

Stalinist Record in the Cuban Revolution

(Continued from last issue)

The Stalinists, foreseeing that a serious attempt to seize power, might precipitate intervention by the armed forces of the United States, came to the conclusion, at the same time that they prepared the "insurrection", that it was necessary to make efforts to avert intervention. Their ideas on this subject were first advanced in this country by Sinaui in the December, 1933 Communist. With the idea in abstracto, we have no disagreement. What is required, however, is an examination to see whether the methods proposed do not compromise the principled position of the revolution. The seizure of power by the workers anywhere on the face of the earth today will be answered by world imperialism with political and economic support of the overthrown capitalists and, if the world and domestic situations permit, attempts at armed suppression of the revolution. Russian and Siberian soil is fertilized with the blood and bones of thousands of workers who gave up their lives in defense of the Russian Revolution in the great civil war. As soon as the Spanish workers and peasants overthrew Alfonso and established the republic British warships rushed to Spanish waters. When the Austrian workers fought the Heimwehr on the barricades Italy and Czechoslovakia massed troops on the frontiers.

Necessity of Tactical Maneuvers
Realistic revolutionaries must take this danger into account in their program and prepare to meet it. The vital aspect of resistance to intervention in addition to the fight on domestic soil is the extension of the struggle to the soil of the imperialist country. Demonstrations, protest strikes, a broad mass movement in sympathy with the proletarian revolution abroad on the domestic soil of the attacking imperialists and in its vulnerable foreign markets, colonies, mandates, protectorates, can force a halt in the aggression, until the rest of the movement catches up with the outpost sufficiently to make its protest count. In the case of Cuba, upon which is centered the eyes of the millions of Latin American workers oppressed by the same imperialist power, the United States, the Cuban proletarian state will appeal to them for support and call on them to follow the example of the Cuban workers.

Now let us see how it stands with the Stalinists with respect to Cuba. According to Sinaui (December 1933, Communist) "the Communist Party of Cuba considers it advisable for the workers and peasants' government, if it should be formed, to enter into negotiations with the government of the U.S.A. on the conditions of nationalization of big foreign property, while not abandoning this nationalization, i. e., it allows the possibility of buying out this property. . . . the Communist Party of Cuba allows the possibility of retaining American ownership to some extent in the form of concessions, as to the conditions on which the property will be bought out (amount, forms and date of payment, etc.) negotiations will have to be carried out between the future revolutionary government of Cuba and the government of the United States." (Our emphasis.)

It is clear from the underscored parts that the sense of this passage defines a MANEUVERING policy of the Communist Party AFTER it has state power. It is the more understandable when it is remembered that this was written, as the text itself clearly states, in the middle of September, that is, a short time before the Communist Party OSTENSIBLY had the perspective of seizing power.

A Retreat in Face of Imperialists
One thing is certain: had the workers seized power in Cuba at that or any other time in the period since the overthrow of Machado, they would have faced the problem of armed intervention by the United States. Or if they seize it in the future before we seize it here the Cuban workers will face that problem either from the U.S. or some other imperialist power. In that situation it would be entirely correct to draw the superior power into protracted negotiations over treaties, settlements, concessions, etc. while might and main were being expended to arouse the workers of Latin America and the United States to come to the assistance of the Cuban workers' state. And, depending upon the situation and the relation of forces to grant concessions would be entirely correct and unavoidable. The alternatives would be voluntary surrender or armed struggle. Sinaui's explanation defines the limits of the concessions to be made: they proposed to make concessions up to the point of nationalization which they proposed to retain. Should this method fail the Communist Party, says Sinaui, would ". . . organize a real nationwide armed resistance to the interventionists."

All of this is correct. If we spend so much time on this point it is not to heap praise on the Stalinists but in the interest of speaking out what is and of making our position clear. We have nothing in common with those ultra-leftists who regard any concession as a betrayal of the revolution and of Marxism. Were we the party in Cuba that is how we would present the question to the masses. Intransigence in principle does not preclude but makes necessary flexibility in tactics; the ability to maneuver within the framework of firmly established Marxist principles, that is the essence of Leninist strategy. The road of the ultra-leftists leads to sectarianism.

Sinaui's position as we have given it above, we repeat is correct. If the matter rested there, if that were all that were involved, we might conclude that the Stalinists had learned from the events of August and were beginning to steer a revolutionary course.

But that was not the case. The idea of averting intervention as formulated by the Stalinists has two aspects: the policy of maneuvering AFTER the seizure of power—which we have already discussed; and the policy of capitulating to American imperialism and the policy of NOT SEIZING POWER.

In Sinaui's explanation there are three main points: "the C. P. of Cuba tries to direct the chief blow of the revolutionary masses above all against the local Cuban ruling classes"; "the Communist Party considers it inadvisable for the workers to seize the American enterprises, and puts forward the slogan of workers' control carried out through factory committees (if there are revolutionary conditions) which can secure the satisfaction of the demands of the workers"; "the Communist Party considers it inadvisable to force ahead the seizure of plantations belonging to American capital, and fights above all for considerable reductions of the rent of this land."

Who Are the Owners of Cuba?
In China the Stalinists tried in vain and with disastrous consequences to make fundamental distinctions between the native bourgeoisie and the foreign imperialists and attached themselves as a tail to the former. In Cuba they repeat the same treachery but they want to direct their blows against the native bourgeoisie and lie down before the imperialists. Who are the Cuban ruling classes? What is their role in Cuban economy and society? Under the oppressive heel of American imperialism Cuban capitalism had been unable to develop its own finance capitalist class. Almost the entire banking of the island is done by three American and one Canadian bank and their branches. The railroads, sugar plantations, telephone, electric, gas and ice industries, mines, docks shipping, street cars, buses, building and other construction; every large and important industry is owned by American capital or leased by it. A small share is in the hands of British capital. The Cuban capitalists have minor shares. They are the vice-presidents of American firms. They wait on the pleasure and orders of the Chase National and the National City Bank. They beg favors from the House of Morgan and the Royal Bank of Canada. They are perhaps the most helpless and least important bourgeoisie in the world. To conduct a revolutionary struggle against them and not against the American interests is first of all a total impossibility, and secondly, its pronouncement is a plain statement of capitulation.

Surrendering the Struggle
When the C. P. says it considers it inadvisable to seize American enterprises it says that it will not touch EIGHTY PERCENT OF THE ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION OF THE COUNTRY. Let us consider the sugar industry. Almost ninety percent of it is in the hands of American capital. Hundreds of thousands of acres of plantations are owned outright by American capital. Hundreds of thousands more are leased by it through banking arrangements which give it virtual ownership. On these vast expanses, the largest of their kind in the capitalist world, live whole cities and their working class populations. For work and bread, for light and gas and ice they are dependent on the equipment of the plantations. If the workers are not to seize these plantations when the general situation demands it and other workers are seizing the isolated plantations owned by Cuban capital it means that they can conduct no struggle at all.

—T. STAMM.

(Continued in next issue)

If the number on your wrapper is **229** or smaller, your subscription to The Militant expired. Do not delay. Send your renewal in at once and so save us unnecessary labor and expense. If you cannot renew at this time let us know how soon you can and we will continue you on the mailing list.

Appeal For Jewish-Arab Workers Solidarity

To the Working Class of America:

In response to the call of a large section of the working class of Palestine, there has been formed in this country a Committee for Jewish-Arab Labor Solidarity in Palestine with the purpose of helping to forge a united front of the Jewish and Arab working masses. The blood in which Palestine was drenched last October, 1933 showed with tragic clarity how acutely such solidarity is needed. Nor was this the first time that blood flowed in Palestine as a result of the imperialist policy of the British government setting up an artificial wall of distrust and separation between the Jewish and Arab masses. The distrust between the two peoples is stimulated, on the one hand, by the Arab reactionary forces, and, on the other, by the Jewish capitalists, true to the old imperialist maxim of divide and rule. One section of the population of Palestine is incited against the other and vicious jingo sentiments are spread among the masses of both peoples, expressed in the fascism of the Revisionist Brown Shirts among the Jews and the fascist Shabbab organization among the Arabs.

A grave error is being committed by the Histadruth (the Jewish trade union organization in Palestine) which bars Arab workers from its unions. Such a policy only widens the chasm between the Jewish and Arab workers and pours oil on the flames of national hatred kindled by the imperialists. It also helps the British mandatory power to cover up its shameful prohibition of Jewish workers immigration and to disguise its persecution of the immigrants under the cloak of pretended "friendship" for the Arab masses.

The "Gewerkschaftern" campaign, initiated by the United Hebrew Trades for the benefit of the Histadruth has never attempted to influence the leadership of the latter to change its attitude towards the Arabian workers. This has only strengthened nationalist jingoism, bringing forward the danger that the Arab reactionary forces will take advantage of the situation to set up dual nationalist-Arab unions against the Histadruth!

Fellow workers! You can not remain indifferent to the bloody games being played in Palestine. In the great chain of world imperialism forged in the vres of violence and oppression, Palestine is by no means an insignificant link. Uniting three continents, Europe, Asia and Africa, it holds a significant key position in the great world struggle between imperialism and the forces of labor emancipation. The stronger the position of the working class in that country, the firmer and mightier the labor front, the harder will be the way of the oppressor in winning the upper hand in this struggle.

In Palestine itself this is being appreciated by ever greater masses of Jewish and Arab workers alike. The success of the strike of the Arab textile workers in Midjalla, organized by the Left Poale Zion, the recent Southern conference of Arab workers, the growth of the Borochov opposition in the Histadruth, the establishment of the organization "Labor Solidarity" in the face of the ban of the British government, the attempts of the Arab fellahin to organization point to the stormy awakening of the Jewish and Arab working masses. They call to us for support and this call we must answer.

The Committee of Jewish Arab Labor Solidarity is our answer to this call. We appeal to the workers of America! Help us to spread this movement far and wide! Form such committees in your localities! Have your unions call upon the Histadruth to admit Arab workers on a plane of equality! Help collect a labor solidarity fund to set up workers clubs and a labor press in Palestine and to establish broad educational activities among the Jewish and Arab masses. Help strengthen the first attempts of the Arab masses to organize themselves under a militant leadership. Help fight the jingo trickery of British imperialism and Jewish-Arab reaction.

For international Labor Solidarity!

M. Alper, Chairman of Friends of Labor Palestine; Louis Berg; P. L. Goldman, Secretary of New York City Committee, Jewish Workers Party Left Poale Zion; Elsie Gluck; Irving Dryer, Managing Editor "Pharmacist Journal"; Chas. A. Zimmerman, Secretary Manager, Local 22, I.L.G.W.U.; M. Levitt, Secretary Jewish Bureau, Communist League of America; B. Lipschutz, Jewish Bureau Communist Party (Opposition); George P. Miles, Managing Editor "Workers Age"; M. Miskowsky; Herbert Solow; Sidney Hook; Arns Swaback, National Secretary Communist League of America; Elliott E. Cohen; V. F. Calverton, Editor "Modern Monthly"; J. P. Cannon, Editor "Militant"; B. Sherman, Secretary Jewish Workers Party Left Poale Zion.

Committee for Jewish-Arab Workers Solidarity in Palestine
B. Sherman, Secretary
New York Union Square Hotel, New York, N. Y.

A Visit to Tom Mooney at San Quentin

I walked down the Embarcadero on the way to the Ferry. The Embarcadero, at noon, was filled with striking longshoremen and sailors, standing along the curbs; the strike was now in its fifth week, and there were cops on horses and riot trucks everywhere, and scareheads in the papers; none of this however frightened the now embattled longshoremen. I took the Ferry. Out in the Bay—under the fog that is always either rising or falling—it was falling now, but I could see the ships at anchor, ships from all corners of the earth, idle and unmoving, quiet. These charlats of commerce were doomed to stay on unloaded day after day, under the numerous fogs that would come. We passed Alcatraz, the U. S. Military prison, a dreary island under a blanket of frozen air; sentinels were walking the Romanlike roads laced from beneath with straight falling cliffs shooting down into the Golden Gate.

Then I disembarked and I took a train and I passed through the beautiful brown hills and hillocks and valleys of California, to San Rafael, and then on a worn-out bus to San Quentin. Going up to the Administration Building I passed the Fire Department where Schmidt, a comrade of Mooney, was. In the fields by the sides of the road were prisoners hoeing and digging, and above well the glistening high parapets and more sentinels walking.

Entering the Prison
Everything is grey from the uniforms to the human feelings in the eyes of the prisoners, the water blue—as it is—even takes on that color, and the iron-grey of the high and massive prison walls—wherein days and nights and months—are just impressions with a pencil on a soiled calendar. Prisons are prisons and the human mould is frail within their stone.

Mr. Holohan—the Warden of San Quentin—is evidently of the younger school, the latest of the bourgeois Republicans having indulged his social fancy on Mr. Lawes' journalistic sorrows. He has a quick smile and you thank him for he well let you see Tom Mooney with the flash and scribble of his signature on your letter of introduction, and now you are free to see the International symbol of the class struggle. You thank him and rush off across the street to the captain of the Guard, where you make your request again and sign your name to a slip of DON'TS instructing you how to behave and how not to act as a visitor. Again you are thankful for their social exercises, this time you go into a near-by waiting-room and you sit, looking at the silver cups won by prisoners in athletic feats.

The Class Fighter Inseparable From the Movement

Tom Mooney was in a white jacket, signifying the sanitation of the kitchen. He works six hours a day peeling vegetables, rising at 4:30 A.M. for the long hours of the friendless sea and the wind; and the click of rifles on the parapets; and the heavy monotony of peeling vegetables and cleaning the kitchen. His face is full and yet drawn; he smiles and you feel so happy to see him smile. His hand

is firm, his eyes are clear—the revolutionary glint engages his face. He talks to you in a hurried fashion; time is short—perhaps an hour and he wants to say so much. The whole world of the working class is his concern; he talks so that almost everyone in the large visitors room—can hear him. His message is not a personal one, it is International! from the dread of Fascism in Germany, to Fascism in America. The Communist Party and the International have botched up everything despite the mass party and the following in Germany; they have not learned the tactical strategy of the united front. Like the Mooney Congress where the Party carried on its own will—incapable of learning anything of the need of the united working-class front, and then the unwillingness of the Socialist Party to act in the Congress. "Fascism is the last stand of a maddened bourgeoisie", he says, "and it will come here, as elsewhere, unless we stop it, and if not—then a world calamity will occur", WAR! out of which perhaps with guns, the armed workers will know what use to make of them. "I am not sorry", he said, "nor do I lament about what I have done, despite the 18 years of imprisonment." His face, like his words and his eyes are firm bastions of struggle.

Mooney's Spirit is in the Class Struggle

He receives the Militant and other papers and magazines. Many times however, the Militant does not come to his cell. Some articles fail to pass the red pencil of the warden. He wants to know about Trotsky, whether he is still in France, and could I see if it is possible to have Trotsky's "History of the Russian Revolution" sent to him, if it does not go through, it will go to the Moulder's Defense Committee. He is vitally interested in the Longshoremen's strike on the Coast and the impending steel strike in Pennsylvania. He asks me to see that a wire is sent to Pittsburgh congratulating the steel workers and urging them to fight. Newspaper men and lawyers have played their part in his 18 years of imprisonment—and for both as a class he has nothing but disdain, emphasizing his attitude with generous proletarian contempt.

"The strike wave will bring on a wave of reaction, and California is no slouch in its inauguration." The official party does a lot, they move about but they are hopeless; five years of depression and they have not grown—they have not infiltrated either into the unions or onto the political scene. He remembers when he rode on the Red Special with Debs, 25 years ago, at that time the Socialist Party had 100,000 members—and today with the crisis as a means of growing, they too—like the official C. P.—have retrogressed. "But still if I were out now I would try to unite the revolutionary movement." I say to him that it can only be done on a Marxist platform, and he smiles broadly. He condemns the official C. P. for what took place at Madison Square Garden, and is genuinely pleasantly surprised that John Dos Passos signed the document printed in the New Masses condemning the party.

Mooney says the ranks and file unions will grow in the country,

witness the Longshoremen's strike, Toledo and Minneapolis, and the opportunity exists to canalize it deeper, and into a broader protest against the Johnsons (Code administrator) and the NRA, now that the NRA is practically discredited in the eyes of the workers.

Unshakable Faith in His Class

An hour has almost past—the guard says I must go. We stand up together and firmly shake each other's hands, and smile strongly, our revolutionary instincts and understanding in our grasp. "Greetings to Cannon" he had said before. He remembered him. Cannon visited him in 1927. I say "Good-bye Tom, and not for long" and he is smiling. He will go back to peeling vegetables and after 6 P. M. when these grey walls of horror are locked and their gates slide and all the prisoners are in their cells for the night, he is going to sleep, he is very tired and will not be able to do any of his correspondence tonight. As I walk out, the large gates sound their closing feeling, they are being shut up on the large penal vise of the bourgeoisie.

I go back across the Bay on the Ferry. The ships in the Bay are now like ghosts and so are the brown hills, no longer brown but as grey as the deep fog. The Embarcadero is still filled with longshoremen and sailors, their faces are moulded by the news in the papers: "Settlement possible." There is no settlement in the class struggle, only partial victories, temporary gains, and only by the destruction of the bourgeois rule is there victory. Till then—we will have more Mooneys, and many comrades in jail: The class struggle goes on and Mooney is with us!

—HARRY ROSS
San Francisco, Cal.
June 13, 1934

No Time To Lose Big Tasks Ahead

Minneapolis, Toledo, California strikes showed that the workers are ready to fight for their rights.

The Steel, Automobile and Textile industries are like volcanoes about to erupt.

We must be prepared to enter the coming struggles as a militant force, applying the experiences and lessons of Minneapolis.

We Must STRENGTHEN OUR PRESS. BUILD OUR ORGANIZATION. SEND ORGANIZERS INTO THE FIELD.

STABILIZE THE MILITANT. Help raise the necessary funds. Get a book of ten coupons for One Dollar.

Sell them among friends and sympathizers of our movement.

Support the **Organization-Press Campaign**
50% to The Militant—50% for the Communist League of America.
126 East 16th Street
New York City

After the Bulgarian Fascist Coup d'Etat

If the three and a half million Bulgarian peasants owing between them a couple of thousand steel plows, lived anywhere in Asia, or South America, the "little Europe", which still considers itself the "world", might hardly have any interest in their fate. But they are rooted in that sore spot of Europe—called the Balkans from which more than once the flames of war have spread; and Europe has every reason to understand the events in those lands which, with their "single industry" and military-dictatorships not unlike South America, are the measure of the barbarism to which the rest of Europe ever more rapidly adapts itself.

The events preceding the coup d'etat itself are simple enough and for the Balkans nothing new. On the 17th of May, the "parliamentary" government of Muschanov resigned; on the 18th of May the troops occupied all the important points and the "King"; that bloodstained degenerate and "skirt chaser" appointed as Ministers Kimon Georgiev and a few other officers of the united "Zveno". The parliament was dissolved. No one as yet knows what the "internal politics" were. But that the ministry in contrast to its predecessors will reconcile itself with the "hereditary enemy" Yugoslavia, and recognize the Soviet Union, is common knowledge—it will be the first step on the part of the government. Monsieur Barthou has shown the Nazi salesman Goering that it is not so easy to reckon without France as the host.

The fascist press rejoiced over the triumph of the "dictatorial principle"; the democrats bewailed the opposite. Both showed a not very extensive acquaintance with what is called "democracy" in the Balkans. Sections of the masses in the Balkans have ruled before through a peasant dictatorship. What we call democracy never existed and towards the end was implemented in the police elections of Joel Bratiann, Pashitch, Venizelos, and even Maschanov. The Balkans were freed by Christian Europe from the horrible but simple slavery of the Turkish landowners, only to sink into a much bitterer, more refined and abysmal serfdom of the German, English, French, Italian and American banks. The interests of the banks could only be protected through the uniformed swagger of the army; for the bourgeoisie are much too weak and insignificant and the masses, to weak to conquer, are, none the less rebellious. The banks oppressed the countries of "single industries" (Bulgaria—tobacco), throttled the industrial development, and, for example, involved Bulgaria before 1914 in three wars.

Today, what exists in Bulgaria is as little fascism as there ever was democracy. By the all too frequent use of "blanket terms" the explanation of a concrete event is confused rather than clarified. The driving forces are different from those in Germany and Italy and consequently the corresponding forms change. After the war Bulgaria lived under the "democratic dictatorship" of the peasant leader Stambulisky who sought through a foreign policy under French domination to obtain a free hand at home for his petty-bourgeois agricultural reforms—meagre in range—whose profits were diminished by the participation of commerce and the banks, and led to the organization of the dissatisfied city petty-bourgeois, the defeated army, and the unfortunate 300,000 Macedonians into a minority movement under the "Zvenos" party. From its inception, some described it as fascist although it lacked very essential characteristics of fascism. (The city petty-bourgeois and the lumpen proletariat remained under the leadership of the army and bourgeoisie; only nationalist, no "socialist", demagogu).

Thanks to the incredible stupidity of the Communist Party which had the whole working class and twenty-five percent of the votes, the minority movement through a putsch on June 9, 1923, seized power. At the leadership of the putsch stood Professor Tsankov, who was before the war a co-worker of the "Neue Zeit" and that "world leader" who was just recalled as ambassador from Rome. The peasant party and its leadership were slaughtered; the cities remained quiet; and the Communist Party, under the leadership of Dimitroff and Korolov, proceeded from the viewpoint that it was merely a struggle between two bourgeois factions. The C. P. "poo-pooed" the spontaneous uprisings in Plevna, etc. Thanks to that in September of the same year it was driven into illegality from which it has never emerged. The traders came into their own, and the foreign policy was orientated toward Italy. Tsankov was replaced in 1928 by Ljaptscheff, not so much because the murder of twenty thousand people during his regime had aroused god-fearing Europe, but rather because England found it necessary to separate itself from the adventurous policy of

Italy in the Balkans, especially in Macedonia, and to take matters into its own hands. Tsankov had reopened parliament with a decree that forbade "discounteous" parties; displeasing deputies were shot. His retreat, like Ljaptscheff in 1931, was effected in a "parliamentary manner". Muschanov's government was also parliamentary; it replaced Tsankov's united "Zgavor" with a coalition government of the peasant parties. Its foreign policy was less constrained. Its "democracy" did not hinder it in its suppression of the workers party—a Communist electioneering party whose membership was as large as its actual capacity for deeds in face of the military action of June 24, 1933. One observes that the rotation from "democracy" to dictatorship is more variegated than in independent countries where the army is of limited importance.

The coup d'etat is hardly proof of the thesis that international democratic countries worry much about democracy for their vassals. Georgieff is the third dictator along with Pilsudski and Shklyovitch who can thank the Third Republic for his existence.

People who still measure the strength of a party by the number of its votes are astonished that there was no opposition. The Communist Party as well as the peasant party commanded large electoral support. But in the case of both the electoral support indicated merely traditional sympathy. The Bulgarian peasant party since 1923 confirmed the experience of every peasant war: 'the peasantry in itself is incapable of leading its struggles. The Communist Party never recovered from the blows and defeats of 1923 and 1925. The young bureaucrats, who replaced the old bankrupts, were not more capable but merely more stupid. The Bulgarian section of the Third International, despite its heroic past, was not spared the fate of its brother-sections. In the general break-up, from the first, the army remained the only force capable of ruling, and it set up its dictatorship on the 18th of May.

The coup d'etat is a stage in the great duel between France and Germany for the Balkans. Had Germany answered the Balkan pact, initiated by France, with an approach to Yugoslavia, even promising a part of Carinthia after the coordination of Austria, and flirted with Bulgaria and France would even up what Goering's trip—and not only it—had hard-heartedly broken down—he had such a pretty "comitadjis" uniform in his traveling bag!—by a putsch in Sofia.

Now the Balkans appear united under the leadership of France. Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, hand in hand; the Macedonian problem on the verge of its solution. Ah, if that were so easy! It is much easier for a Balkan government to change its color. One should not forget that the sum, which Bulgaria's entry into the World War cost, is very well known and that the majority of the heroes of May 18 over eleven years ago "putsched" for an opposite orientation.

To solve the Macedonian question. A few guerrilla leaders who plunder and kill are not enough. For that the unfortunate 300,000 whom the Yugoslavs on the basis of a "peace treaty" drove from their homes and land to Bulgaria—and the pauperized whom they made the prey of every putsch—must be aroused from their hovels and helped to their land, for that not only the Greek and Yugoslavian yoke in Macedonia must be smashed, but the peasant economy, which cannot be helped through divisions, must be collectivized on a higher basis; in short, everything must be done which before the proletarian seizure of power, the torn Balkan states neither will nor can do.

This new attempt at Balkan unity is no sign of peace but an alarm signal of the coming war.

—E. T., in Unser Wort

Chicago Debate

Spartacus Youth League vs. Young Peoples Socialist League.

Resolved that the organization of a Fourth International is indispensable to the victory of the World Working Class over Fascism.

Affirmative
Nathan Gould and Albert Glotzer (Members National Committee S.Y.L.)

Negative
Arthur MacDowell (National Chairman Y.P.S.L.) and John Riener.

Chairman
Ralph Chaplin—Editor Industrial Worker.

Friday, June 29th, 1934 at 7:45 P.M.
National Socialist Institute
3322 W. Douglas Blvd.
Admission 15c.

Buy a PIONEER PUBLISHERS-CERTIFICATE. It's only \$5 and entitles you to 40% discount on our publications and to a 20% reduction on any book published by other publishers.