

VANGUARD

A LIBERTARIAN COMMUNIST JOURNAL

Vol. II — No. 4

JULY-AUGUST, 1935

Price 10 Cents

IN THIS ISSUE:

•

Armando Borghi

Former Secretary of the Italian Syndicalist Union

**Seizure of the Factories
in Italy, 1920**

•

NATIONALISM --

The Root Source of Fascism

•

COLONIES --

A Short Cut to Freedom?

Published by VANGUARD GROUP, 45 West 17th Street, New York

The Comintern Has Convened!

The Seventh World Congress of the Third International has finally convened at Moscow. Seven long years have elapsed since the sixth, during which time apparently nothing disturbing occurred in world history which warranted the calling of a congress. The fathers of the Comintern's statutes were evidently mistaken in requiring a congress every two years. History in modern times moves slowly. Eventful days are long and far between.

Our communist theoreticians could always be dependent upon to provide astounding opinions on world events and tactics. But how much more profound must be the collective opinion of scores of theoreticians convened in Moscow. The atmosphere in Russia is reputed to be so conducive to correct thinking that we are sure it was by a unanimous decision that communists are now to fight for bourgeois democracy along with other partisans of liberty, bourgeois or otherwise, against the fascist menace.

Were you once led to believe that only two roads were open for human society today — fascism or social revolution? No, my friends, you are dead wrong! You are hereby ordered to unite ourselves with liberals, priests and bourgeois politicians to uphold the rotting bourgeois democracy which is sinking in the mire of a degenerate economic system. Forget, just for a short time, of course, that modern capitalism is driving toward war and its inevitable consequence — fascism. Lest your character be sworn away by our Moscow strategists, join with honorable militarists who are intent upon saving democracy on the glorious field of imperialist battle.

Such are the counsels of Moscow today, less than three years after the German debacle, and upon the eve of a new world war. Our friends who still pride themselves on their grasp of realities and on their revolutionary fervor, are set upon retreat. They are meeting the advance of fascism, not with the cry of social revolution, but by compromising with those capitalist elements who are as yet enraptured with bourgeois democracy. The communists know only too well that the social revolution is the only way to crush fascism. But having been brought up in the school of political expediency, they are content to deceive the masses. They are urging them to unite with allies for the defense of a decaying economic system, which itself is leading toward fascism, rather than risk a revolution for which they are doing nothing to prepare the masses, and which through fear are probably incapable of leading. They are teaching the masses to trust allies who may at any moment join the fascist forces when it becomes profitable for them to do so. The united front against fascism which they will build is in effect a national front against revolution.

The degeneracy of the Communist International will prove costly to the working class. The only hope is that those latent truly revolutionary forces within the working class will assert themselves before they are led into the abyss of reaction.

R. W.

Nationalism — the Root Source of Fascism.

When asked about the chances of Spain going fascist in the near future, Mussolini answered that for the time being Spain lacks the necessary prerequisite for a fascist victory — and that is an intensified national movement based upon a rediscovery of national values.

The arch renegade of our time is right in this respect: Nationalism is the vehicle of modern counter-revolution. Every epoch has such vehicles. In the past it was religious passions or feudal loyalties that lent themselves as powerful instrumentalities of the reactionary forces. Now it is national sentiments that are mobilized for the same purpose. Neither the Italian nor German fascist movements show any great concern for religious or monarchist attachments. Their driving force is national passion, aroused to the same pitch of fanaticism as the religious frenzies of years ago. This, however, does not detract from the counter-revolutionary nature of the Fascist movements. If anything, they represent a much more ominous form of reaction than the older ones fighting the progressive forces of humanity in the name of God and King.

Nor is it a mere accident that the vilest form of counter-revolution should break forth along the channels of national aspirations. The so called national values are becoming one of the chief obstacles on the road of modern progress. They militate against the two great ideals which arose before our epoch with the force of a pressing task of the actual day. Those are: economic unity of the human race and the emancipation of the individual from the obsessive power of extraneous values, that is those that do not arise and find their justification within the individual himself.

Nationalism in the field of economic relationships is now decried by every sane person with some inkling of economic realities. But too often the danger of economic nationalism is laid at the door of the extreme development of the national idea and not the idea itself. It isn't the latter, we are told, that works havoc with our economic life, but the absurd lengths to which it is carried at times. The events of the last years have shown, however, that the so called perversion of the national idea is an inevitable process resulting from the attempt to apply the principle of nationality in the field of economic relationships.

National sovereignty is in itself a prolific source of economic chaos, injustice, conflicts and wars. Any attempt to order our economic life along national lines will throw it out of balance, thwart its development, produce irrepressible conflicts, with the sword as the only logical arbiter. And this holds true not only about our own capitalist economy. It applies even more so to any form of socialist economy in which the masses of people have a larger stake.

Let Europe go socialistic, but retain the same economic crazy-quilt arrangement along national lines it has now — and economic life will be just as hopelessly clogged up as it is at the present day. The great differential existing between various sections of the continent in respect of natural resources, raw materials, technical skill, scientific knowledge, abundance of capital can be leveled out only within the frame of a united Europe representing one single economic organism. The same is true of the world as a whole. The necessary flow of economic activity from one geographic potential to the other, without

which no economic order can function normally, demands first of all the complete disregard of the national principle in any scheme of social reconstruction. Mere socialization of economic functions will not suffice. Socialistic Germany, separated from other countries by national barriers, will still remain overpopulated, will still be deprived of many materials necessary for its industrial development. It will still be pressing hungrily for the more sparsely populated sections of the globe possessing all those things that are necessary for its economic development. And let national barriers be raised upon the road of such a lawful expansion and the answer will be socialistic imperialism. For imperialism is nothing but an attempt to solve in a barbarous way the difficulties arising from the application of the barbarous idea of tribe and nation to the complex realities of present day economic life.

But of no less dangerous implications is the national principle in its application to human culture. Cultural nationalism represents a complete inversion of the natural scale of values obtained in the course of a normal cultural development. Such a development is universal in its scope and significance. It does not know of any national boundaries. Every true cultural value toward which humanity has been and is aspiring, is the product of humanity as a whole and not of a single nation. Science, philosophy, technical inventions, economic development, the growth of arts, moral progress, the liberation of the individual, the great collective outbursts of revolutionary passion for justice — whatever is best and noble in humanity takes its origin and finds its development in complete disregard of national differences. It is only the trifling and accidental which bears a distinct national impress.

The essential idea of national culture is to raise this accidental element into the rank of a dominant value to which the genuinely great universal values by which humanity lives are subordinated. That is why the culture of nationalism runs counter to the natural course of progressive development, why it militates so strongly against the basic factor of modern progress — the growth of individual autonomy. National culture is incompatible with the tendency of the emancipated individuality to freely select out of the great range of universal values those that are conducive to its development. The idea of national culture is to shut off from the individual the possibility of such a free and wide choice, to force upon it an allegiance to a moldy, national tradition, the greater part of which consists of useless historical cargo, of dead ballast of outlived ideas and values, torn out of their living context and now fit only as subject of anthropological research.

It is this romantic idealization of the past, the attempt to subordinate the living interests of actuality to the cobwebs of a decadent tradition, the tendency to perpetuate the pathological state of mankind, which accounts for the very existence of national tradition as such, — it is all this that renders the national idea so fit an instrumentality of the embattled counter revolution. To check and thwart the powerful drive toward unity of the human race, to drive the individual from the lately conquered positions of independence in regard to the collective herd, recourse had to be made to the tribal idea, to the tribal jealousy and animosity, still beating fiercely under the then veneer of civilization. The old doomed world of privilege, intolerance feels instinctively that it can obtain a temporary hold upon life only by making the most of the national idea, by inflating it and casting it athwart the advancing forces of progressive humanity.

And that is why the latter must strike at the very principle itself. The compromise which the older generation of socialists allowed themselves with the national idea must be definitely swept aside. In the past it begot that monstrous hybrid which may yet prove to be one of the worst forms of social life — and that is national socialism. To deflate the national idea, to bring it down to the same modest position in the scale of values which the erstwhile dominant idea of city patriotism now occupies in our political life, such is the primary task of the international socialism of our day.

Libertarian socialism started out as a cosmopolitan idea. It proclaimed the ideal of a free individual within a united humanity. The time has now come to reassert those ideas with an increased vigor. For the most effective way of striking at fascism is to strike at the source of its nourishment — the national idea itself. S—X.

Seizure of the Factories in Italy, 1920.

By ARMANDO BORGHI

(Editor's Note: The question raised by comrade Borghi, former secretary of the Italian Syndicalist Union, is of interest not only to the students of the Italian revolutionary movement of 1920. It goes to the very heart of revolutionary tactics and helps us understand why that movement was an abortive one. Every revolution—and Italy was on the eve of such a revolution in 1920—has such crucial moments as described by comrade Borghi. The lack of resolute action at such a juncture leads to failure and the triumph of the counter-revolution. The seizure of the factories in 1920 was one of such critical moments when the destinies of the Italian revolution—and of the world revolution too for that matter—became suspended in the balance. Whose fault was it that the balance tipped in the direction of the Fascist counter-revolution — that is what comrade Borghi answers in this article.)

The first of August will the fifteenth anniversary of the seizure of the factories in Italy. This is a long time for those who prefer to forget, but it is not long enough for those who wish to disguise the historical truth. However, it is no time at all for us who may have neither forgotten anything nor disavowed any of these events. The communists are not among those who like to make the truth known. I have just read a choice morsel of Spanish prose leveled at the anarchists by a specialist in parrotry. His name is Ferragut. In the March, 1932 issue of *Mundo Obrero* his name appears under the title "The Anarchists, The Russian Revolution, and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat." This may seem a little late, but it is always timely, for the same absurdities are continually propagated by the communists by orders from Moscow. The piece is as follows:

"The example of Italy in 1920, where the anarchists limited themselves to the seizing the factories with the hope that the capitalists and the bourgeoisie would abdicate, proves how empty and chimerical the conception of the anarchists is concerning force of resistance and attack."

The above proves one thing perfectly: How great, how vast and deeply rooted is the ignorance (or the dishonesty) of these reporters of cock and bull stories of which Moscow has become the nursery ground for years.

Just the opposite of the quotation is the truth.

First: The seizure of the factories in Italy was not the work of the anarchists. This movement was undertaken under the responsibility of the labor unions.

Second: The anarchist workers were just one element, though a considerable factor, in only one workers organization, the Italian Syndicalist Unions. This organization was a minority. Opposed to it (especially in times of revolutionary action) there was the General Confederation of Labor.* The latter was powerful for the following reasons: a) It was looked upon favorably by the government because it had from the time of its formation (1906) to Red Week (1914) always betrayed, repudiated, suppressed and set up barriers in the way of any direct action movement. b) Since its formation it was protected by the Socialist Party with which it was linked officially for the purpose of achieving electoral gains. c) It had made use of its collaboration with the government during the war (though it pretended to be against war under guidance of the Socialist Party) to become numerically powerful. d) During the post war events it was protected by the left wing of the Socialist Party (the wing that was actually leading the Socialist Party in 1920) Now this left wing was formed in 1920 by the Bombacci, the Serrati, the Gennari, etc.: that is, the very people who were then the proteges of Lenin and the "communists" of the Socialist Party. (The Communist Party of Italy was organized a year later by the same Bombacci, Serrati, etc.)

During the occupation of the factories, the trustworthy friends of Moscow, Bombacci, Serrati, etc., were in cordial and official relationship with the reformist leaders of the Confederation of Labor and were working together against the anarchists, against their newspaper Umanita Nova, edited by Malatesta, and against the Italian Syndicalist Union, which was not anarchist but which was for direct action and very much influenced by the anarchists.

But what were the reproaches of the Confederation of Labor and the communist extremists who were at the head of the Socialist Party? What were their common reproaches against the anarchists? They are as follows: The anarchists wished to proceed too quickly with force; their actions were precipitant; they were demoralizing the well disciplined forces of the Confederation of Labor; they did not care to understand that a revolution comes by itself, by a strange fatality.

What was the anarchist reply to this point of view?

They replied that they had done well to seize the factories**; that this movement would have been sterile if not carried out to its logical end at that moment

* There were anarchists in the Confederation of Labor, but they were scattered and without directing influence.

** The seizure of the factories was not originally the realization of a revolutionary conspiracy. It began as a union drive of the metal workers to restore the wage level. It was only after the industry attempted to lock them out, that the workers replied by locking themselves in.

of revolutionary upsurge following the war; that one could not retreat and that at that time one could not stop on the slope without causing a violent reaction; that it was a good tactic to *arm* oneself; that direct appropriation had to be extended to strengthen and support the movement; that without killing the watchdog of property, that is, the state, nothing could be taken at all.

But just think: It was the anarchists who believed they could get rid of the bourgeoisie at once! Not only must one be entirely ignorant of Italian affairs, but also an imbecile to think that everyone would foolishly believe this idea of the *renunciation* of power by the bourgeoisie, which has been a part of Marxist fatalism against which the anarchists have fought for forty years. It is just this "mechanical" conception of historical materialism which makes the whole social structure depend on the economic factors. It is in opposition to this that the anarchists have fought most with the Marxists: be they the opportunistic Marxists, or the partisans of a "temporary" dictatorship.

And it is precisely against the same conception of historical materialism that the latter communists had been led to believe that it is sufficient to deny the bourgeoisie the right of vote, to give it exclusively to the proletariat; gradually to crush capitalism by means of the dictatorial state! The vote, always the vote, is the lever of the socialists as well as for the communists to destroy the bourgeoisie*. It is always this same fatalism which makes the communists believe (if they still do believe it) in the certain disappearance of the classes after the temporary period of dictatorship. The anarchists still believe that the capitalists must be driven away by force. So you see they are not so naive when it comes to the idea of *resistance and attack*.

Fifteen years after these Red Days, we can still prove with many documents that with or without previously seizing the factories, it was the historical moment for the Italian Revolution. The government could not stop it; the bourgeoisie believed it inevitable; the working class was ready for the fight. Only the tactics of delay, of obstructionism, treachery, electoral illusions (referring to the last electoral attempts), of well prepared sabotage by the communists of the Socialist Party together with the leaders of the Confederation of Labor, only these could succeed in rendering worthless the efforts of the anarchists, the Syndicalist Union and of a few sincere socialists who were soon expelled from the party for being tainted by . . . anarchism.

Colonies — a Short Cut to Freedom?

As much as the major revolutionary groups may differ in their positive programs of action, there is one method of trying to rebuild society which has been rejected by the advanced portions of all the contemporary militant labor bodies. They have all been plagued more or less by the actions of some of their adherents who had become tired of the long, arduous struggle with their

* The Socialists believe in the unlimited power of the vote in the hands of the proletariat. The communists in its power to crush the bourgeoisie when the vote is denied to them.

class enemies or had suffered an infatuation with an idyllic picture of a simple, self-sufficient back-to-nature commune and had begun to live their communism here and now by running off in small groups to some place in the hills or the woods, far away from the din of the battle. There they would work together and share together the fruits of their toil and in that manner construct a sort of communistic oasis of their own. Their example would be an inspiration for others who would follow suit and eventually the land would be filled with communistic settlements and the millenium would be ushered in.

One of the serious obstacles to the growth and progress of the libertarian movement in the United States has been this continual migration to colonies and formation of communes. During a considerable part of our history the vast expanses of cheap or free land proved a glowing inducement to the numerous utopian sects that were seeking a haven. America became a happy hunting ground for all those who hoped to establish communes and thus live in peace and contentment forever after. And so there have been many hundreds of colonies and settlements in America based upon such methods of achieving salvation as communal living, moon worship, religious mysticism, vegetarianism, nutarianism, nudism, free love, etc. From its earliest years American anarchism lost many of its proponents who were lured away by the romantic inducements of this tradition.

The individualistic character of native American anarchism and the debilitating effects of this migration to communes were important factors in preventing the successful growth of an anarchist-communist movement of the type which arose in the eighties of the last century.

At the present moment we are witnessing in this country the emergence of a new libertarian movement, that of libertarian communism. The libertarian communists believe in utilizing all the technological and industrial advances made during the capitalist era but want to change the social structure so that it becomes functionally decentralized, production and economic administration being undertaken by the various industrial unions under the control of the workers themselves and problems of consumption and social administration being under the jurisdiction of the local, regional, "national," and international consumers organizations. In countries where the libertarian movement is very strong, such as Sweden, Argentina and especially Spain, our comrades are taking the logical steps toward the achievement of this goal. They have organized industrial unions, are conducting many schools, workers clubs, youth organizations and local consumers organizations. They are now being used in the fight against capitalism, for the winning of "immediate demands" and the final overthrow of capitalism. These organizations of struggle will eventually become the functioning economic and social units of the new society.

This position is obviously for the most part a rationalization of the desire to escape from the realities of the necessary steps towards our goal, to run away from the fight which we cannot avoid if we are to succeed. Although we know the rationalization for what it is, that is, a pathological symptom of an "escape" psychology, we must also explode this theory on the basis of its own contentions.

Their idea is to construct a self-sufficient economic unit within the confines of the capitalist system. In order to have both economic self-sufficiency and economic abundance it is necessary to utilize modern machinery for agricultural and industrial production. This, of course, requires a large-scale division of

labor and mass production. No commune, consisting even of several thousand members, could succeed in using mass production methods unless it produces for the market. If it did this, then the commune would no longer be economically self-sufficient. The degree of economic self-sufficiency in a commune is a factor in determining the degree of abundance which will exist there. If it tries to produce by itself as many of its necessities as it possibly can, then the innumerable hours of hard labor which the use of old fashioned methods of production entails, and the meager rewards which this toil provides will not, indeed, be much of an inducement for those in the outside world to follow their example. All those "colonies" which have attempted to stick to the straight and narrow path of self-sufficiency have failed and gone out of existence.

But not all colony settlers are made of such stern stuff. Some communes have found it necessary to specialize in the production of one or a small number of commodities and therefore use mass production methods. These obviously no longer fit the picture as originally painted. They are placed in the position of buyers and sellers in the market. They become business firms with each member a shareholder, a property owner. And when such enterprises do succeed for a time their members have vested interests which the destruction of the present economic system would endanger. Their interests are no longer those of the working class. (There have been, ironically enough, a number of so-called communes in recent years which employed laborers for hire or exploited sharecroppers working on their land.) The logical outcome, then, of this policy of seeking a short cut to freedom is (that is, when the "commune" maintains its existence) that the "commune" which was to show the way to real communism becomes in fact a part of the economy of bourgeois society. In this role, it must eventually suffer the same consequences as all other middle-class business organizations.

The chances of surviving all the difficulties noted here are so small that the vast majority of communes formed during the last half century were short lived. Thus we see that the road followed by those who want to run away from realities and seek a short cut to communism not only leads to a blind alley, but thins the ranks of those on the fighting line and makes their struggle more difficult than need be.

S. MORRISON.

On the Class War Front.

Every week brings new major strikes throughout the country before the public eye. Accompanied by violence, they make front page news for a number of days. But rarely does the public learn the terms of settlement which are oftentimes made by union officialdom far removed from the striking workers, surrounded by the government's friendly labor arbiters. Naive observers of American labor activity would suppose that the tremendous power displayed by the workers at Toledo, Terre Haute, Omaha, in the north west lumber camps, etc., would sufficiently frighten the employers into early and complete submission. At the first threat of a general strike, the A. F. of L. officialdom

punctually arrives, declares itself open for negotiations and issues a statement deploring violence and destruction of property. But the peace conference they hold are most likely to enchain the workers with a pact as venal as that made in Versailles 17 years ago.

In the northwest lumber camps the strike has now continued for many weeks. It is one of the largest lumber strikes that have been called since the great I. W. W. strike there during the war. But despite the great enthusiasm of the loggers, the many attempts to wrest the control away from the powerful officialdom of the A. F. of L. headed by A. W. Muir have utterly failed. Lumber is an industry spread over an extensive field, though controlled by a few large owners. The betraying activities of the A. F. of L. can therefore be more easily noted than in strikes where negotiations are carried on locally with one or just a few employers participating. Even before the date of the walkout, Muir tried to prevent workers in certain plants from joining the strike on the grounds that their employers were willing to listen to terms. He started to lower the original demands of the walkout and then in true A. F. of L. style made "special agreements" with companies, and ordered their employees back to work.

One of these "special agreements" covered the Longview local 2504 of the Saw Mill and Timber Workers whose members refused to be sold out. Muir suspended the local but the central labor council of Longview continued to recognize them. Wm. Green threatened to revoke its charter, and sent down a representative, who finally managed to engineer a vote at the labor council meeting ousting the local's representatives. Three new charters were then issued by Muir who had now expelled the local. The Longview Daily News, controlled by Weyerhaeuser of kidnapping and labor hating fame, and against whom local 2504 had fought, expressed its appreciation of Muir's efforts in its July 23 issue: "The action last evening of the central labor council in ousting the delegates of the erstwhile saw mill workers local 2504, which has been deprived of its charter, was another step in the recognition of and return to true leadership as provided by the American Federation of Labor and subordinate brotherhoods". Mr. Muir explained that it has always been the policy of organized labor to treat its friends well. One can well imagine what this long drawn out strike will win for the valiant strikers under A. F. of L. leadership.

Once again in July 22, the sceptre of the general strike waved over the heads of union officialdom at Terre Haute, Indiana. For four long months the 600 employees of the Columbia Stamping and Enameling Co. have been on strike for union recognition and wage increases. When the company started to bring in farm lads into the city as scabs, rank and file agitation brought about a general strike of 22,000 workers. Leaders of the Central Labor Council, supposedly friendly to the strike, took fright and called it a wildcat demonstration. In three days they managed to send the workers back without even obtaining the release of 135 unionist jailed during the walkout which should have at least been the one condition set upon the workers return to the shops. In splendid adherence to traditional A. F. of L. policy, they announced that AFTER workers went back to work negotiations would be started. Keeping their promises as all A. F. of L. officials do, no settlement as yet been made, nor is there one in sight.

Speaking of General Strikes, the New York Times of July 28 makes note that the A. F. of L. shudders at the word. Not only are sacred contracts broken but the general strike has revolutionary implications thus making it doubly unpopular with that organization. Despite the fact that William Green threatened its use to force passage of the Wagner Bill, his talented assistant, Matthew Woll, in his recent book explains that the general strike, "as a political instrument, is both impracticable and impossible. The state has the right to protect itself against all forms of attack, including the attack by strike"!

In the Toledo strike several weeks ago an old story was again repeated. Francis Dillon, national organizer of the A. F. of L. in the auto industry, forced the newly organized auto workers to accept a compromise agreement with General Motors. The strike could have expanded into a nationwide auto strike against the company, had the workers not been browbeaten with threats of revoking their charter, an old A. F. of L. trick. Ironically enough, the Workers Party which prides itself in leading a progressive element in the Federal Auto Union, is determined to save the A. F. of L. charter for the workers, and finally get them an international charter. What a working class triumph that would be.

Small wonder that the militant workers, unionists, who have been in the A. F. of L. for years, finally revolt as they have done in New England and Illinois. For thirty-five years the shoe workers of New England struggled to rid themselves of that union and finally succeeded. So well expressed are the majority of the workers there against the A. F. of L. that the most ardent patriots of that organization, the Lovestoneites, are silent on the question of the A. F. of L. in that region. In its fifty years of existence, the A. F. of L. has been able to perfect its technique of betrayal to a high point of efficiency. Gaining finesse from its early start in scabbing out the Knights of Labor, the organization today has a well oiled machine doing its part in ironing out the difficulties and preserving the harmony between labor and capital. This machine is admirably prepared at an instant notice to pour oil upon the trouble waters during any major strike which threatens to disrupt the understanding between the government and the organization. For what better agents than the A. F. of L. can the exploiters of American labor wish? Raymond Moley was quite right when he wrote several months back that the A. F. of L. would fit in perfectly in the Corporate state.

ROMAN WEINREBE.

Our Mail Box.

We have been receiving numerous questions and inquiries from our readers in regard to the statements and opinion expressed in our magazine. We are selecting some of those questions for our latter box section, hoping to clarify some of the issues and principles of our philosophy from the specific angle of the readers' interest. We invite our readers to avail themselves of

the opportunity of airing their views and doubts offered by this section, which we expect to make into a permanent feature of the magazine.

QUESTION: In your last issue we read that "the state can never be anything but bourgeois in its nature" (Volin's article "The Historic Role of the State" in VANGUARD, No. 3). How does this square with the well known fact that the bourgeois state came only at a comparatively late period. The state existed before the bourgeoisie came to power and still exists in a country (Soviet Russia) where the bourgeoisie is vanishing as a class.

ANSWER: The term "bourgeois" is used by comrade Volin in the generic sense, denoting the general idea of exploitation. Taken in that sense, the meaning of comrade Volin's statement is the cause of exploitation and not the effect thereof. This is a basic idea of the political philosophy of anarchism, which is now fully borne out by the experience of Soviet Russia. The bourgeoisie may be vanishing there as a specific class, but the monstrous concentration of political power is giving rise to a new privileged class, driving the wedge of inequality more and more deeply into the new social structure.

QUESTION: You Libertarian Communists are just as hopelessly utopian as the anarchists of a generation ago. For what but rank utopian is the statement made in the article "Socialism Redefined" by S.X (Vanguard, No. 2) that "Socialism must be built by progressive forces who further the ideal of human brotherhood and equality". That is the language of the utopian pre-scientific socialists who thought that the new society can be ushered in by awakening the moral sense of humanity. Capitalism will be superseded by a socialistic society not because of its inferior moral worth but because it is proving itself to be an unworkable system.

ANSWER: It is true that capitalism collapses because of its unworkability as an economic system. But that is a mere restatement of the moral problem. It is unworkable because it fails to meet the standards of elementary principles of mutual aid. And it is in the name of such principles that the masses of humanity are rising up against it. That is the only meaning in which workability can be applied to an economic system. No economic system collapses automatically. Nor will capitalism collapse in such a manner. Unless the moral sense of the great mass of people be aroused against it, it will keep on functioning, although in an ever deteriorating form. From the comparatively free system it was originally, it will deteriorate into a new form of serfdom already adumbrated in the fascist economy. And that is why any socialist movement which ignores the moral aspect of the struggle for a new society, plays unwittingly into the hands of the fascist reaction.

Comrade S. Weiner's article on the work of anarchists in the unions evoked a lively response and stirred up quite a discussion in our midst. The subject will be treated in greater length in our further issues. In the meantime we shall answer some of the questions sent by our own comrades in response to this article.

QUESTION: Why must all anarchists who work in the unions adhere to one single policy? Wouldn't it be more in agreement with our principles to let everyone be guided by his own judgment in that matter?

ANSWER: We uphold the idea of freedom, but we don't reject the compelling power of logic. The anarchist position has certain logical implications in regard to the work in unions. We cannot give up the work of bringing out such implications by comradely discussions and forging an intelligent comradely opinion on that matter. Without such a collective work of clarification we shall have the same monstrosities upon which comrade Weiner dwelt in his article: anarchists who preach in their groups against authority and centralization of power, but who support in the unions the most corrupt political cliques.

QUESTION: What is all this ballyhoo about "right and proper" tactics to be pursued by anarchists in the unions? Is it a question of mere tactics only? The very idea of selecting the unions as a medium of realization of the anarchist ideal is wrong. It is high time to realize that anarchism and revolutionary unionism are not exactly one and the same thing.

ANSWER: Regardless of the question whether unions are to become the instrumentality of the realization of the anarchist ideal (and we believe that it should become one of such instrumentalities), it is clear that anarchists who do work in the unions should be guided by the principles of anarchist ethics. Whether anarchists should center their work on revolutionizing the unions is a question that can be debated in our midst. But we certainly cannot even debate the question whether anarchists should confine their work in the unions to job holding, "yessing" and time serving the corrupt officialdom.

QUESTION: While agreeing with much of what comrade Weiner says in his article I cannot approve the violent language used in regard to the A. F. of L. Such phrases as "the machine of the A. F. of L. must be smashed" hardly serve the purpose of rallying our forces. It smuggles in the idea of dual unionism, the impracticability of which already has been demonstrated and against which many of comrades will protest.

ANSWER: The question of dual unionism was not raised in Weiner's article. The policy of the magazine in regard to this question will be enunciated in our coming issues, apart from which we shall also open the pages of our magazine for a comradely discussion on the question of new revolutionary unions versus the tactics of boring from within. What we do insist, however, is that even a policy of boring from within must pursue clear objectives in order to be successful. And one of such objectives is the smashing of the bureaucratic machine of the A. F. of L. The existence of such a machine concentrating in its hands colossal powers and already fenced off from the working class by its fantastically high income is incompatible with the idea of a libertarian institution based upon the idea of equality, into which we hope to transform the labor unions. To compromise on this issue by soft-peddling it is to reduce to naught all the chances of reforming the old unions which some claim on the behalf of the method of boring from within.

In Answer to the "Workers Age"

In the July 13th issue of WORKERS AGE George F. Miles in "Trade Union Notes" comments on two articles which appeared in the last issue of the VANGUARD. He quotes from the article dealing with the I. W. W. and the Cleveland strikes: "its (I. W. W.) revolutionary principles, its rank and file control and democratic methods of organization has roused hope and admiration to such an extent that a strike there of charwomen under its leadership has continued since Dec. 12th". Not being able to find anything wrong with this, Mr. Miles resorts to what he regards as sarcasm. He says: "For the I. W. W. to have even called a strike is of tremendous news value, but even more would it have been had it succeeded in settling a strike somewhere." He writes this about the I. W. W., the most revolutionary labor organization in the history of the American labor movement. In Cleveland alone the I. W. W. has won over twenty strikes in the past year! It ill becomes the Lovestoneites to berate the I. W. W. for failing to call and settle strikes, when the A. F. of L. has and still is selling out strikes, when almost every strike that was called by the rank and file was sabotaged by the leadership, and "settled" by the misleaders of the workers to the advantage of the employers. Members of the A. F. of L. who go on strike are compelled to fight both the bosses and their own organization. Perhaps the Lovestoneites can explain why their New England shoe unions are voluntarily taking a wage cut and longer hours despite the fact that they had previously decided NOT to accept these new conditions? This must be the fashion in which Lovestoneites settle strikes.

Mr. Miles does not agree with our trade union policy, but he does not state his reasons. He objects to my statement that, "the unions of the A. F. of L. are assisting in and becoming part of the growing policy of fascization of our economic life by the government — the bureaucratic machine of the A. F. of L. must be smashed and the unions reorganized on the principles of rank and file control, direct action and workers democracy".

In the issue of the WORKERS AGE the draft thesis of the Lovestoneites states (page four): "The dominant officialdom of the A. F. of L., headed by the executive council, has proven itself totally bankrupt in the face of critical situations and countless opportunities to register achievements on behalf of the working class. The great wave of strikes and organization has found these top leaders unprepared, often unwilling to assist, and, all too often blocking and paralyzing the militant efforts of the workers". This is doubtlessly true, why then do the Lovestoneites object to the statement that this machine must be smashed, that the unions must be reorganized on different principles? How do they expect to change this condition without destroying the bureaucracy? How explain the fact that while the politicians of the A. F. of L. hate and persecute radicals, they nevertheless tolerate the Lovestoneites? Hypocritical condemnations of the officialdom of the A. F. of L. notwithstanding the fact remains that this toleration has been paid for by the complete abandonment by the Lovestoneites of every principle of decent unionism. Likewise, the inconsistency of the Lovestoneites is evident when they condemn me for pointing out the fascistic tendencies of the A. F. of L. while

they state in their Draft Thesis that the leadership of the A. F. of L. in endorsing the Wagner Bill and other dangerous measures are "thus preparing the most serious steps in the direction of corporate unionism and Fascism".

In my article, I declared that the SOME anarchists failed to take an independent position, and swung their influence to the corrupt officialdom (in the fight between the communists and the socialists for control of the needle trades several years ago). I used this as an example to illustrate the inevitable result which must follow when any group forgets its principles, compromises with the parasites of the labor movement, the clique of jobholders. Such groups and individuals gradually become themselves politicians and officeholders. This is precisely what has happened to the Lovestoneites.

Mr. Miles claims that he printed those remarks from my article because "We know of a number of anarchists working in the trade unions in a constructive militant manner and we are certain that this attempt at a reorientation of the anarchists in the trade unions does not represent their viewpoint". The article was written in order to expose the mistakes of these anarchists whom Mr. Miles considers "militant" and "constructive," everything in the preceding paragraph applies to them as well as it does to the Lovestoneites.

Since the WORKERS AGE admits that the militant elements are being outlawed by the A. F. of L., that one of the most pressing tasks to-day is the — "transformation of the craft unions into militant industrial unions": in view of the record of the A. F. of L. in the San Francisco, Toledo, textile, and many other strikes — we fail to see why Mr. Miles objects to the statement that "If history has proven anything it has proven that the A. F. of L. is incapable of being reformed and that only too often this noble organization represents capitalist interests instead of workers".

Only one way is open to those who wish to build a real revolutionary labor movement, that is; to smash the machine, to admit that the unions must be organized on revolutionary principles, to expose the politicians of all shades. Failure to understand this is to become sterile, reactionary, hopelessly enmeshed in the contradiction between the need for a revolutionary labor movement and the policy of playing politics, of attempting to patch up a senior institution far gone in degeneracy, an institution which is blocking the progress of the American working class.

NOTE: Mr. Miles claims that our Libertarian Communism is a misnomer since he can find no communism in the Vanguard. We are pleased to state that Mr. Miles' brand of "communism" will not be found in the Vanguard. A communism based upon the complete suppression of individual rights, upon a fascist regimentation of the great mass of people, is abhorrent to us to the same degree as the "socialism" of the Nazis. As for Libertarian Communism, Mr. Miles will have to unlearn a great deal of his marxist dry rot before he can hope to understand it.

S. WEINER.

International Movement.

FRANCE.

We have lately been hearing a good deal about the change of heart which the international social-democracy underwent since the tragic defeats of two years ago. The lessons of such defeats, we are told, were not lost on the socialist parties, who since then developed a revolutionary policy of dealing with the fascist danger.

To what extent such opinions represent mere wishful thinking is shown by the recent convention of the Socialist Party of France. The latter, as it is known, is rapidly approaching a political crisis of the kind which swept the Nazis into power in Germany. The Fascist movement is growing by leaps and bounds. It is fed by the same sources as in Germany, and while it may not yet be ready for an immediate upheaval, it is rapidly assuming such threatening proportions as to constitute an imminent danger to the life of the Republic in the very near future.

How are the French socialists meeting that danger? The answer given to it by the last socialist convention coincides in its main outlines with the same fatal line which led the German social-democracy to its ignominious defeat. It is the policy of shunning responsibility, of foregoing any revolutionary initiative, of leaning upon the broken reed of bourgeois democratic forces whose social base — the middle classes — is being rapidly undermined by the fascist movement.

The resolutions adopted at that convention approved such a policy in its main outlines. They left the door open to a coalition cabinet, they pussifooted the crucial question of arming workers for self-defense, thus placing their main hope upon the state institutions like the army and police, which as the German example showed, can be easily adapted for fascist purposes. And last, but not least, those resolutions ignored the most important question of all — and that is meeting the aggressive social demogogy of the fascists by a bold policy of revolutionary reconstruction along socialistic lines.

And while French socialists approach in their main policies the fatal line followed by the German social-democracy, the French communists differ in one important respect. The German communists made some show of revolutionary action, while the French communists gave up all pretense of it. Following the promise given by Stalin to Laval of seeing that the Communist Party of France would fall in line with the militarist policies of the government, the French communists veered around to the most conciliatory policy toward the bourgeois government. The French Communist Party is now occupying the extreme right position of the labor movement. Leon Blum, the leader of the Socialist Party, openly declared at the convention that it was the Communist Party that during the last governmental crisis was most zealously concerned with the formation of a coalition government of socialist and bourgeois parties. This is borne out by the comments made by the communist daily "Humanite'" on the proceedings of the convention. The moderate faction was favorably commented upon, while the left elements were vituperated in the typically communist fashion.

Nor is the role of those left elements that stand outside both political parties

the same as that in Germany. The anarchists and syndicalists of France possess great historical traditions which are bound to assert themselves in the present crisis. Thus we hear of the growth of the anarchist movement which is being strengthened by the influx of the younger elements in the revolutionary movement. Even the Trotzkyite paper "Verite" had to take stock of the drift, regretting it of course in its own sectarian manner.

The syndicalist elements, within and outside the reformist trade union movement, are bestirring themselves to a new life. A call for a new Zimmerwald conference has been issued by the old syndicalist revolutionary Pierre Monat. And judging by the enthusiastic reception given to it in various quarters, the organization of the genuinely revolutionary forces is a question of the very near future.

The working class of France is shaking itself clear from the apathy and inertia of the last decade, and that means that it is about to rediscover the road of true revolutionary action upon which the past generation of anarcho-syndicalists did so much pioneering spade work.

SWEDEN.

A ray of light in the dark night of reaction is the Swedish Syndicalist Movement. In a large part of the world the revolutionary movement is suppressed. Sweden is one of the few countries where it is still possible to carry on Libertarian propaganda.

The S.A.C. (Sveriges Arbetares Centralorganisation, affiliated with the I.W.M.A.) has a membership of over 40,000 and publishes two daily newspapers. Although the organization is a minority in the labor movement, its militancy, its consistent, uncompromising activity against capitalism and the state has given it an enormous influence, far out of proportion to its numerical strength. For a quarter of a century the S.A.C. has been the vanguard of the Swedish labor movement. Its opponents cannot deny this, for experience proves it. The boycott against Nazi Germany is a recent example. This boycott, which was initiated and conducted by the S.A.C., won the sympathy of the workers in the reformist unions, yet the leaders of their unions carried on a conspiracy of silence and sometimes even openly sabotaged the syndicalist campaign. The German films, once very popular, have now disappeared from the screens.

Out of more than 700 local organizations which sent delegates to the recent congress of S.A.C., only three delegates representing communism were sent. This is a ridiculously small representation when we consider that the S.A.C. is an industrial class war organization consisting solely of wage workers.

The most important and timely subject discussed at the congress was the attitude of the S.A.C. toward war. A memorandum presented by comrade Jensen was unanimously adopted by the congress opposing the false tactics of the communists. The congress called attention to the fact that it would be fooling oneself to believe that the proletariat was in a position at present to fulfill its historic mission — to tear the weapons out of the hands of the oppressors and establish peace.

In 1914 the workers organizations were not yet broken by splits and fascism. The organizational apparatus necessary for enforcing peace by the international solidarity of the workers was in existence. Yet there was no action. The in-

dispensable ideological conditions were lacking due to the nationalistic, parliamentary orientation of the great reformist labor movement. The necessary conditions are lacking today, not only in the Second International, but in the Third International as well. The labor movement in many countries has disappeared. We must recognize the unpleasant truth that the labor movement, regarded from the international point of view is not in the position to prevent the outbreak of war.

Because the social-democracy prepared the ground for fascism, war is brought closer. Fascism and National-Socialism are headed for war. On the pretext of insuring peace the Soviet Union has made alliances with Fascist Italy and imperialistic France. The excuse that the Soviet-Franco Pact serves freedom and peace is false to the core.

The communist movement, controlled by the Russian party, has been turned into a propaganda machine for inciting the masses to go to war against Nazi Germany. The Social-Democracy is doing the very same thing. The proletariat is on the verge of making the same catastrophic blunders as were made in 1914.

A war against German fascism will lead to still greater fascism, just as the last war was to save democracy and destroy militarism led to stronger militarism and a more terrific reaction. A new war will result in a frightful dictatorship of the sword. It is nothing short of lunacy to believe that fascism can be fought by state socialism when state socialism itself leads to fascism. Only the anti-fascist forces in the fascist countries can successfully fight fascism in all its forms.

If the revolutionary workers cannot stop war, they must strive to change the imperialist war into a war of the working masses, for the complete extermination of imperialism and fascism.

The congress, far from contenting itself with negatives and pessimism, called upon the revolutionary workers of Sweden to fight war through the general strike, to boycott the war industries and be prepared to suffer for its action. The congress allotted funds to carry on extraordinary vigorous propaganda along those lines. There are great possibilities for such a movement to spread throughout the Scandinavian countries, inspired by revolutionary syndicalism, to rally the workers all over the world to follow their example.

The growing youth movement consisting of 5000 young militant syndicalists, inspired with anarchist ideas, are ready to fight war through direct action. A heroic youth! A powerful organization! A splendid fighting spirit! A new hope for Libertarian Socialism the world over.

A. SOUCHY, *Stockholm.*

PERU.

"...We live in this country under an autocratic government controlled by the most vicious elements of the bourgeois-clerical reaction. Laws have been passed forbidding the sale and circulation of socialist, bolshevik and anarchist publications. Freedom of thought is totally absent. Labor unions and other workers' organizations have been placed under the strict control of the police which attempts to stamp out the slightest tendency toward revolutionary syndicalism, libertarianism or any other manifestation of workers' initiative.

"Numerous arrests of our comrades took place recently. As it is the case with other politicals, our comrades were not given an open trial. Subject to the

whims of the administration, they will rot for years in places of deadly climate to which the politicals are exiled.

"Several years ago such an arbitrary act would have released a wave of mass protests and revolutionary strikes inspired by the anarchists and syndicalists. But now, due to the weakening and demoralization introduced by the left politicians into the labor movement, and also to the increased terror on the part of the authorities, labor lacks the spirit, the necessary degree of unity and collective strength to act in due manner against the fascist repressions.

"Our work is now carried on clandestinely. There is no abatement of it in spite of the severe persecutions and the frequent arrests of our comrades. We have numerous youth groups which carry on the traditions of anarchist militancy. "La Protesta", the old anarchist paper of Peru, appears now from time to time as an underground publication. The police strains all its efforts to "spot" this publication, to find out where it is published and who edits it. But all the numerous raids notwithstanding, the third degree used on our comrades in order to extort from them some information in this respect, the paper still keeps on coming out with as much regularity as such conditions permit.

"For the anarchists, for the proletariat of this country, "La Protesta" is a symbol of liberty, of the hope of an upsurge of the revolutionary forces of the proletariat, and that is why they rally to its support with so much devotion.

"Such is the situation under which we live now. On the one hand — a dictatorial government striking out against any progressive idea. And on the other hand an uncompromising anarchist movement fighting on resolutely to bring this fight to a successful finish."

Lima, June, 1935.

The Piesco Frame Up

After thirty five years of subjection to the A. F. of L.'s Boot and Shoe Workers Union, the shoemakers of Brockton, Mass. organized a brotherhood for the purpose of securing higher wages and better working conditions. They had intended to establish a union which would give every worker an equal right in determining its activities. Unfortunately, Frank Goodwin, a man who had distinguished himself by his part in the prosecution of Sacco and Vanzetti, maneuvered himself into the leadership of this new venture. Together with John Murphy and Danny Collins he has managed to resist all the efforts of the rank and file to oust him. Ably assisted by the police in framing up and beating up all those who dare to question his authority, he continues after two years of constant betrayals as the leader of this union.

On May 20th of this year, at a meeting of the General Executive Board of the Brotherhood, Saveiro Piesco, an Italian worker who had been delegated to represent one of the locals, dared to stand up and ask a question regarding the disposal of certain funds and the abandonment of the democratic principles of the union. The question was an embarrassing one to the man who had become the absolute monarch of the brotherhood. Piesco received the answer to it when six of Goodwin's henchmen pounced upon him and beat him into insensibility.

Previous to this Goodwin had attempted to intimidate the courageous Piesco by threatening 'to teach him a lesson'!

Rafael Piesco, brother of Saveiro, and a member of the executive board of the union, encountered Giusto Tonoli, one of his brothers assailants at the union hall. He gave Tonoli a sound thrashing and a few hours later was arrested on a charge of assaulting him with a knife. He was held on a thousand dollars bail. Having no definite proof of his guilt the police released him. Very shortly after, Goodwin exerted his influence to have him arrested. This time he was charged with attempted murder.

The Piesco Defense Committee makes an urgent request for contributions to save this worker from what may turn out to be a life imprisonment. Send your donations to Box 831, Brockton, Mass., in care of the committee.

Ferrero and Sallitto

The case of Ferrero and Sallitto, described in the last issue of the Vanguard, is still hanging in the balance. The two Italian workers remain in danger of being deported to the fascist hell of Italy.

Upon the initiative of the libertarian groups now in New York, a conference was called to which all radical organizations were invited. The conference, attended by the American Civil Liberties Union, General Defense Committee of the I. W. W., Non-Partisan Labor Defense, Communist League of Struggle, League for the Protection of Foreign Born, League for a Revolutionary Workers Party, and the libertarian groups of New York, constituted itself as a committee for the defense of Ferrero and Sallitto. Two large meetings and several neighborhood meetings have already been held to acquaint the workers of New York with the facts of the case. The committee has printed a leaflet giving the history of the government's attempt to deport these two workers. Another meeting is scheduled on August 24, 2 P. M. on Union Square. Thousands of leaflets have been distributed to urge workers to protest against the "liberal" administration at Washington acting as the foreign agents of the arch-murderer Mussolini.

Ferrero and Sallitto were arrested because they rented space to an anarchist publication. If the government is successful in deporting these two anti-fascist fighters, the ground will be prepared for the complete suppression of all radical publications, organizations and unions. Protests should be sent to the Department of Labor. The deportation must be stopped! Activity in behalf of these two foreign workers must be increased. Conferences like those in California and New York should be organized.

From Chicago we hear that such a conference has been called by the Libertarian Groups there and the General Defense Committee on August 21, at the Workmens Circle Hall, 1241 No. California Avenue, Chicago. Chicagoans should back this conference up at once!

Book Review

"THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION" by William Chamberlin, Macmillan Co.

With all vast speculation revolving around the Russian Revolution and its bearing on the problems of the day, there is a surprising lack of elementary histories on that subject in the English language. A few monographs dealing with some of its obscure and relatively unimportant phases, casual reminiscences of stranded visitors, gleanings of historical information to be found in the polemical writings of communists and their opponents, — that sums up to a great extent the literature we have in the English language on the Russian Revolution.

The only outstanding book on that subject — Trotzky's three-volume "History of the Russian Revolution" — deals only with what might be called the prelude to the October Revolution. What happened since the October days can be answered by the general reader who is unacquainted with the Russian language only in terms of most worn out commonplaces. It would be difficult for him to visualize the course of the civil war, to grasp the nature of the social factors determining its ups and downs, or to form a clear idea of the chief landmarks in the development of the October Revolution — from its inchoate beginnings to the well-shaped course it assumed within a few years.

William Chamberlin's latest book on the Russian Revolution supplies the need of such general information. An inferior book from the point of view of genuine history writing, it is nevertheless of great value as the first systematic presentation of the outstanding facts of the October Revolution, treated with a certain detachment and objectivity of mind. The importance of such a book lies not only in the power to dispel numerous fantastic notions which a persistent propaganda instilled into the minds of many. It would be difficult, for instance, to believe, after having read Chamberlin's book, in the miraculous infallibility of Lenin's mind. His numerous blunders committed during the revolution are recorded in this book as facts of indisputable authenticity. That Lenin was not omniscient, that Stalin's role was quite secondary at the beginning of the revolution, that the Communist Party at that very same period was confused as to the basic purposes of the revolution, that it was driven leftward, and quite reluctantly at times, by the pressure of the masses, — such and many other facts are brought out in this book as a matter of plain historical record.

The real importance, however, of this book lies in the wide panorama revealed by this plain and unadorned tale of the revolution. Very few events offer as deep an insight into the dynamics of history as the great October Revolution. To have a clear mental picture of its outstanding events in their chronological sequence is to obtain a cross section view of history in the making. And it is such a view that is very often afforded by Chamberlin's book, notwithstanding its total lack of valuable historical generalizations. The plain, but authenticated account of the tragi-comic role of moderate socialists (Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionists) affords in itself a revealing glimpse into the objective forces driving the parties of the Second International into an inevitable bankruptcy. The chronicling of the stubborn attempts on the part of the Communist Party to foist a controlled capitalism upon the new social order emerging out of the chaos of the first year of the revolution enables us to understand the tragic

course into which the revolution was forced in its attempt to extort grain from the peasants by force of arms. The close link between the lack of a definite policy of social reconstruction on the part of the guiding elements of the revolution and the economic debacle which set in during the first year of the revolution is brought out clearly by the simple narration of facts as they occurred. In reading such a plain chronicle one cannot help questioning himself: what if the leading elements of the revolution did have a bold scheme of social reconstruction before them? If instead of impeding the elemental sweep of the revolution toward socialization of the means of production they would take the lead in that process? Wouldn't the course of the revolution be profoundly altered by having the peasantry drawn into the process of building up the new socialist economy instead of setting it up as an implacable enemy of the starved cities which were paralyzed into an economic standstill by the obstructionist policies of the Communist Party?

It would be futile of course to expect even an inkling of those problems in the book itself. Written by one who, his long sojourn in post-revolutionary Russia notwithstanding, remained quite foreign to the moving spirit of the revolution, it shows a complete lack of understanding of the basic drives of the revolution. And surely no one can understand the tragic frustrations of the revolution unless one can visualize its basic aspirations. That is why the value of this book is confined to its factual framework and its rich implication. The generalization profusely scattered by the author are of the most vacuous kind, in the light of which this profoundest manifestation of the moving forces of modern history is reduced to a series of meaningless accidents. Was the monopoly of one party the only course the revolution had to follow? Was the forceful requisition of grain the only valid revolutionary policy? Was the monstrous lifeless mechanism of war communism the only possible way of giving expression to the drive of revolutionary forces toward the socialization of industries? Chamberlin does not ask himself those crucial questions. Instead he indulges in the most insipid speculations about the Russian soul, the heritage of Russian history, the spirit of the iron age, etc. To view the Russian Revolution in the perspective of the policies of Peter the Great, as Chamberlin does, is about as helpful in understanding it as the equally profound treatment of American history as the emanation of the Anglo-Saxon spirit would be helpful in grasping the nature of the Civil War.

To reconstruct a great historic event like the Russian Revolution is not only to record all the facts in their chronological sequence. It demands also some understanding of how those facts are interrelated, and what is the basic pattern followed by them in their historic actualization. It is the lack of such a pattern that reduces Chamberlin's book to the rank of an elementary text book whose only value lies in a conscientious recording of available facts, in sifting them in the light of elementary demands of historical science. The greater book on the Russian Revolution is yet to come and that will be written not by a mere bystander like William Chamberlin, but by those who are in deep sympathy with the basic aspirations of the great October Revolution.

S-X.

Building the Future.

The Vanguard is thankful to those who have thus far enabled us to put out four issues. Widespread interest has already convinced us that the future of this libertarian publication is promising. We are therefore now more confident that the Vanguard will soon be able to appear in larger form and more regularly. But as yet we must still appeal to our devoted comrades to do their utmost. For we wish to emphasize, as we have done before, that regularity is one of the greatest factors influencing the success of a magazine.

A great deal more organized effort must now be made than we have had in the past. Indeed, a movement to support it must be built around the magazine. Organized activity to secure the appearance of the Vanguard will have to be undertaken by our out of town comrades. Though it was the Vanguard Group which initiated this move for an outstanding Libertarian Communist Journal that would be instrumental in attracting young thinking people to our movement, it cannot be left to them alone to continue. The group does not want to consider Vanguard as its own organ, but rather the organ of the combined co-operating groups. We wish to see more groups take an active interest in the financial and editorial angles of the publication. We want them to discuss the magazine and feel free to write their suggestions and criticisms, and give real support to the undertaking if they are convinced as we are that our movement needs a vigorous publication especially so in such critical times.

With such an end in view, we submit to our friends and groups a suggestion which we believe will help put the magazine on a more stable basis, and which will bring these groups into closer relations with us. A task which all these comrades should place before themselves is the organization of special groups composed of sincere individuals anxious to support the magazine in every way and who will keep in constant correspondence with us. These special groups should work out details for the sale of the Vanguard, for subscriptions, and donations. Sometime after the organization of these groups, a conference will be called, probably around Christmas time, for the purpose of laying plans for the consolidation of our forces and propaganda in this country. These special groups, armed with literature, are effective means of not only building the Vanguard, but the building of strong, active libertarian groups.

We know the meagre forces of our movement and the difficulty of starting such an undertaking. We know the burdens under which many groups are laboring. But such a move is well worth while. It lays the foundation for a vigorous and complete magazine, and with it a powerful libertarian movement. We urge our friends and comrades to set to work on this plan and see if we cannot make a success of it in a short time. Let them get busy! Get after others to do likewise! All those comrades who are interested in the idea should write to us immediately.

Financial Statement

May 28, 1935 to August 16, 1935

Total Income	\$78.70
Total Expenditures	74.45
Balance	\$4.25
Recautulation:	
Deficit May 28, 1935	\$18.32
Balance for period	4.25
Deficit for August 16, 1935	\$14.07

In Forthcoming Issues of the Vanguard

ARMANDO BORGHI

Former Secretary of the Italian Syndicalist Union

will write on the "Technique of Fascism"

How the Black Shirts of Mussolini Rode into Power

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

Send \$1 to VANGUARD, P. O. Box 92, Station D, New York

COME TO THE FERRERO and SALLITTO MASS MEETING

On Union Square — Sat. Aug. 24th at 2 P. M.

Prevent the Deportation of these Two Anti-Fascist Fighters
PROMINENT SPEAKERS

KEEP NOVEMBER 16th OPEN

to attend a

A Grand Entertainment and Dance

RAND SCHOOL, 7 East 15th Street

Given by the Vanguard and Russian Libertarian Groups

ADMISSION 49c.

