN COMMUNISM (Part II)

THE ideal of a classless, stateless society whose structure and spirit would be built upon liberty, equality and fraternity is not merely an anarchist dream. It is, presumably, what all good marxists would like this world to be. But in the process of their political peripatations the marxists have permitted this ideal gradually to recede so far beyond their horizon that their goal has assumed a completely different shape. No longer does the average Communist or Socialist think of his party or trade-union activities in terms of a struggle which will eventually lead the workers out of the mire of capitalism into a classless, stateless commonwealth of labor. If he envisions a revamping of the current social set-up at all, he tends to picture it merely as a more efficient state-managed social economy; whether this is to be achieved by reform or revolution, the goal he sees is virtually the same. Even a cursory study of the current marxist periodicals should convince the reader that free communism is not taken very seriously by them, even as a far-off dream.

Now, we Libertarian Communists have often been charged with occupying ourselves mainly with the utopian aspects of communism and thereby neglecting the practical social struggles of the day. The relative merits of free communism and state socialism as the type of future society to be desired, it has been said, is an academic question. And indeed it might be, were we just debating about visions of a future many hundred years hence. But the undeniable fact is that in more than one country today the question "What kind of socialism do we want?" is of paramount interest and importance to the workers. The obvious cases of a degenerate U.S.S.R. with its state-socialist commissar-ocracy and a tragic, embattled Spain with Libertarian Communism partly achieved, need only be mentioned. Very few observers expected a libertarian revolution in Spain, or in fact any socialist revolution. And now, with Fascism and military dictatorship ominously threatening to engulf most European countries (and also spreading in the

Western Hemisphere like a plague) the lesson of the struggle in Spain, the spearhead of resistance against Fascism—that the fight against reaction requires the motivating force of something to fight for, that Fascism can in the last analysis be opposed only by social revolution—this lesson becomes the focal point of socialist struggles for the international working class today. Socialism, therefore, is no longer a vision of the future. It is on the order of the day.

In the first part of this article we noted briefly what the structural and moral foundations of a Libertarian Communist social order would be and we indicated that the vehicles for achieving such a social change (labor unions, etc.), the "shells of the new society within the old," would have to travel on the firm humanitarian ground of liberty, equality and fraternity. For, anybody can talk in the holy name of liberty, equality and fraternity (even the Fascists), but to make these a living part of a social movement, embodied in its very structure and daily activities, is the central task of social revolutionists. And in this respect the anarchist (Libertarian Communist) movement has more than amply demonstrated its superiority over the marxist movements. The latter have asked the workers to relinquish liberty for the present, to turn it over to the chosen leaders who would efficiently administer the social revolution for us, set up a transitional "workers state" and, sometime in the future, hand down to the workers on a silver platter a truly classless, stateless society. Indeed, the gradual abandonment by the marxists of the ideal of free socialism, one is impelled to conclude, has more than a little to do with their mechanistic theory of the marxist party and the state: the latter merely represents the class in power, and if a marxist party, *i. e.*, a working-class party, ran the state it could manipulate the social economy at will until it gradually became honest-to-goodness socialism. But the means has become an end in itself. And the tragic consequences thereof are evi-

dent in the complete bankruptcy of the marxist movements today.

Parties and Masses

A comparison of anarchist and marxist doctrines on the relation of the social revolutionary vanguard to the working-class mass organizations will further reveal the inherent anti-libertarian bias of the marxists and the necessity for a libertarian approach to the problem of revolutionary tactics. While the libertarians assign to the revolutionary labor unions the major role in social reconstruction the marxists feel that a political party (their party, of course) must be the main instrumentality of social change. This messianic notion of the marxists produces such arrogant conceit among them that a man like John Strachey, the intellectual leader of the British Communist Party, a very cautious and reserved writer, has the unmitigated gall to say that, "The Communist Party is the only organized body of persons who possess a knowledge of the science of social change." (*The Theory and Practice of Socialism*, page 475.) After telling us that he and his stooges are the only ones who know how to make the working class happy and secure, he proceeds to warn us, in his suave, honeyed manner, that when his clique becomes strong enough they will (a la Stalin) shove happiness down our throats whether we like it or not. In the same book he says (page 477): "Stalin has summed up the function of such an organization by saying that such political parties must perform for the working class the functions which a general staff performs for an army. . . . A working class which persists in possessing two or more general staffs . . . is not likely to enjoy much success." Obviously, all Stalinist talk about democracy can be considered as nothing but sheer demagoguery. For dictatorship by a clique is seen to be an integral part of their theory. That this logically yields just the opposite of socialism is a point that need not be stressed here. If the working class is to rely upon the wisdom of a political party at all then the workers might as well stop worrying altogether and leave everything to the generals. "Revolutionary" marxists have always made quite a point of this, even to the extent of making a principled virtue of militarization in the economic sphere. The brilliant, but unfortunate, Leon Trotsky becomes eloquent in describing his own scheme of "socialist" slavery. In his book *Dictatorship vs. Democracy*, published in 1920, Trotzky writes the following:

"The foundations of the militarization of labor are those forms of State compulsion without which the replacement of capitalist economy by the Socialist will forever remain an empty sound." (p. 141) "... We can have no way to Socialism except by the authoritative regulation of the economic forces and resources of the country, and the centralized distribution of labor power in harmony with the general State plan. The Labor State considers itself empowered to send every worker to the place where his work is necessary. And not one serious Socialist will begin to deny to the Labor State the right to lay its hand upon the worker who refuses to execute his labor duty." (p. 142) "... The young Socialist State requires trade unions, not for a struggle for better conditions of labor—that is the task of the social and State

organizations as a whole—but to organize the working class for the needs of production, to educate, discipline . . . in a word, hand in hand with the State, exercise their authority in order to lead the workers into the framework of a single economic plan, (p. 143) "... We still retain, and for a long time will retain, the system of wages."

Organized Labor Must Play Major Role

The damage done by this conception of socialism—both by indoctrinating the followers of marxism with a submissive, slavish psychology, and scaring away the rebellious liberty-loving worker from the very thought of socialism—is almost incalculable. But we do not believe that this is the only way to socialism. For there are important libertarian currents in present day society that give us more than a mere hope for the possibility of turning back the totalitarian tide. The task of the libertarian movement is to nurture these currents and help them flower into large-scale actions.

On the one hand we see numerous examples of the courageous action of workers in the elemental struggle to ameliorate their conditions. Oppressed toilers have in all stages of history made attempts to break their chains and in times of crisis, like these, such attempts can become conscious strivings towards a rearrangement of human relationships. On the other hand there is a natural progress in the sphere of social thought, a constant development of human moral and political ideals, which, taken together with scientific advances, can be formulated into a set of social and intellectual principles. Not a dogma or a collection of slogans, but an evolving, empirical social philosophy! That such currents exist cannot be denied. But a worker can be free only if he frees himself. And for a social ideal to become a reality it must permeate the mass of the people. The task of Libertarian Communism is to unite these two currents. Society cannot be free unless the individuals composing it are free. In fusing these two tendencies the rebellious worker becomes a conscious "idealist" and the ideal becomes a living reality.

The Libertarian Communist movement, therefore, has two sides: One, the libertarian movement itself, which unites those active militants whose devotion to the propagation of our ideas continues regardless of the degree of rebelliousness of the masses. The libertarian aspirations of mankind need a conscious, organized body to keep them alive. The other, the anarcho-syndicalist labor movement which is the main organ of struggle and means of social reconstruction for the workers. The anarchist must not only be in the forefront of the struggles of the anarcho-syndicalist unions; he must show them their primary role and help them guard their independence from all political entanglements. While the marxists want an obedient, grey mass of followers, for the anarchists the mass is the most active ingredient in the struggle for a new world.

Anarchists do not believe that revolutions can be created artificially. A social upheaval occurs when a state, in a crisis, can no longer maintain its authority. And at such a time the road which a social change will take

depends on the degree of conscious preparation on the part of the masses. Since we don't make revolutions to order, the degree to which Libertarian Communism will be instituted cannot be foretold. The nature of the period of transition will depend, among other things, upon the extent to which bourgeois ideology and remnants of bourgeois institutions will persist. However, the use of armed defense of working class institutions and the gradual peaceful elimination of the vestiges of capitalism must not be confused with the marxist "transitional" period. The politicians want to give us an all-powerful state-party which suppresses all other socialist opinions and tendencies except its own and sets up a new tyranny which is the kind of medicine that may

be worse than the disease it tried to cure.

By showing how to integrate the basic elements of civilized life, liberty, equality and fraternity, with all the phases of social struggles—the fight against capitalist oppression today, the fight against Fascism and war, the social revolution, and the revolutionary transition to Libertarian Communism—the Libertarian Communist movement offers a profound contribution to the humanitarian trends in civilization that make life worth living.

—S.M.

(Editors' note: Future issue of the Vanguard will contain articles dealing in detail with our program for the working-class today, anarchist tactics and our theory of the transitional period.)

IS CANADA GOING FASCIST?

by JACK FITZGERALD

A SPECTRE is haunting the Dominion of Canada—the spectre of communism. Sometimes his favorite haunting ground is Ontario, at present it is Quebec; but within these two provinces, containing the greater part of Canada's eleven million population, the red bogey is continually on the march.

In 1931 the bogey, in the person of Tim Buck, was found guilty of having revolutionary intentions and sentenced to the penitentiary. During the following year or two, Bennett, leader of the Conservative Federal Government, carried on a campaign of deportation of foreigners, while, in Ontario particularly the local Conservative machines governing the province and the City of Toronto maintained a campaign of red baiting. Newspaper headlines would reveal that the reds, in camps outside Toronto, were drilling hordes of children with rifles preparing them for a descent on the city. Battalions of police arrived instantly anyone attempted to make a speech in a park; and even the pinkest of socialist meetings were forbidden. Again in 1933 the bogey sneaked into the town of Stratford where some furniture workers had the audacity to form a trade union. Whereupon, to the gates of Stratford, with armed tanks, came the Government militia. But it was only a battle of gestures. The militia did not fire a shot nor did the Stratford workers. After that, Canadians were almost allowed to forget the spectre until recent events in Ontario and Quebec.

Who initiates all these campaigns against the reds? Is Canada going Fascist? Are the reds as strong as the clamour would seem to indicate? The last two questions we will try and answer later. A reply to the first question concerns the politicians and their masters.

Canada is a country with more than its share of governments. There are the provincial governments complete with ministers and cabinets, and, in the case of Quebec, with upper and lower houses. They have much wider scope than do the state apparatuses in America. Then, there is the big pow-wow, the Federal government. We will pass over the governor and lieutenant-governors.

In political parties, Canada has Conservatives, Liberals, and small groups. Conservatives and Liberals are roughly like Republicans and Democrats, except that in Canada it is more difficult to tell the difference between the two. For instance, the Liberal Party dominated Quebec politics for forty years, while, during the same period, the Conservatives ruled in Ontario. Until, almost simultaneously, Ontario went liberal under Hepburn and the Conservatives under Duplessis in Quebec made an alliance with a lesser grouping, changed their name to Nationalist, and took over the government. At the same time,

the Dominion government changed from Conservative to Liberal with the support of the same electors that put in the two major provincial governments. Yet the Federal government evidently dare not utter a reproving word to Quebec; Hepburn defies Meckenzie King, the Dominion prime minister; while Hepburn, the Liberal, and Duplessis, the Conservative, with their famous Ontario-Quebec axis, are political allies. When it comes to putting something over on the poorer provinces and evading tax burdens to provide relief for destitute Western farmers, these two allies gang up like Hitler and Mussolini and loudly shout "NO!"

There are further similarities between these chummy provincial premiers and the European dictators; witness Hepburn's tirades against the C.I.O. and the Oshawa strikers, and the Padlock Law of Duplessis.

Hepburn's outbursts during the Oshawa incident closely resembled Hitler's hysteria over weightier matters. Actually, the Oshawa workers went about their strike with peace in their hearts and were more amused than anything else by the violent intentions of the young "Hitler," who, in short order, fired two cabinet ministers who mildly suggested that there might be something to the workers side of the case, mobilized the provincial police, enlisted a special militia, issued them uniforms and commenced drilling them in the Toronto Armouries. Undeterred, the Oshawa workers went on with their strike and affiliated to the C.I.O. Hepburn raved about foreign (i.e. American) agitators coming to the land of the Maple Leaf to organize locally against General Motors of America. For a time, the mere mention of the three letters C.I.O. produced among "good" Ontarians almost as much alarm as the letters I.W.W. once did with more cause over the whole continent. But the Oshawa workers only laughed, obtained a small raise, and went back to work without throwing a pebble, leaving Hepburn with a small Fascist militia on his hands and nothing for it to do. The special militia has since been disbanded.

Since then, the limelight has shifted to Quebec where another *enfant terrible* is playing dictator. Fascism is proudly proclaimed in Quebec but it does not startle Quebec itself nearly as much as it does other parts of the world because it is a question whether Quebec has at any time in its history been far removed from the extreme form of authoritarianism known as Fascism. Why then the new Fascist names for the same old repression? Why the Padlock Law?

The real answer to these questions is that in the French speaking province, the Roman Catholic church occupies a position of influence without equal in any other part of the world.

It is the Church that educates and tells the people how they may vote. It is the Church which sanctions the open, French Nationalist, anti-English, anti-Jewish, propaganda of Adrian Arcand, leader of the Quebec Fascists, only a left wing minority in the government, however, and without anything like the public support that rumor says. It is the Church that says to Duplessis, "Pass a Padlock Law." Duplessis, Adrian Arcand, and Cardinal Villeneuve are close friends and co-operators, but the Cardinal is "God the father" in this trinity.

And why has the Church been condoning the Fascist talk and action? There are a number of reasons.

Firstly, because labour intimidation and repression are always on the order of the day in Quebec. Secondly, because nationalist legislation and talk of separatism for French Canadians strengthens the bargaining position of Quebec in federal affairs. Quebec needs to bargain because big finance, behind the federal government, is more a power over than a power in Quebec. The Church probably owns half the real estate in the province, but the railways, commercial institutions, banks and factories are predominantly under the control of English speaking and not French Canadian citizens. Thirdly, the Roman Catholic Church, in its press and on its radio programs, shows a violent emotional disturbance over events in Spain. The church sees red not because there is much red in Quebec to see but because there has been in Spain.

Moreover, the Padlock Law can be used not only against "Reds" but against anything not Catholic or French Canadian. The law forbids the propaganda of anything the authorities might consider as Communism. Duplessis has said that a definition of Communism was deliberately omitted from the Act "because Communism can be felt."

Enough has been said to show that Roman Catholicism is behind events in Quebec. Outside of the province Catholic pressure on Canadian governments is also marked. The Federal Radio Commission, for instance, lets them boss the Canadian radio. Father Lamphier, the Father Coughlin of Toronto, is given broadcasting facilities to support Franco, Mussolini, the bombing of Guernica and everything reactionary, but the Protestant Rev. Mr. Zeidman is barred from using the radio for political talks of the most mildly democratic kind. In return for the vote it controls the Catholic Church demands big payment from the politicians it seats, which the rest of the population divided in all directions, religious and otherwise, cannot do. Nearly half the population of Canada is Catholic. Catholics multiply rapidly so that a Catholic majority is not far off. Catholic influence is the most likely rallying force for Fascism in Canada. What are the forces for opposition to Fascism or for that matter Capitalism in any form?

In the parliamentary arena are the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and the Communist Party avowing a socialist objective. The C.C.F. has three or four members in the Federal parliament, an odd member or two in several provinces, and, together with the Socialists, a larger sprinkling in British Columbia. The Communists have one member in the Manitoba Provincial Parliament and an odd representative in the municipal field, including two Aldermen in the City of Toronto. If parliaments are any barometer of how people think, it must be admitted that the combined C.C.F. and Communist voting strength hardly constitute the Communist menace that Hepburn and Duplessis fear so much. Nor can it be said that the menace is represented by the fact that, in the prairie province of Alberta, the electors put into office a government dedicated to a plan to distribute purchasing power by means of a futile Social Credit scheme. Perhaps the menace is to be found in the economic organizations of the workers. What is their strength?

An examination of statistics will show that Canada is not strong in trade union organization. In spite of the recent wave of organization which sent new sections of Canadian labour into the C.I.O., there still remain, in vital industries, large sections of workers unorganized. As for the organized, it is to be

remembered that organization is under bureaucratic strangle holds of four different kinds: the parochial national unions, the most conservative of A. F. of L. unions, C.I.O. unions, and in Quebec, Catholic Unions (with one or two exceptions, notably that of the dress makers in Montreal organized in the International.) The forms of organization named hardly represent labour organization at its best, and yet the picture is not entirely black. There are parts of Canada known for working class militancy. The miners, from Nova Scotia to British Columbia, have had struggles in which blood has flowed. Winnipeg had its One Big Union and a general strike in 1919. During the recent wave of strikes, Canadian workers showed that they are capable of spontaneous action. Even French textile workers, under the yoke of the Catholic Unions, acted independently in one or two cases, and, in at least one town in Quebec, went as far as to stone their leaders and set fire to their own union headquarters. But these incidents still leave the country a long way from communism in the best sense of the word.

JAPANESE ANARCHISTS OPPOSE WAR

We quote excerpts from a letter written by some of our Japanese comrades to their comrades in China. The simple outline of their revolutionary anti-war activities in the face of the severest repression is an eloquent testimonial of the kind of working-class solidarity that alone can halt the activities of the imperialists' bandits. For obvious reasons we quote only part of the letter.

Comrades:

Since the war broke out, more than three hundred of our comrades, Japanese and Koreans, affiliated with the "Black Youth" and "Anarcho-Syndicalist Federation" were arrested in Tokyo, Osaka, Yokohama, and other cities, on the ground that they translated and printed the publications of the I.A.M.B., and distributed them all at the above mentioned cities.

In Tokyo, our comrades of the Printing Syndicate were very active. Some of them refused to serve in the army and the others were doing work among the soldiers. And now, we don't hear anything from them; we are most certain that they were murdered by the militarists. However, we know that our organizations in the capital of Korea are very active.

Although the war broke up our communication of information it can not, and absolutely will not cut off the real solidarity of the anti-militarists and the anti-capitalists in our two countries.

(signed) K. B.

Emma Goldman Greets Vanguard Group

For some time now we have been planning to have a page in "Vanguard" for correspondence but we are always cramped for space. In this issue we have even had to omit important notices and news of the movement. However, we feel that our readers would be especially interested in reading what our valiant comrade Emma Goldman has to say about our work. The following is a brief excerpt from her letter.

London, March 4th, 1938.

Dear Comrades of the Vanguard Group:

While I have not written you for a long time, I have not lost interest in your work, especially in your splendid publication. I have enjoyed every number. Often I wanted to write to tell you how very highly I consider the little magazine and its forceful tone . . . I am keenly interested in everything going on in my erstwhile country and field of activities.

With affectionate greetings to all of you, Salud,

EMMA GOLDMAN,

G.P.U. INTRIGUES IN AMERICA

THAT the G.P.U. maintains its spies in foreign countries has been known to many, but it was generally assumed that their main activities centered upon the tasks of informing on and denouncing each other or keeping track of the latest Moscow line. But several occurrences in the past few years have revealed the astonishing and horrible fact that the Stalinist octopus has extended its tentacles far beyond the courtroom walls and the G.P.U. dungeons of Moscow. Its human victims are seized on the shores of Geneva, on the Barricades of Barcelona, even on the streets of New York, and transported to the inky black hell of the "Socialist Fatherland." No more can any revolutionist or truly honest liberal sit back complacently and view the degenerate regime from the distance. Once safety from Moscow was measured by the distance from that unhappy paradise. Today we are faced with the astonishing fact that no one anywhere, who is too well-informed, is safe from Stalin's international gangsters.

The recent case of Robinson-Rubens and the disappearance of Miss Juliet Stuart Pointz reveal the methods of the G.P.U.; how the Moscow trials are prepared, how witnesses and "confessions" may be obtained and how undesirables are disposed of.

Stalin prepares his trials not only with the purpose of disposing of enemies, shifting blame to the shoulders of unfortunate rivals, future and past, for the mistakes of his regime, but with the view also of influencing foreign policy and setting the stage for military alliances. It is no secret that he fervently hopes for such an alliance with the U.S. against Japan. If the foreign office cannot do it, then maybe the G.P.U. can? The intrigue apparently involves a cooked-up Japanese plot against America and the unfortunate confessors will be the Fascist agents of Japan—the Robinson-Rubens couple.

But the facts that have been revealed have exploded the well laid plans of the bureaucracy. Many months ago the Soviet government let it be known that they were seeking for a Robinson couple. The couple obliged and arrived at Moscow, leaving America as the Rubens and coming into the U.S.S.R., for the benefit of the G.P.U., as the Robinsons. That they were G.P.U. agents, being sacrificed may be incontrovertibly shown:

They applied for birth certificates in the name of long dead children and used an address on 17th St. N. Y., which was the hangout of Stalinists and G.P.U. agents. They obtained their passports thru the intervention of one Sharfin, a member of Section 15, Bronx C.P. The passports were received in care of Helen Ravitch, also a communist at the Drama Travel League, who is the wife of Dr. S. Bernstein, personal physician to Wm. Z. Foster, communist leader, and to the Stalinist I.W.O. The G.P.U. got them faked passports—and their friends described them as "communists." Mr. Alfred Bingham, editor of *Common Sense*, has received a letter from a close friend of Mrs. Rubens, a resident of Miami, Florida, stating categorically that Mrs. Rubens was a fanatical communist. Mrs. Rubens participated in communist unemployed demonstrations and was hailed into court for her activities. And to add the appearance of authenticity to the trial the couple visited the West Coast where Japan would presumably have its interest centered and saw the sights of Mexico so that Trotzky could be implicated. Thus the plot was laid. The conduct of the Soviet authorities offers further evidence. First came denials and then affirmation of the arrest. After much pressure and delay an "interview" was granted to the American *attaché*, in which Mrs. Rubens refused American aid. But to Moscow's dismay, the woman has definitely been established as an Ameri-

can citizen, and as a result the case was investigated by the U. S. government.

Juliet Stuart Pointz' disappearance has not received the attention from the press nor from radicals and "liberals" that it should have. Why are the latter silent about her? Where is Juliet Pointz?

Startling circumstantial evidence indicates that Miss Pointz was either kidnapped or lured to Russia from New York by agents of the G.P.U.

The woman was an outstanding Stalinist leader, for years serving as a connecting link between the American Communist Party and Moscow. Miss Pointz held an important position in the G.P.U. and when her loyalty to Stalin waned a short time ago, the bureaucracy feared she would disclose some of the secret methods of Moscow. Juliet Stuart Pointz disappeared on or about June 5th, 1937. *Her disappearance aroused no public interest on the part of the Communist Party. A high official of the Party even denied that she was known to the Party!*

Associated with Miss Pointz in her G.P.U. activities were several other agents who could probably shed much light on her disappearance. One George Mink, late Philadelphia taxi-driver and petty crook, latter G.P.U. chief in Barcelona, under the name of Alfred Hertz, carrying a faked American passport. Mink has been named as the assassin of Camillo Berneri and Barbieri by Carlo Tresca on the basis of conclusive evidence presented by our comrades of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. in Spain. Miss Pointz was seen with Mink as late as 1936 in Moscow. Another G.P.U. agent who was in the company of Miss Pointz *the week of her disappearance* and an ideal man to do the "job" because he had known her for many years, (it was he who had first introduced her to the Communist Party) was Schachno Epstein, former editor of the Communist Yiddish daily, *Freiheit*.

Before the Russian Revolution, Epstein was an editor of *Gerechtigkeit*, the Yiddish organ of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. Miss Pointz was then employed in the same union and the two were intimate friends. When the revolution broke out Epstein went to Russia, joined the communists to save his neck and was sent back to America as Joseph Berson. Later he became editor of the *Freiheit*. In two or three years he was recalled to Russia. As it happens to anyone in the Russian system who can be of use, accusations are made, confessions given and, before this modern era of mass murder, exile and recantation, would usually be the sequence of events. Thus Epstein was denounced as a Trotzkyite and after a short period of exile he became an agent of the G.P.U. as the price for his liberty and life, ready to do whatever they bid, just as the unfortunate Robinson-Rubens couple.

Miss Pointz returned from Moscow in 1936 disillusioned and therefore dangerous to the Party. "It is only natural that her life long friend, Epstein, should be given the new "job." He was seen in her company by several persons just prior to her disappearance.

On August 17th, 1937, Epstein sailed from America on the "Queen Mary." He told Julius Hochmah, general manager of the Dressmakers Joint Board of the I.L.G.W.U., who was travelling in the same boat that he was going back and forth from Russia to keep valid his American Citizenship status as Schachno Epstein. The list of passengers published by the "Queen Mary" showed no such name. It is a fact that he was travelling under the name of Stone—with a false passport. (Stone was on the list.) In the Jewish circles of the United

(Continued on back cover)

THE STUDENT IN POLITICS

by STEPHEN CRAIG

AT THE start of the new year, in accordance with a custom set by its predecessors, the American Student Union (ASU) threw overboard all the accumulated baggage with which it set out at its formation in 1935; and commenced what seems to be a strenuous effort to establish itself in the good graces of the powers that be, the school and governmental authorities. For the ASU came into being, no doubt, as a strategic method of glossing over the spirit of political factionalism between the National Students League (NSL), and the Students League for Industrial Democracy (SLID). Factionalism was not only preventing any sort of cooperation between the Communist controlled NSL and the socialist controlled SLID—but was also a prime factor in the alienation of non-partisan youth from any type of student organization whatsoever. I say 'glossing over' rather than 'removing' for this is precisely what was done. A platform was developed with planks of such generality that a socially-minded person could endorse at least one of them—and then, to cap the situation, a proviso was added to the effect that any student subscribing to any one or more of these principles would be accepted as a member of the A.S.U. irrespective of his viewpoint on the others. Among these principles were the following: for the Oxford pledge (which expressed opposition to any and all imperialist wars); against racial discrimination; for the American Youth Act; against fascism. Since none of these planks nor any of the others in any way remedied the existing political discord; and since the leading spirits of this present-day phoenix were young Communists and Socialists—after the store shine had worn off the new organization—the old fight for supremacy was on again. The amalgamation had succeeded only in increasing the number of organized students by a quantity ascribable to certain religious organizations which had seen their way to agreeing to some of the "ultra-radical" points raised in the program of the A.S.U., and to a small number of newcomers who would probably have joined either of the now defunct organizations. As a result of the inevitable intensified rivalries and the absence of a fighting program, both the spirit and activity in the organization fell to a disheartening level.

A further result of political wire-pulling in the A.S.U. was clearly evidenced in the split which occurred recently at the Vassar convention of the A.S.U. The greatest controversy arose over the Ludlow amendment, with the majority of the delegates in favor of selling the Oxford Pledge down the river, and replacing it with a fond hope that peace could be kept among the growling imperialist wolves by a policy of "collective security" in line with the stand of our very socialistically inclined President Roosevelt. In view of the recent gigantic appropriations for strengthening the navy, which our patriotic student jingoists did not find necessary to oppose, Roosevelt made no mistake in sending the A.S.U. convention a telegram of congratulations. Under the pressure of the Young Communist League, who predominated at the convention, the fraud of "collective security" was swallowed by the representatives of the organized students. There are other points which might be seized upon by any thoughtful observer, but none, quite so pernicious as the totally fallacious, single argument advanced to support "collective security," stating categorically that but one alternative exists, namely, that of isolation. Were we to grant this absurd argument (in which, by the way, it has never been found necessary to mention the methods whereby "collective security" will attain its ends) even then it could not follow that the Oxford Pledge represents an isolationist policy in the slightest degree. And the alternative of direct action by the international working-class to stop war is not considered important enough by the Stalins to deserve even a mention!

But Stalinism is not finding it so easy to sell its working-class following to the war-mongers. Proletarian organizations which make opportunistic compromises that transcend their class nature

tend to lose their effectiveness and mass appeal. The attempt to turn an anti-war student movement into a thinly-veiled adjunct of the Stalinist-bourgeois war propaganda machine is having a devastating effect upon the vitality of our organized student body. The A.S.U. is now weak and powerless and a growing number of students are becoming aware of the true nature of its present course.

Not only do its treacherous war policies cause disaffection, but the organizational structure of the A.S.U. is the topic of considerable sarcastic comment.

Paradoxically enough the A.S.U. is an anomaly among organizations, being at the same time both centralized and disorganized! Locally, it is disorganized since there are very few discussion and activity linkages among the individual chapters; while it is beyond dispute that the national officials of the A.S.U. find it possible to execute their plans without ever having to put them to the test of a referendum.

It must be realized that the only significant base upon which a student organization can be built is one which is of fundamental and immediate interest to the great majority of students. Also, the form of organization must permit of a high degree of coordination without impairing full democratic control. Now, of fundamental interest to the student is close affiliation with the industrial world, since the students of today are the workers of the future. In Spain, the student and youth organizations participate actively in many phases of the work of the C.N.T., the anarcho-syndicalist labor union. But they have also a task which is more directly their own, namely, assisting in the control and operation of the entire school system together with the educational workers syndicate.

In industry, and in agriculture too, tremendous strides have been taken; (Ed. Note—details of this and the above can be obtained in 'Spanish Revolution' and back numbers of 'Vanguard'.) nor would we be at fault were we to ascribe the great majority of these to a successful application of functional decentralism. This form of organization obtains a maximum of democracy by rigid insistence on complete control of the entire organization from below by means of short term, recall, and referendum, as well as by its emphasis on autonomy for the individual units of the organization.

Still another feature of this method of organization is that when once put into operation it creates a 'shell of the new order in the old'; and at its inception it will not repel those American students who are opposed, even to a suspicion of radicalism. Yet, once in the organization, they will be drawn into truly revolutionary activity by the natural progression of events.

The non-working class appeal of the A.S.U. tends to destroy the very reason for its existence, namely, the cementing and extension of its contacts with the worker's organizations in their struggles for better living conditions. The students, armed with better facilities of education, and soon to become (for the most part) an integral part of the proletariat, should be the vanguard in this struggle which is basically that of socialism. By opposing this course they place themselves and the workers in the mire of patriotism and become supporters of capitalism. The libertarian youth will fight this treacherous tendency among the students and will exert all their efforts in directing it along the lines of anti-statism and anti-capitalism through solid links with the working-class.

It is only through emulation of our Spanish comrades, both students and workers, with, of course, a rational consideration of the necessity for many changes in details, that the students of the United States will be able to attain their objectives of peace and progressive education, successfully avoiding the major catastrophe which overtook us in 1917.

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

by RUDOLF ROCKER

(The following essay is part of a chapter taken from the manuscript of Rudolf Rocker's forthcoming book "Anarcho-Syndicalism" to be published shortly in England by Suker and Warburg.—The Editors)

WITH the founding of the *International Workingmen's Association* there was a revival of the doctrines of a militant and constructive Socialism, and after that they spread internationally. The International, which exercised such a powerful influence on the intellectual development of the body of European workers, and which even to-day has not lost its magnetic attraction in the Latin countries, was brought into being by the collaboration of the English and French workers in 1864. It was the first great attempt to unite the workers of all countries in an international alliance which should open the path for the social and economic liberation of the working class. It was from the beginning distinguished from all the political forms of organization of bourgeois radicalism by pointing out that the economic subservience of the workers to the owners of the raw materials and the tools of production was the source of the slavery which revealed itself in social misery, intellectual degradation, and political oppression. For this reason it proclaimed in its statutes the economic liberation of the working class as the great purpose to which every political movement must be subordinated.

Since the most important object was to unite the different factions of the social movement in Europe for this purpose, the organizational structure of the vast workers' alliance was based on the principles of Federalism, which guaranteed to each particular school the possibility of working for this common goal in accordance with their own convictions and on the basis of the peculiar conditions in each country. The International did not stand for any defined social system; it was rather the expression of a movement whose theoretical principles slowly matured in the practical struggles of everyday life and took clearer form at every stage of its vigorous growth. The first need was to bring the workers of the different countries closer to one another, to make them understand that their economic and social enslavement was everywhere traceable to the same causes, and that consequently the manifestation of their solidarity must reach beyond the artificial boundaries of the states, since it is not tied up with the alleged interests of the nation, but with the lot of their class.

The practical efforts of its sections to end the importation of foreign strike-breakers in times of industrial warfare, and to furnish material and moral assistance to militant workers in every country by international collections, contributed more to the development of an international consciousness among the workers than the loveliest theories could have done. They gave the workers a practical education in social philosophy. It was a fact that after every considerable strike the membership of the International soared mightily, and the conviction of its natural coherence and homogeneity was constantly strengthened.

Thus the International became the great school mistress of the Socialist labour movement and confronted the capitalist world with the world of international labour, which was being ever more firmly welded together in the bonds of proletarian solidarity. The first two congresses of the International, at Geneva in 1866, and at Lausanne in 1867, were characterized by a spirit of comparative moderation. They were the first tentative efforts of a movement which was only slowly becoming clear as to its task, and was seeking for a definite expression. But the great strike movements in France, Belgium, Switzerland, and other countries, gave the International a powerful forward impetus and revolutionized the minds of the workers, a change to which the powerful revival during that period of the democratic ideas, which had suffered a severe setback after the collapse of the revolutions of 1848-49, contributed not a little.

The congress at Brussels, in 1868, was animated by a totally

different spirit from that of its two predecessors. It was felt that the workers everywhere were awakening to new life and were becoming constantly surer of the object of their endeavours. The congress, by a large majority, declared itself for the collectivizing of the land and other means of production, and called upon the sections in the different countries to go exhaustively into this question, so that at the next congress a clear decision could be reached. With this the International took on an outspokenly Socialistic character, which was most happily complemented by the outstandingly libertarian tendency of the workers in the Latin countries. The resolution to prepare the workers for a general strike to meet the danger of a threatened war, because they were the only class that could by energetic intervention prevent the organized mass murder, also testified to the spirit by which the International was permeated at that time.

At the congress in Basel, in 1869, the ideational development of the great workers' alliance reached its zenith. The congress concerned itself only with questions which had an immediate connection with the economic and social problems of the working class. It ratified the resolutions which the Brussels congress had adopted concerning the collective ownership of the means of production, leaving the question of the organization of labour open. But the interesting debates at the Basel congress show very plainly that the advanced sections of the International had already been giving attention to this question, and had, moreover, come to very clear conclusions about it. This was revealed particularly in the utterances concerning the importance of trade union organizations to the working class. In the report upon this question which Eugène Hins laid before the congress in the name of the Belgian Federation, there was presented for the first time a wholly new point of view, which had an unmistakable resemblance to certain ideas of Owen and the English labour movement of the 30's.

In order to make a correct estimate of this one must remember that the various schools of state-socialism of that time attributed to the trade unions either no importance at all or at best only a subordinate one. The French Blanquists saw in the trade unions merely a reform movement, with which they wished to have nothing to do, as their immediate aim was a Socialist dictatorship. Ferdinand Lassalle directed all his activities toward welding the workers into a political party and was an outspoken opponent of all trade union endeavors, in which he saw only a hindrance to the political evolution of the working class. Marx, and more especially his friends of that period in Germany, recognized, it is true, the necessity of the trade unions for the achievement of certain betterments within the capitalist social system, but they believed that their rôle would be exhausted with this, and that they would disappear along with capitalism, since the transition to Socialism could be guided only by a proletarian dictatorship.

At Basel this idea underwent for the first time a thorough critical examination. In the Belgian report which Hins laid before the congress, the views expressed in which were shared by the delegates from Spain, the Swiss Jura, and a considerable part of the French sections, it was clearly set forth that the trade union organizations of the workers not only had a right to existence within the present society, but they were even more to be regarded as the social cells of a coming Socialist order, and it was, therefore, the task of the International to educate them for this service. In accordance with this the congress adopted the following resolution:

"The Congress declares that all workers should strive to establish associations for resistance in their various trades. As soon as a trade union is formed the unions in the same trade are to be notified so that the formation of national alliances in the industries may be begun. These alliances shall be charged

with the duty of collecting all material relating to their industry, of advising about measures to be executed in common, and of seeing that they are carried out, to the end, that the present wage system may be replaced by the federation of free producers. The Congress directs the General Council to provide for the alliance of the trade unions of all countries."

In his argument for the resolution proposed by the committee Hins explained that "by this double form of organization of local workers' associations and general alliances for each industry on the one hand the political administration of the committees, and on the other, the general representation of labour, regional, national and international, will be provided for. *The councils of the trade and industrial organizations will take the place of the present government, and this representation of labour will do away, once and forever, with the governments of the past.*"

This new and fruitful idea grew out of the recognition that every new economic form must be accompanied by a new political form of the social organism and could only attain practical expression in this. Therefore, Socialism also had to have a special political form of expression, within which it may become a living thing, and they thought they had found this form in a *system of labour councils*. The workers in the Latin countries, in which the International found its principal support, developed their movement on the basis of economic fighting organizations and Socialist propaganda groups, and worked in the spirit of the Basel resolutions.

As they recognized in the state the political agent and defender of the possessing classes, they did not strive at all for the conquest of political power, but for the overthrow of the state and of every form of political power, in which with sure instinct they saw the requisite preliminary condition for all tyranny and all exploitation. They did, therefore, not choose to imitate the bourgeois classes and set up a political party, thus preparing the way for a new class of professional politicians, whose goal was the conquest of the governing power. They understood that, along with the monopoly of property, the monopoly of power must also be destroyed, if complete reshaping of social life was to be achieved. Proceeding from their recognition that the lordship of man over man had had its day, they sought to familiarize themselves with the administration of things. So to the state politics of the parties they opposed the economic policy of the workers. They understood that the re-organization of society on a Socialist pattern must be carried out in various branches of industry and in the departments of agrarian production; of this understanding was born the idea of a system of labour councils.

It was this same idea which inspired large sections of the Russian workers and peasants at the outbreak of the revolution, even if the idea had never been thought out so clearly and systematically in Russia as in the sections of the First International. Under Tsarism the Russian workers lacked the requisite preparation for this. But Bolshevism put an abrupt end to this fruitful idea. For the despotism of dictatorship stands in irreconcilable contradiction to the constructive idea of the council system, that is, to a Socialist reconstruction of society by the producers themselves. The attempt to combine the two by force could only lead to that soulless bureaucracy which has been so disastrous for the Russian Revolution. The council system brooks no dictatorship, as it proceeds from totally different assumptions. In it is embodied the will from below, the creative energy of the toiling masses. In dictatorship, however, lives only barren compulsion from above, which will suffer no creative activity and proclaims blind submission as the highest law for all. The two cannot exist together. In Russia dictatorship proved victorious. Hence there are no more soviets there. All that is left of them is the name and a gruesome caricature of its original meaning.

The council system for labour embraces a large part of the economic forms employed by a constructive Socialism which of its own accord operates and produces to meet all natural re-

quirements. It was the direct result of a fruitful development of ideas growing out of the Socialist labour movement. This particular idea rose from the effort to provide a concrete basis for the realization of Socialism. This basis was seen to lie in the constructive employment of every efficient human being. But dictatorship is an inheritance from bourgeois society, the traditional precipitate of French Jacobinism, which was dragged into the proletarian movement by the so-called Baboeuvists and later taken over by Marx and his followers. The idea of the council system is intimately intergrown with Socialism and is unthinkable without it; dictatorship, however, has nothing whatever in common with Socialism, and at best can only lead to the most barren of state capitalism.

Dictatorship is a definite form of state power; the state in state of siege. Like all other advocates of the state idea, so also the advocates of dictatorship proceed from the assumption that any alleged advance and every temporary necessity must be forced upon the people from above. This assumption alone makes dictatorship the greatest obstacle to any social revolution, the proper element of which is the free initiative and constructive activity of the people. Dictatorship is the negation of organic development, of natural building from below upwards, it is the proclamation of the wardship of the toiling people, a guardianship forced upon the masses by a tiny minority. *Even if its supporters are animated by the very best intentions*, the iron logic of the facts will always drive them into the camp of extremist despotism. Russia has given us the most instructive example of this. And the pretence that the so-called *dictatorship of the proletariat* is something different, because we have here to do with the dictatorship of a class, not the dictatorship of individuals, deceives no earnest critic; it is only a sophisticated trick to fool simpletons. Such a thing as the dictatorship of a class is utterly unthinkable, since there will always be involved merely the dictatorship of a particular party which takes it upon itself to speak *in the name of a class*, just as the bourgeoisie justified any despotic proceeding *in the name of the people*.

The idea of a council system for labour was the practical overthrow of the state idea as a whole; it stands, therefore, in frank antagonism to any form of dictatorship, which must always have in view the highest development of the power of the state. The pioneers of this idea in the First International recognized that economic equality without political and social liberty is unthinkable; for this reason they were firmly convinced that the liquidation of all institutions of political power must be the first task of the social revolution, so as to make any new form of exploitation impossible. They believe that the workers' International was destined gradually to gather all effective workers into its ranks, and at the proper time to overthrow the economic despotism of the possessing classes, and along with all the political coercive institutions of the capitalist state, and to replace these by a new order of things. This conviction was held by all libertarian sections of the International. Bakunin expressed it in the following words:

"Since the organization of the International has as its goal, not the setting up of new states or despots, but the radical destruction of every separate sovereignty, it must have an essentially different character from the organization of the state. To just the degree that the latter is authoritarian, artificial, and violent, alien and hostile to the natural development of the interests and the instincts of the people, to that same degree must the organization of the International be free, natural, and in every respect in accord with those interests and instincts. But what is the natural organization of the masses? It is one based on the different occupations of their actual daily life, on their various kinds of work, organization according to their occupations, trade organizations. When all industries, including the various branches of agriculture, are represented in the International, its organization, the organization of the masses of the people, will be finished."

From this line of thought arose likewise the idea of opposing to the bourgeois parliaments a *Chamber of Labour*, which proceeded from the ranks of the Belgian Internationalists. These labour chambers were to represent the organized labour of every trade and industry, and were to concern themselves with all questions of social economy and economic organization on a socialist basis, in order to prepare practically for the taking over by the organized workers of the means of production, and in this spirit to provide for the intellectual training of the producers. In addition these bodies were to pass judgment from the workers' point of view on all questions brought up in the bourgeois parliaments which were of interest to the workers, so as to contrast the policies of bourgeois society with the views of the workers. Max Nettlau has given to the public in his book, *Der Anarchismus von Proudhon zu Kropotkin*, a hitherto unknown passage from one of Bakunin's manuscripts that is highly indicative of Bakunin's views on this question:

"... All this practical and vital study of social science by the workers themselves in their trade sections and in these chambers will, and already has, engendered in them the unanimous, well-considered, theoretically and practically demonstrable conviction that the serious, final, complete liberation of the workers is possible only upon one condition, that of the appropriation of capital, that is, of raw material and all the tools of labour including land, by the whole body of workers... The organization of the trade sections, their federation in the International, and their representation by the Chambers of Labour, not only create a great academy, in which the workers of the International, combining theory and practice, can and must study economic science, they also bear in themselves the living germs of the new social order, which is to replace the bourgeois world. They are creating not only the ideas but also the facts of the future itself..."

These ideas were at that time generally disseminated in the sections of the International in Belgium, Holland, the Swiss Jura, France and Spain, and gave to the Socialism of the great workers' alliance a peculiar character, which with the development of political labour parties in Europe was for a considerable time almost completely forgotten, and only in Spain never exhausted its power to win converts, as recent events in that country have so clearly shown. They found active advocates in men like James Guillaume, Adhémar Schewitzguébel, Eugène Varlin, Louis Pindy, César De Paepe, Eugène Hins, Hector Denis, Guillaume De Greef, Victor Arnould, R. Farga Pellicer, G. Sentifión, Anselmo Lorenzo, to mention here only the best-known names, all men of excellent reputation in the International. The fact is that the whole intellectual development of the International is to be ascribed to the enthusiasm of these libertarian elements in it, and received no stimulus from either the state Socialist factions in Germany and Switzerland or pure Trades Unionism in England.

So long as the International pursued these general lines, and for the rest respected the right of decision of the separate federations, as was provided in its statutes, it exercised an irresistible influence over the organized workers. But that changed at once when Marx and Engels began to use their position in the London General Council to commit the separate federations to parliamentary action. This occurred first at the unhappy London Conference of 1871. This behaviour was in sharp violation not only of the spirit but also of the statutes of the International. It could but encounter the united resistance of all the libertarian elements in the International, the more so as the question had never previously been brought before a congress for consideration.

Shortly after the London Conference the Jura Federation published the historic circular of Sonvillier, which protested in determined and unequivocal words against the arrogant presumption of the London General Council. But the congress at

The Hague in 1872, in which a majority had been artificially created by the employment of the dirtiest and most reprehensible methods, crowned the work begun by the London Conference of transforming the International into an electoral machine. In order to obviate any misunderstanding the Blanquist, Edouard Vaillant, in his argument for the resolution of political power by the working class, explained that "as soon as this resolution has been adopted by the Congress and so incorporated in the Bible of the International, it will be the duty of every member to follow it under penalty of expulsion." By this Marx and his followers directly provoked the open split in the International with all its disastrous consequences for the development of the labour movement, and inaugurated the period of parliamentary politics which of natural necessity led to the intellectual stagnation and moral degeneration in the Socialist movement which we can observe to-day in most countries.

Soon after the Hague Congress the delegates of the most important and energetic federations of the International met in the anti-authoritarian congress in St. Imier, which declared all the resolutions adopted at the Hague null and void. From then on dates the split in the Socialist camp between the advocates of direct revolutionary action and the spokesmen for parliamentary politics, which with the lapse of time has grown constantly wider and more unbridgeable. Marx and Bakunin were merely the most prominent representatives of the opposed factions in this struggle between two different conceptions of the fundamental principles of Socialism. But it would be a big mistake to try to explain this struggle as merely a conflict between two personalities; it was the antagonism between two sets of ideas which gave to this struggle its real importance, and still gives it to-day. That Marx and Engels gave such a spiteful and personal character to the dissension was a disaster. The International had room for every faction, and a continuous discussion of the different views could only have contributed to their clarification. But the effect to make all schools of thought subservient to one particular school, one which, moreover, represented only a small minority in the International, could but lead to a cleavage to the decline of the alliance of workers, could but destroy those promising germs which were of such great importance to the labour movement in every land.

A LETTER FROM A CLOTHING WORKER

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union of America has a reputation for being one of the most "progressive" unions in the country. But how well its vaunted progressivism measures up to its practices is something that would make a very revealing story; one that should interest every union member and friend of honest unionism. A striking illustration of the power of its bureaucratic officials is presented in the letter we are herewith printing, that was sent us by a former member of the A.C.W.U. of A. The vile perversion of trade-unionism to the point where a worker is deprived by a union official of the right to earn a living because she refused to accept non-union working conditions is a challenge that must not go unanswered. Since the case of Jennie Cohen is apparently not the only one of its kind, and has not been given publicity in any labor paper except "The Industrial Worker" (I.W.W.), we want to draw it to the attention of the public, in general, and the members of the Amalgamated, in particular, who should immediately launch a vigorous protest and investigation.

—THE EDITORS.

To the Editors of the Vanguard:

Three years ago I went to work at Rosman & Sheer's shop. As a faithful union member I regularly attended meetings of the local. Often I heard Brother Gold, trade manager of local 25, and Brother Hollander, General Manager, appeal to the workers not to break union regulations against overtime. In my shop they worked three and four hours overtime besides Saturdays. So one Friday I went to the union office to inform

the Business Agent, Brother Weiner, as to what was going on. He was out, but an investigating committee was sent and found the shop working full blast. On Monday morning I came to work. The manager of the shop, Morris Kneitel, refused to let me work. He said, "Go to Weiner, he will tell you why." When I went to Brother Weiner to ask for an explanation, he declared, "You started all the trouble, and you, yourself will have to take the consequences. I won't do anything for you." I then went to Brother Gold who refused to see me. But things became worse. I was being persecuted. They encouraged some of the women workers to pick fights with me, promising them better working conditions for their dirty work. I was again sent away from the shop. Weiner again refused to do anything for me. I was again reinstated by Brother Hollander.

Realizing that they could not take my job away, they made it unbearable for me. . . . And now comes the climax of this scandalous affair.

A presser by the name of Sam Feldman, works in the shop of Rosman & Sheer. As a member of Local No. 3, he signed an affidavit, in which Weiner and the chairman were accused of taking graft, extorting money from him under all sorts of pretenses. I was accused by Weiner of telling the presser to make out this affidavit, I was fired from my job. Weiner told me I was through. When I went to Weiner and asked for my job back, he insulted me in the vilest language. He got himself a woman gangster who threatened me. When I came to Weiner's door this bodyguard was there. She went into Weiner's office, and after coming out she attacked me. I am deprived of earning my daily bread because I was foolish enough to demand that the union live up to its boast of being "progressive" and "democratic," that it be a REAL union. I dared to interfere with the racketeering of the officialdom. Now I am out of the trade. I appeal to all true friends of unionism to print this protest. I stand behind every statement made. My case is not the only one; countless sincere union members have been subjected to the same, even worse, persecutions. As a matter of principle the facts about the Amalgamated Clothing Workers should be brought before the workers. I CHALLENGE any contradiction to the facts stated above. I am willing to submit this case to any IMPARTIAL tribunal, and I will abide by the decision. Let the charlatans and gangsters and pompous racketeers of the union answer this challenge if they DARE.

SIGNED Jennie Cohen
FORMER MEMBER Local 25, A. C. W. U. of A.

VANGUARD SUSTAINING FUND

DONATIONS FROM GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS
(This list does not include payment for bundles, subscriptions or direct sales. Numbers in brackets indicate the receipt numbers)

Kropotkin Literary Society, W. C. Br. 413, Los Angeles, Cal. (309), \$23.00; Ritman (345), \$1.00; H. Van Huizen (378), \$3.00; H. Schukman (380), \$10.00; Free Society Group, Chicago, Ill. (386), \$9.50 and same group (305), \$5.45.

G. Stevenson (403), \$5.00; E. Isakovitch (418), \$1.00; Free Society Group of Chicago, Ill. (421), \$25.00; Mohegan Colony comrades at Bogins (437), \$30.00; S. Rothman (448), \$1.00; Libertarian Group of Los Angeles, Cal. (467), \$8.00; M. Grishkan (459), \$1.00; James Prassow (484)*, \$3.00; Kropotkin Literary Society, W. C. Br. 413 (481), \$16.38; M. R. (484)*, \$2.00; Mohegan Colony comrades (488), \$17.50.

Receipts marked by asterisk (*) indicate that we received the money via the F.A.S., therefore it is all on one receipt. Individual receipts were sent by F.A.S. in the above mentioned cases.

This is the column that keeps "Vanguard" alive. Help us make it grow. It means more frequent and better "Vanguards." If we are to publish regularly, we must wipe out our deficit of over \$175.00. Send your contributions to Vanguard, 45 W. 17th Street, New York City.

G.P.U. IN AMERICA

(Continued from page eleven)

States where he worked he is also known as Stone. The day that Carlo Tresca appeared before the Grand Jury, *The Jewish Daily Forward* published the name of Schachno Epstein in connection with the Pointz case. It seems that the *Forward* is not afraid of any comeback from Epstein. One of the editors of that paper has stated that a leading member of the Communist Party has told him that the charges in connection with this matter are true and that the facts are known in Communist Party circles in New York City.

Where is Juliet Stuart Pointz? That the government is not much concerned we can clearly see and understand. That the Communist Party doesn't evince any interest in her disappearance can have but one explanation. But that thousands of liberals, radicals and organizations like the American Civil Liberties Union and its director Roger Baldwin should have no word of protest is abominable. The safety of outspoken anti-Stalinists is at stake. Shall Stalin be permitted to extend the terrors of his G.P.U. even to the shores of America? The labor and liberal world owes itself an answer to that question. What shall that answer be?

TROTZKY SETTLES ALL

His Eminence, Leon Trotsky, from his seat at Coyacan, Mexico, has placed the final seal on Kronstadt. But even his usual brilliance could not put an end to the "hue and cry over Kronstadt," certainly not the puerile *potpourri* of slander, falsification and amalgams that Trotsky attempts to palm off on us. Does the assassin of the Kronstadt sailors believe that he can wash his bloody hands of the tragic event by disguising its significance with references to it as an attempt on the part of the anarchists to cover what he calls their "popular front" tactics in the Spanish tragedy?

Long before the Spanish events there was Kronstadt and the issue was raised then. Before Kronstadt and during the Revolution, Malatesta, seeing the methods of the Bolsheviks, correctly pointed out where their road was leading them. Long before the Russian Revolution, Kropotkin and Bakunin, with deep insight, accurately indicated the eventual destiny of Marxist ideas put into practice. In the light of the collapse of Russian "revolutionary" Marxism and the betrayals of "reformist" Marxism in other countries it becomes necessary to undertake a thorough investigation of the theoretical and tactical bases of Marxism. Kronstadt is one key in our unravelling of this problem and proof of the inevitably counter-revolutionary nature of Marxism. This is the issue, Leon Trotsky. Do not befuddle it for the sake of building up a new party.

A GREAT OPPORTUNITY

— FOR A LIMITED TIME ONLY —
COMBINATION OFFER

Nationalism and Culture by Rudolf Rocker (reg. \$3.50) and a one year subscription to *Vanguard* (reg. \$1.00) for only \$2.75. Please send money order or check direct to VANGUARD, 45 West 17th St., New York City.

Name

Address

Combination, \$2.75 () Subs. only \$1.00 ()