

SOCIALIST APPEAL

An Organ of Revolutionary Socialism

Volume II. No. 1.

OCTOBER, 1935

Price 5 cents

FROM OUR VIEWPOINT

RIGHT WING OF NEW YORK MOVES TO EXPEL MILITANTS

Almost at the very last moment prior to going to press we received a communication from New York to the following effect:

1) The State Executive Committee of New York directed Local New York to expel Abe Kruger from the Socialist Party for "the advocacy of communism." (See section of article by Jack Altman and Harold Siegel, dealing with the Kruger Case). The Central Committee of Local New York refused to concur in the action of the State Executive Committee. The right wing could not muster the necessary two-thirds vote. The right wing has openly stated that the State Committee will revoke the Charter of Local New York and reorganize the Local.

2) The New York City Executive Committee passed a motion to the effect "that only literature and newspapers approved by the City Executive Committee shall be distributed and sold at all meetings (street or hall) arranged by the Socialist Party of New York City and all branches of the Socialist Party."

The determination of the New York old guard to expel all those who do not agree with the decrepit socialism that it stands for should now be clear even to those who were naive enough to believe that the "peace pact" agreed to by the right wing and timid centrist majority of the

National Executive Committee, would bring harmony into the party.

If the State Executive Committee reorganizes Local New York there will in effect be two Socialist Parties in New York. To be more accurate there will be two parties called 'Socialist,' one of which, dominated by the right wing, will be nothing but a tail to the La Guardia administration. The revolutionary left wing of the country will recognize the left wing of New York as the only real Socialist Party.

What will the National Executive Committee do? We of course have very little faith that it will do anything. In a critical situation Hoan and his followers will support their blood-bothers of New York.

At any rate the militant revolutionary socialists of the whole country must, in resolutions and communications to the National Executive Committee, make it clear that they will not permit the expulsion of the left wing of the New York party.

The fate of the revolutionary socialists in the whole country is tied up with the fate of the New York left wing. The majority of the N. E. C. should not forget that.

The motion of the City Executive Committee that literature sold at Socialist meetings must first have its approval has the obvious purpose of preventing the sale of the Socialist Call. The only effective answer to such an unwarranted motion is to triple and quadruple the sale of the Call not only in New York but all over the country.

THE SOCIALIST CALL INSTITUTE

IN THE development of the socialist movement the conference held at Boundbrook, New Jersey during the week-end of September 7-8 has a significance which cannot be overestimated. It was held under the auspices of the Socialist Call and consequently can with justification be designated as a conference of revolutionary socialists. It is true that the Call has weaknesses which do not as yet entitle it to be considered a revolutionary socialist propaganda paper but it does represent to a certain extent the revolutionary tendencies in the Socialist party and any conference held under its auspices will necessarily be a conference of those elements within our party that strive to make of the party a revolutionary instrument.

The great significance of the conference lies in the fact that for the first time the leftward moving elements in the Socialist party have attempted to come together and formulate a program and work out resolutions on important problems confronting the world socialist movement which program and resolutions would form the basis of an organized left wing movement on a national scale. For a long time the question could be and was asked of those members of the Socialist party who consider themselves Militants or left wingers: What do you stand for? What principles and tactics do you advocate? The answer could at best be vague. There were no documents to which the questioner could be referred. Every one with left wing tendencies could give his own interpretation of the basic principles and tactics of the left wing.

That the declaration of principles adopted at the Detroit convention could not possibly serve as a theoretical basis for an organized left wing movement became clear to everyone after the New York meeting of the National Executive Committee where the notorious "peace pact" was adopted. It must now be accepted without argument that any document supported by Hoan and all other municipal socialists is fundamentally defective and cannot form the basis of a left wing movement. What

was absolutely necessary was to formulate a theoretical position which would sharply distinguish the revolutionary socialists from the right wing and also from the hesitating centrist elements.

To claim that this important task was accomplished at the Boundbrook conference would be absurd. We can and we do claim that only a beginning was made at that conference. The consummation of that task is still in the future. A provisional program was presented which no one claims to be a perfect document; skeleton resolutions were prepared; various viewpoints were presented during the discussion; the documents introduced were referred to a committee to be revised and amended. To dismiss all this as unimportant and to declare, as does the New Militant, organ of the Workers Party, that "Militant's Confab Proves a Failure" because it was "inconclusive and took no definite steps" is a shortsighted attitude which has nothing in common with Marxist criticism.

Other similar conferences are scheduled to take place. There will be a mid-west conference held at Chicago; there will be one held in one of the New England states. Discussions with reference to the program and resolutions will continue. A final draft will be formulated only after these discussions.

We can even assume that the final draft will not be perfect. But only pure revolutionary sects are able to produce perfect programmatic documents. The declaration of principles of our critics from the Workers' Party is severely criticized by the leftist sectarian groups. And the very criticisms which the writer in the Militant makes of the draft program are made of the Workers' Party declaration of principles by the sectarians. The phrase "armed insurrection" which to all leftists is the *sine qua non* of any revolutionary program is omitted from the W. P. declaration and it is hardly in good taste for any member of that party to criticize the draft program for failure to describe "the nature of the civil war attending the conquest of power". Even if the W. P. declaration did describe in detail the

exact nature of the armed insurrection attending the conquest of power we would feel that it would be perfectly correct to omit such a description. As it is we can, in addition to contending that we are correct, also say something about people who live in glass houses.

We are far from resenting criticism. We shall have opportunity to criticize the program in detail. Some of the points made by members of small revolutionary groups with reference to the provisional program are undoubtedly correct and we hope that the final draft will correct the errors. But a criticism which sweeps away the whole program and declares the conference a failure is not even worth discussing.

At the Boundbrook conference the left wing began the laying of a firm foundation for an organized revolutionary left-wing movement. The program that will ultimately come out will be a program which the left wing will present to the whole membership of the Socialist party to be accepted by the party at its next convention. It will not be a program for the left wing exclusively but a program of the left wing for the party. It will be a program which, if accepted by the party as a whole, will steer it in the right direction, in the direction of organizing the American workers for a victorious struggle for power.

We have been careful in saying that all the Boundbrook conference did was simply to make a beginning. In the socialist movement too frequently has it happened that revolutionary principles are accepted in the abstract without having any effect upon the daily activities of those who accept them. This is a typical centrist fault. It is true that revolutionary practice is impossible without revolutionary theory but it is also true that a revolutionary theory does not necessarily result in revolutionary practice. With the acceptance of a revolutionary program our task is far from ending. We must all the more carefully watch our daily activities so that they be in consonance with our revolutionary theory.

In the bitter struggle that lies before us there must be no hesitation. We must not hesitate to criticize ourselves and those with whom we are closely connected. Only by adopting a revolutionary Marxist attitude which above all means a critical attitude can we succeed in building a left wing and a party that will be more than a mere haven for tired radicals and ambitious bureaucrats and careerists.

The Boundbrook conference will be of historical significance if we carry out all its implications.

SOCIALISTS AND THE ITALIAN-ETHIOPIAN CONFLICT

THE National Executive Committee of our party correctly surmised that the contemplated attack of Italy upon the Ethiopian people was important enough and serious enough to justify the issuing of an appeal to the American workers to support the Ethiopian people. Perhaps we should be grateful for such little favors and not look too carefully at the contents of the proclamation. But alas we need not look too carefully at the contents to convince us that as revolutionary socialists we must protest and vigorously at that.

We had a vague suspicion that our N E C had something to do with the socialist movement. We therefore half expected that a proclamation coming from the N E C dealing with such a vital problem as an immediately threatening attack by an imperialist power would say something with reference to capitalism being the fundamental cause of imperialist war and with reference to socialism as the only guarantee of permanent peace. Knowing the character of the N E C we hardly expected a revolutionary socialist proclamation but we did hope for a vaguely socialist proclamation.

The word 'socialism' cannot be found in the proclamation except when mention is made of the Labor and Socialist International. Neither does the word 'capitalism' occur. It would be absurd for us to insist that those words must be used in every socialist proclamation although we can hardly conceive of the possibility that they would be altogether omitted. We simply mean to indicate that the proclamation has absolutely no socialist character whatsoever about it. The mildest type of liberal could vote for that proclamation with both hands. As a matter of fact no supporter of the capitalist system could possibly take offense at it, excluding a principled fascist.

What an enthusiastic greeting the proclamation should

receive at the hands of the Stalinists! It contains the fundamental premise of the communists that at the present time only the reactionary powers, Italy, Germany and Japan will be responsible for any war. The inference is clear that the other capitalist powers are not reactionary and are not to be held responsible for any conflict.

"The enemy of all that is best in modern civilization.... is to be found in the fascist and aggressive militarist nations like Italy, Germany and Japan" categorically asserts the N E C in its statement. What conclusion can the workers draw from this solemn pronouncement? That capitalism is not the enemy; only fascism. If the dominant elements of the N E C had any political sense they would immediately accept every united-front offer of the communists. There are no theoretical differences between those two camps. In France where the situation is critical the right wing socialists have some political acumen and are not governed by the prejudices of yesterday and consequently find no difficulty in working together with the bureaucrats of the Communist party against the revolutionary socialist elements.

Position of Norman Thomas

We presume that Comrade Thomas read the NEC proclamation and realized that it is not exactly in harmony with his position of supporting the neutrality resolution introduced in congress. Thomas was not satisfied with that resolution because he was in favor of a more strict neutrality than that provided for by the resolution. In his later comments on the war situation Thomas does not at all make clear what attitude he takes towards the problem of neutrality. He seems to have veered around to the N E C position of a boycott against Italy and not against Ethiopia, which is correct.

No argument should be necessary to convince a revolutionary socialist that it is impossible for a Socialist party to be neutral in a war between an imperialist robber country and a semi-colonial people. We must call upon the workers to do all they can to defeat the imperialist power because the interests of the international working class demands the defeat of any imperialist power attempting to enslave a backward people.

This does not mean that we should agitate to have our own capitalist government place an embargo on Italy. In a case where war is involved the working class must play its role independently of the capitalist government. We can have no faith whatever in any motives of a government representing the capitalist class. We would be bitterly opposed to having our "own" government declare war on Italy because we know that it would do so only to protect its own imperialist interests and not to help Ethiopia.

Reformist Socialists and Communists Help their Capitalist Governments

The Labor and Socialist International, the International Federation of Trade Unions together with the Communist International have come out for sanctions by the League of Nations against Italy. **THIS IS THE BETRAYAL OF 1914 OVER AGAIN.**

We are against supporting any capitalist government in any war. Revolutionary socialists are for revolutionary defeatism. The reformist socialists and the communists have now openly shown that they are birds of one feather. The threatening war has shown clearly that a united front of reformists and Stalinists against revolutionary socialists is inevitable.

Pacifism and Confusion

In the lead of those who demand that the capitalist governments apply sanctions against Mussolini are the British labor leaders, as was to be expected. That party is more than anxious to show its readiness to defend the interests of British imperialism. George Lansbury and Arthur Ponsonby of the British Labor party have come out in opposition to sanctions because they are opposed to a "peace by force policy." This is a pacifist position with which revolutionary socialists can have nothing in common. The attitude of Stafford Cripps is a highly confused one. As John Cripps admits in an article in the Socialist Call "its practical results would be very similar to that of Comrade Lansbury". Cripps says he will not support sanctions as long as it is in favor of an imperialist government but his methods of doing away with imperialists

(Continued on page 8)

IN NEW YORK SINCE THE "PEACE PACT"

by Jack Altman and Harold Siegel

MEMBERS OF the Socialist Party throughout the country breathed a sigh of relief when the so-called "peace pact" was negotiated at the New York meeting of the National Executive Committee. They had expectations that some kind of organizational unity could be achieved. However, the Militants of New York, while accepting the pact in the spirit of discipline, were not too sanguine. It must be remembered that the pact was drawn between the N.E.C. and the New York State Committee. The Militants as an interested faction were not consulted. In fact the representatives of the New York State Committee, when confronted with the possibility of conferring with the leadership of the Militants in the presence of the National Executive Committee, stated emphatically that if the Militants were called in they would refuse to continue negotiations with the National Executive Committee, and would stand by their original position.

The Old Guard soon flew its colors. Louis Waldman, New York State Chairman, at a meeting of the Jewish Verband in New York stated that the peace did not include the Militants. It was merely a contract between the State Committee and the N.E.C. He made it clear that so far as the Old Guard was concerned there could be no peace in the Party until the Militants were driven out.

Despite the above, the New York Militants accepted the "peace pact" in good faith and tried to carry it out, although they were under no illusions as to the intransigent position of the old guard. This can be proven by the position taken by the militants at the first meeting of the Central Committee immediately after the "peace pact" was signed.

At this meeting, a leading militant made a motion to dispense with all the previous minutes. Motion after motion was made by militants proposing activity, as the report of the Central Committee, in the "Socialist Call" and The "New Leader" of August 7th will bear out.

However, it is worth while, in the light of what may happen in the future, to take up specifically all the important questions arising subsequent to the "pact" — questions that are bringing division and bitterness into New York.

The Picnic at Ulmer Park

A week after the Central Committee meeting and two weeks after the "peace pact" Local New York held its annual picnic at Ulmer Park. At this picnic, although the New York State Committee had already stated that it would re-instate the Yipsels, a large sign greeted the people coming into the park, saying: "Join the Young Socialist Alliance," the organization which the old guard created to take the place of the Yipsels.

Yipsels selling the official YPSL pamphlet "Make Freedom Constitutional" were stopped, in many cases forcibly.

Comrades selling the "Socialist Call" had their "Calls" taken away from them and some of them were beaten by the special police in the park.

The Kruger Case

A. N. Kruger, a member of the City Central Committee, was brought up on charges of advocating communism. The evidence was a letter sent by Comrade Kruger, who at that time was working for the "New Leader," to comrades in charge of the "Jamestown Labor News" to which he had been recommended as editor by the "New Leader." In this letter he stated that he believes in some of the ideas that are commonly known as communism and made a distinction between his beliefs and those of the Communist Party.

Kruger's defense was simple. He admitted writing the letter and that the letter accurately stated his position. However, as a disciplined party member, he would accept the N E C decision even to the extent of not urging his viewpoint among the membership.

A motion to expel which requires a two-thirds vote was defeated. Julius Gerber then stated that he would appeal this case to the State Committee. It was then carried by a majority vote that Kruger be suspended until the State Committee acts on Gerber's appeal. This was done despite the fact that only the defendant can appeal to the State Committee on a disciplinary action.

There are quite a number of comrades who must answer

similar charges. The old guard, fortified by the "peace pact", is continuing its heresy hunt for the purpose of eliminating all opposition.

Queens County Committee

During the period of the intense fight in Local New York the old guard organized new branches by taking out right wingers from militant branches and bestowing charters upon them. According to the constitution branches can be organized only through the County Committee. The Queens County Committee refused to permit the organization of the branches in question on the ground that they were being organized for factional reasons only and that there was no need for additional branches in the particular localities. Despite the objection of the County Committee Local New York chartered these branches and the County Committee refused to seat their delegates. The County Committee had also condemned the Jewish Daily Forward for its anti-socialist conduct.

Local New York has demanded that Queens County Committee rescind these two actions by September 20th or suffer the penalty of reorganization. This will mean the expulsion of leading members of Queens County. At the time of writing we do not know what action Queens County will take but we are sure that they will not fall into the trap set by the right wing.

Unemployed Work

At the City Central Committee meeting immediately after the "peace pact" motions were made for Party activity. Many of these motions specifically referred to work among the unemployed. The City Central Committee felt that it did not have enough time to take up each item separately and referred them to the Executive Committee. After the Executive Committee labored for two and one-half months activity was born. It discharged Saul Parker as Secretary of the Unemployed Committee, on the ground that "The Unemployed Union is not an official Party organization". This despite the fact that the Unemployed Union has been organized for more than two years, and Saul Parker has been working in this capacity for more than a year and a half, at the salary of \$10 a week.

What this means is that the Unemployed Union is not a tool of the old guard, and as such, they refuse to do anything to support it. If this is not the case, then it is the blindest kind of sectarianism for a Party like ours.

This is another sign of peace — the peace of the grave.

Julius Gerber

Julius Gerber, who is the cause of a great deal of the trouble in New York because of his emotional instability and lack of initiative resigned during the heat of the fight, although he never relinquished his place in the Party office, and still wrote official letters in his name.

He resigned at that time to take over the duties of Secretary for the Eastern State Conference, which was nothing more nor less than the direction and planning of the expected split. In that capacity he sent out the most scurrilous literature, even to non-Party members, attacking the National Executive Committee, as well as Party members.

During this period Julius Gerber decided to run as President of the Sheet Metal Workers Union, and when he was defeated was again nominated for Executive Secretary of New York, although those members of the Executive Committee electing him knew full well the resentment this would cause among Party members. But it seems that "peace pact" or no "peace pact", their factional representative must be in office, and Julius Gerber was elected. The vote on this question, as it is on most questions, was very close. On a roll-call vote, 45 for Julius Gerber, 36 against. This does not represent the true opposition to him, because we feel that in a referendum he would be defeated.

The Teachers' Union

The merits of the Teachers' Union case cannot be treated here, except insofar as it touches upon the fight in New York.

About eight or nine months ago Louis Waldman raised the question of the Socialist group in the Teachers' Union, and he seems to have given lots of guidance, from his own vast experience, to those who have wanted to split the Union. The actions of the administration group in the Teachers' Union have followed almost in every detail the actions pursued by Louis

Waldman and his group after the National Convention of the Socialist Party, with only this difference.

Linville and his group resigned, in the hope that the A. F. of L. Convention will revoke the charter of the A. F. of L. while Louis Waldman could only depend upon the Labor and Socialist International for such an action, and it seemed too slender a reed to lean upon.

The method used by the old guard in this instance is indicative of its general policy. The columns of the "New Leader," a so-called Socialist organ, were thrown open to Abraham Lefkowitz, a non-Party member, in which he viciously attacked leading members of the Socialist Party, including a member of the National Executive Committee. This article attacking Socialists was advertised by the "New Leader" in the "New York Post" and in the "New York World Telegram", through paid advertising, thus calling the attention of even non-Socialists to an attack on Socialists, in a so-called Socialist organ. This was done without giving an opportunity to those members of the Party who were attacked to answer in the same issue.

Indicative of old guard ethics, a "red scare" headline was given to the article. It was so vicious that even Lefkowitz publicly repudiated the headline, making it very clear that he was in no way responsible.

Again the old guard steps in and acts with a group that is ready to split a national A. F. of L. organization. We are convinced that the vast majority of Socialist teachers and of Party members feel disgusted with this exhibition.

The Young People's Socialist League

Immediately following the NEC meeting the Yipsels appeared before the Executive Committee requesting the election of a committee to work out the program for re-instatement. This was done and the committee laid down conditions for the re-instatement of the Yipsels. Amongst the conditions were the following:

1. That all decisions of the Local are binding and will be obeyed by the YPSL and that the YPSL may not adopt any resolution, declaration or statement on questions of socialist principles policies or tactics.

2. Should there be any disagreement between the Executive Committee of Local New York and the YPSL of New York the decision of Local New York shall stand unless overruled by the State Committee of New York.

THIS QUESTION OF THE YPSL

I.

AMONG PARTY comrades, not much effort has been made to evaluate the role, the function and the prospects of the Young People's Socialist League. But much attention has been given to the conflict in New York between the League and Party. Intelligent consideration of that dispute can be given only upon the basis of an understanding of the YPSL.

The YPSL has two, and only two tasks:

1. To help the Party become the political guide for the working class revolution.

2. To win over the youth for active support of that revolution.

II.

How is the YPSL to help the Party become the political guide for the working class revolution? There are five ways:

1. By preparing its members for effective Party membership. This necessarily means to make them much more capable than even most of the Party leaders are today.

2. By being a constant source of criticism and examination of party policy and tactics. Just as trade unionists must do this; just as branches, locals, state organizations, the NEC and the National Conventions must do this;—so also the Yipsels must reach into their background, their problems and the lessons of their Socialist experience to contribute their voice to the many voices which blend themselves into Party policy and decisions. Yipsels are the socialists of the rising generation. They are reflections of and reactions to new conditions. They bring into the movement a new vigor, and a new attitude which to a considerable extent is typical of the

3. All activities of the YPSL except that of education shall be under the direct control of the Committee of Youth Activities of Local N. Y. and all committees must operate through the Committee on Youth Activities.

4. The educational work of the YPSL shall be under the direct control of the Committee on Education of Local N. Y. and the Committee on Youth Activities to have a representative on the Committee on Education.

These conditions were completely contrary to the letter and spirit of the NEC meeting and the YPSL was compelled to reject them. The Yipsels would simply be children doing the dirty work of the Party without the privileges of even a branch of the Party.

Point 2 was so obviously contrary to the NEC decision that the old guard realized that they made a mistake and on August 28, laid down the following new conditions, which were the conditions of the NEC.

"1. That the YPSL conform to the decision of Local New York; 2. that no disciplinary action be taken by the YPSL against members of the Young Socialist Alliance; and (3) that all members and circles be reinstated with all rights and privileges. There is therefore no need for further negotiations and unless the YPSL reinstate itself with Local New York by September 10th, 1935, Local New York will notify the State Committee of New York and the NEC that the YPSL has failed to live up to the decision of the NEC and the agreement between the NEC and the New York State Committee".

However the old guard refused to renounce or repudiate the conditions they laid down in the first instance, conditions which were contrary to the August 28th resolution. In fact Julius Gerber stated at a meeting of the City Central Committee that these conditions would be applied as soon as the Yipsels would be reinstated. The Yipsels of course have refused to put their heads into the noose of the old guard.

This is only part of the story.

Local New York is laying down specific rules and more discipline of a negative kind than even the Communist party, but it still allows Socialists to fight Socialists in the unions and refuses to lay down a policy for work in outside organizations. All this indicates an unprincipled desire to keep power for the sake of power and a policy that will bring ruin to the Party, not unity.

By Ben Fischer

rising generation. Our Party, which must always adapt itself to new conditions and new attitudes, should realize the importance of the point of view and the criticisms of the younger elements. Just as stability and experience are vital to the movement, so also youth and the attitude of the rising generation are vital to the movement.

3. By bringing people with whom they come into contact in the course of their work on the various fields of youth activity into the Party. Where these persons are above 30 years of age, they are brought directly into the Party. Where they are below thirty, they are brought into the Yipsels and then into the Party. Yipsels above 21, who have been in the YPSL for 6 months or more, MUST apply for membership to the Party.

4. By opposing all efforts to frustrate the Party by converting it into an organization whose main orientation is towards municipal socialism and enthusiastic acquiescence to every word and gesture of trade union officials.

5. By resisting every effort to expel loyal Party members whose only "crime" is adherence to revolutionary Socialist principles and policies.

Why are these things functions of the YPSL? Shouldn't the YPSL keep out of Party affairs? These questions are constantly posed.

Young people who are giving their lives to the movement will not keep out of Party affairs. The Party is our Party. It is the Party we live and fight for. It is the Party which is our hope and our source of courage. When it is endangered from the outside, we fight for its welfare. When it is en-

dangered as an effective revolutionary instrument from within, we fight just as strenuously to preserve it for revolutionary Socialism.

But why "use" the YPSL, we are asked. Because it is our organization; it is where we find ourselves. People strive to achieve a purpose through organization of like-minded persons. By and large, we in the YPSL are like-minded. Therefore, being together in our organization, we act together through our organization.

But why not act through Party membership? Because then the YPSL would be removed from the realities of the work and interests of its membership. How can we come to YPSL meetings and close our ears to the vital nature of the Party controversy? Branches and locals have tried that and fallen apart. YPSL circles would react no differently from Party branches.

Then does this mean that the YPSL must participate in every controversy? No, but when our Party is in danger of degenerating or when it is being destroyed by attempts to expel left-wing elements, then the YPSL is concerned. It would be treachery for the members of the League—most of whom are left-wing—not to fight for the Party and the principles to which they are devoted.

III.

How is the YPSL to win over the youth for Socialism?

1. By our members going to the youth wherever they are—in unions, in student groups, in settlement houses, in churches, in Y's. We must go to them because economic forces will not bring them to us through the trade unions—as we had once thought. Millions of young people will never have the opportunity to join trade unions.
2. By developing ourselves to become able workers in youth groups and unions and able exponents of our program and policies.
3. By developing through education and experience a membership which can create correct policies.
4. By developing effective methods of working with students, young trade unionists and the other elements to whom we can possibly appeal.
5. By dramatizing and systematizing our work.
6. By meeting rival youth groups squarely. It does the YPSL no good to bury its head and not recognize the existence of the Young Communist League and even of the minor groups in the radical movement. The YCL has great influence among the youth, probably as great or even greater than we have. We must present our program in contradistinction to theirs to young people.

Can we do all these things? Certainly—if our membership develops; if Party comrades aid our work; if more mature elements can be attracted to the League in larger numbers.

This approach depends on the conception that we are not a group unto ourselves which is to grow only from within. We are an organization which must reach out and bring the youth to our movement. We must train ourselves and gear our organization in such a way as to make it possible for the Yipsels to become a corps of active fighters and organizers for Socialism. Each of us must live for the movement. Each of us must fearlessly go to the gathering places of young people, to the scenes of the struggles of youth, to imbue youth with our doctrines and impress them with the need for organizing for Socialist triumph. To educate youth is important. But in addition to education, we must be the most active and clear-headed participants and leaders in the struggles of the unemployed youth, the trade union youth, the anti-war movement and every field in which youth fights for progressive aims and better conditions.

IV.

There is a different approach from the one outlined above. It is the approach of the right wing. It says that the YPSL has as its tasks aiding the Party, growing in size, preparing people for Party membership and affording young Socialists with cultural, sports and general educational opportunities.

This approach reminds one of the Young Circle League, the youth section of the Workmen's Circle. Substitute "Workmen's Circle" for "Party" in the above paragraph and you have out-

lined the tasks of the Young Circle League as proposed by the right wing for the YPSL.

The YPSL should aid the Party; but to the right wing that phrase means one thing only—the Yipsels should be the leaflet distributors and errand boys for the Party, because in so many places, many Party members don't like to do the Jimmy Higgins work of the movement.

The YPSL should grow in size; but what about developing its members, building mass organizations for young people not yet ready to become affiliated with a political youth organization? What about the Yipsel's growing in influence and ability and experience. Growing in size if not qualified, can only mean growing into a loose cultural vaguely Socialist organization. We do not want this.

Preparing people for Party membership is fine. But we want Yipsels to be intelligent, capable Party members—not just one more in the army of dues-payers.

Affording sports and cultural activities is the task not of the YPSL, but of the Workers' Sport League, Rebel Arts, the Young Circle League and similar groups.

Affording educational opportunities? The Rand School when it was alive attracted many New York Yipsels. The right wingers thought that education meant bawling out Yipsels for being young, for being critical of an older generation of Socialists who had left no great marks of success though fine marks of courage and loyalty. Students became disgusted or embittered. They came for knowledge and received sermons from the Mount of 30 years of Experience which were not to be questioned or doubted but merely accepted.

The right wing has done a miserable job in the field of education. The YPSL itself, with its feeble resources and facilities has even done better.

These two approaches towards the YPSL are before us now. The Yipsels have declared their preference in many ways. The right wing has summed up its preference very simply. August 14th, the Local New York Executive Committee provided that as conditions of reinstatement of the New York Yipsels the latter must accept the following—"That all decisions of the Local are binding and will be obeyed by the YPSL, and that the YPSL in NYC may not adopt any resolution, declaration or statement on questions of socialist principles, policies or tactics;" and in the same decision, "All activities of the YPSL except that of Education shall be under the direct control of the Committee on Youth Activities of Local New York and all committees must operate through the Committee on Youth Activities. The Educational work of the YPSL shall be under the direct control and supervision of the Committee on Education of Local New York and the Committee on Youth Activities to have a representative on the Committee on Education."

Here it is in so many words—the right wing has expressed its point of view.

If the New York Yipsels must accept the Local New York terms, then the Old Guard point of view wins out. The chance of developing a political youth organization for Socialism dies, unless the fight for a real YPSL can win.

Socialism needs the youth. The Socialist Party itself CANNOT win the youth. It does not have machinery to do that and it is not an organization of youth. Only Youth Can Win Over the Youth. Let this be very clear!

The YPSL as a political organization can bring into reality what has been said so often by so many Socialists—"The Youth are the hope of Socialism." But the YPSL as a cultural group, firmly under the thumb of the Party Locals, stripped of inner-democracy, its national organization made unnecessary, its officers bound by every Party whim, but its membership only vaguely sympathetic to Socialism to our Party—such a YPSL will be an excuse for youth work. It will not be able to compete with the Communists, the liberals, the conservatives, the reactionaries. The others will have more life and vigor and be more sensitive to the political tendencies and gropings of the young men and women of America.

Our movement is in danger!

The right wing wants to destroy the YPSL as a political youth organization, because the YPSL is a protector of the Left-

wing, a force for the development of our Party into a clear revolutionary Party; and a source of new leadership and material trained and tried, for the left wing Party forces.

"KILL IT BEFORE IT KILLS US" is the cry of the right wing. But the YPSL will never kill the right wing. If allowed to grow and flourish it will contribute to the change of our Party from a groping hodge-podge to a clear force for Socialism in Our Time. Of course, those who will seek to destroy every advance by disruption and slander, must be eliminated from the ranks

of the organized Socialist movement.

Socialists who take their movement seriously must come to the support of the Yipsels. The question is clear—a political youth organization which will be a constant source of energy, freshness, vigor and courage; or a YPSL which will afford cultural, recreational and educational opportunities for its members, errand boys for the Party and will refrain from "interfering" with the Party which some people look upon as their personal property.

The Franco-Soviet Alliance and the World Proletariat

By Harold Draper

IT IS well known, by now, that since the Franco-Soviet Pact the Comintern and its sections have openly taken the stand that they will support war by an imperialist government where the government is fighting on the same side as the Soviet Union—i.e. against Hitler Germany or Japan; and that so long as this line-up remains, they will not attempt to overthrow that imperialist government through revolution. In the words of the editor of the *Daily Worker*:

"At the outset of the war and in so far as France really fights alongside the Soviet Union, we are not going to call for the defeat of the country that is helping us."
(Hathaway, *Daily Worker*, July 6.)

It is likewise well known that the C. I.'s explanation runs as follows: The Franco-Soviet Pact is a force for peace. Anything that delays the coming of war (which must however be admitted to be inevitable under capitalism) is in the interests of the Soviet Union, and *ipso facto*, of the world proletariat. The Franco-Soviet Pact must therefore be supported by the French workers. Of course this means that when war does come they must support that war; but although it may be true that the French government will fight Germany for its own imperialist interests, yet the by-product of its action (defense of the USSR) is objectively desirable and beneficial to the working class, and it is therefore that we support the war.

The *Socialist Appeal* and the *Socialist Call* have already pointed out that this "justification" is the same as that of the social-patriots of 1914. One need only point to the Serbian question in the World War: Serbia was one of the national states of the Austrian Empire, fighting a national-revolutionary war against Austria. Everyone knows that it is as incumbent on revolutionaries to support national-revolutionary wars as proletarian struggles. And Russia entered the war, she said, to help the Slav peoples to freedom. Although her real reason was her own imperialist aims, Russia was objectively working for the liberation of Serbia. Was Lenin therefore wrong in working for the defeat of Russia?

So today: war by France on Germany may objectively aid the USSR, but as far as the French working class is concerned, their government is carrying on an imperialist war, and they cannot support it. And since support of the Franco-Soviet pact entails support of France's war against Germany, they cannot support that either, even if it is otherwise of aid to the Soviet Union.

This is the fundamental criticism. But apart from this basic consideration—**IS IT TRUE THAT THE FRANCO-SOVIET PACT IS IN THE INTERESTS OF THE SOVIET UNION?**

1. The Franco-Soviet military alliance does NOT make for peace, as the Communists claim. (The Communists, indeed, claim more than this. They have actually asserted that the Pact guarantees peace!—See Duclos in *L'Humanité*, central organ of the French C. P., June 21.)

But when France and the USSR declare their alliance against German aggression, the situation is not eased but only made tense. Germany does not cease to be impelled toward war by the international forces of fascist capitalism, but it is spurred to still greater armaments and militarization. In reaction to one alliance, counter-alliances are crystallized. Since the Pact, England has been pushed closer to Germany (cf. the air treaty), and a sharp swing in Japanese opinion in the direction of Germany has been reported. Nothing is pacified. The lines of war are merely clearly drawn. All existing antagonisms are jacked up a notch. When war does come, it is bigger and better.

This process is nothing new. Fay's *Origins of the World War*

traces it in detail. The Communists point to the defensive character of the Franco-Soviet Alliance as distinguishing it from the pre-war variety: this means nothing except to clear the Soviet Union of suspicion of aggressive or imperialist designs, if this is necessary. The Pact is no less a part of the lining up of the Powers for the next war.

But more important even is the fact that the Franco-Soviet Pact removes the biggest obstacle to the provocation of war: the fear of the war-makers that the declaration of war will unleash revolution or, at least, internal struggles. As far back as 1909, Kautsky gave this as the reason why the war he saw brewing had not yet broken out.

"Long ago this situation would have led to war... had it not been for the fact that this alternative would have brought the revolution that stands behind the war—nearer than even behind an armed peace. It is the rising power of the proletariat which for three decades has prevented every European war, and which today causes every European government to shudder at the prospect of war. But forces are driving us on to a condition where at last the weapons will be automatically released." (*Road to Power*, pp. 111-112.)

And indeed, the memoirs of German statesmen show that their anxiety before the war was not to see whether the Social-Democrats were in favor of peace, but to make sure what they would do once war was declared.

The Franco-Soviet Pact means that the menace of internal disturbance—the main obstacle to war—is removed (as far as the Communists are concerned). The boldness and provocativeness of the French imperialists then depends only on the strength of their enemy without, not within.

And it is this pact that is hailed as a step toward—nay, a "guarantee" of—peace!

II. But let us probe all the possibilities. Suppose the Pact did delay war (it is not worthwhile here refuting the view that it cannot guarantee the end of war): The Communists argue that even if the pact means a breathing-space of only a month, or a year, or two years, it is worth supporting; for then the Soviet Union has so much more time to grow strong. Certainly, if this were the only result of the Pact, there could be no criticism. But to sacrifice the opportunity for proletarian revolution that imperialist war offers—to sell the workers into the service of imperialism—for the sake of one month, or one year or one decade of the Second Five-Year Plan is—rather a bad bargain.

The question is squarely posed: Which is of greater value to the USSR—a breathing space, or the existence of a revolutionary menace behind the lines of the capitalist nations? What should a Socialist state rely on—national self-sufficiency, or the revolutionary workers of the world? Hitherto, the Communists have claimed that these two are not mutually exclusive, but rather complementary. This should be so, but the Franco-Soviet Pact drives a wedge between the two, and forces the Comintern to choose—the first. The Soviet Union thereby sacrifices its ultimate interests to its temporary interests.

Lenin defined opportunism as the sacrificing of "the fundamental interests of the masses" to the temporary interests of a minority of the workers. This is what the German Social-Democrats did on August 4, 1914: it would have been impossible for them to fight the war without seeing the magnificent structure which they had so laboriously built up within capitalism go to smash—their labor institutions, unions, banks, cooperatives, the whole labor bureaucracy.... This constituted for the Social-

Democrats a vested interest which they had to preserve at all costs, since to them it represented the nucleus around which the future Socialist society would gradually grow. (So, being opportunists, they saved their Socialist-society-within-capitalism, and these same opportunist policies made it possible for a Hitler to smash their little world anyway, later. Truly, reformism carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction.)

"The more things change, the more they are the same," said a French wit, (some time before the Franco-Soviet Pact). Opportunism may change its form, and call itself by the horrendous name of Communism, but it remains the same. For behold! the Communist International also has its vested interest, called the Soviet Union, and it is as willing as the next to sacrifice the

"fundamental interests of the masses" to the temporary, short-range, and therefore false interests of a minority.

Does this mean that the Third International is following in the footsteps of the Second? No. Everybody knows that Communists work with a quicker tempo than reformists. The Second International held congresses at Stuttgart and Basle at which it sent out clarion calls to the workers of the world to warn them against the approaching imperialist war. Even the despised German Social-Democrats vigorously opposed war until its very declaration. It took them until August 4 to come around to social-patriotism and betrayal.

The Comintern is more honest. It scorns to deceive the workers so long.

"FASCISM" IN TERRE HAUTE

by Lydia Beidel

THE WORKING-CLASS movement is an international whole. The saddest proof of this theory is the agility with which the various national sections adopt each other's false ideas and immature concepts. If this weakness were balanced by an equal adeptness in learning the lessons of theoretical and tactical error, things might be much better with the revolutionary socialist movement today.

Remote as it may seem, geographically and politically, from Berlin, Paris, or Moscow, Terre Haute, Indiana brings up the present rear in the procession of error in revolutionary theory as it is expressed by some of our Socialist party members.

For almost two months Terre Haute and Vigo County Indiana, have suffered under a form of martial law. A general strike of short duration declared in the last week of July was offered by Governor McNutt as the excuse for a partial suspension of civil authority and the bringing in of troops. Picketing is prohibited and the general meeting-together of workers forbidden, except when such meetings occur under A. F. of L. auspices. Strike-breakers for the Columbia Enameling Works transact their business under sanction of a pass signed jointly by the vice-president of the Enameling Company and the commanding officer of the Indiana National Guard. Men arrested by the National Guard are held incommunicado for weeks; the right of habeas corpus is suspended. All of which leads many of our American Socialist party members dangerously far along a path strewn with the bleeding bodies and corpses of other Socialist parties of the world.

What do conditions in Terre Haute signify? Terre Haute does not stand alone as a single peak of organized mass action against economic oppression. It has some very significant predecessors — Minneapolis, Toledo, San Francisco. To view any of these upheavals as isolated "accidental" instances or rebellion is to fail to see the profound change through which American labor is going. Each of these is a dramatic manifestation of the slow development of strike strategy to a new and higher level. The decomposition of the capitalist producing machine (of which enhanced monopoly is a part) is making more and more ineffective the strike against the single industrial enterprise. Only two alternatives offer themselves: the general "horizontal" tie-up of an industry (which presupposes a growth of industrial unionism); or the general strike, paralyzing the functioning of a highly interdependent geographic area.

As the decay of capitalism proceeds, the use of the general strike tactic will become ever more necessary and frequent. Coincident with this broadening of strike strategy will come the increasingly more brazen and ruthless use of governmental force on the side of capital. Each of these developments finds its source in the immutable logic of capitalist economic evolution; it is capitalist economy and not the presence of a peculiarly constituted political superstructure that is the root cause of working class misery. One political set-up as against another might add a few embellishments on the side of capitalism, but the prime mover of repressive force against workers is the capitalist producing apparatus.

In the minds of some of our comrades, martial law in Terre

Haute falls, together with the NRA, low wages on relief projects, the cutting down of educational budgets and a hundred other things, into the category of American fascism. According to one party member, Governor McNutt himself declared that he has instituted a fascist dictatorship in Vigo County; and because Governor McNutt knows just nothing at all about the theoretical basic characteristics of fascism, we are not obligated to echo his words. Our comrades have found an "illegal" use of martial law; is our logical position therefore to strive to cleanse martial law of its "illegality"? "The whole thing is unconstitutional anyhow". Fight martial law on this basis and the next time Governor McNutt will give you a thoroughly constitutional martial law — and the constitutional clubs will crack just as loudly on workers' skulls and the constitutional bullets kill just as dead.

The declaration of any form of martial law is a move of the capitalist state machine against the working class. "Unconstitutional" or otherwise, it is a vicious assault upon the workers' interests. Terre Haute workers must be swung into a fight against martial law knowing that they are faced with a normal expression of capitalist class rule at a given intensity of struggle. To fight on the basis of legality is in essence to assist capitalism in making its future onslaughts fool-proof; and it diverts to a superficial technicality the attention which the workers should have directed to the fundamentals of the class nature of the state. But most vicious of all, such a campaign throws the reliance of the working class upon the "liberal" phases of the bourgeois constitution instead of upon their own organized resistance.

The state and its troops have allied themselves with the capitalist owners of industry; witness the famous pass issued to the strike-breakers; this is fascism, cry some socialists. Can anyone dig up a single strike of major importance in the history of American industry where this has not happened? Have we all forgotten Ludlow and Homestead, fruit of the heyday of capitalist democracy? Has everyone forgotten that parties were declared illegal and men—hundreds of them—held incommunicado by Attorney-General Palmer in 1919, long before even Mussolini began to do much about fascism? The fact that the Terre Haute A. F. of L. is allowed to sponsor huge open-air mass meetings on the steps of the court-house is not only an indication of the questionable working class virtues of that respectable body but also a pretty certain mark of an ordinary non-fascist capitalist behavior on the part of the governor.

The things taking place in Terre Haute are not happening because the administration of the state of Indiana has broken with bourgeois democracy and gone fascist in one county. If the administration uses some of the methods of fascism (but leaves undone some much more important things that a fascist regime should do) that does not excuse us for raising the confusing "wolf"-cry of "fascist dictatorship" against it. These acts are the flower of Capitalism—the plain, everyday, garden variety; and compared with Ludlow and Homestead and Minneapolis and San Francisco, weeds of a mild odor. Violence comes out of capitalism just as fascism develops from capitalism; the working class must fight terror in Terre Haute today as a manifestation of an existing capitalist economy and not as the threat of something bad lurking in the dark future.

But is it mere pedantic quibbling to denounce as a very costly sport this loud labeling of the obviously common functional manifestations of a capitalist state machine as fascism? The number of German and Austrian proletarian lives that have paid the price of this sport is well up in the thousands. The Communist party of Germany found full-blown fascism in every administration preceding Hitler—nay, it found it even in the ranks of the Social-Democratic and Communist Labor parties. So many of the ordinary things of life were fascism that the masses of workers found themselves quite unmoved to take arms against the arch-fascist, Hitler. And the revolutionary workers themselves, whose first duty to the movement is intellectual clarity and scientific accuracy, were confused and stupified by a slipshod irresponsible leadership. You cannot destroy an enemy if you do not know of what he is made nor where he is.

This simple and hysterical crying of "Fascism, fascism" has a corollary still more dangerous to the revolutionary socialist movement. That consists in diverting all of the energies of the party membership and sympathetic masses into the channel of a defensive struggle against a threatening condition without recognizing that the best defense against that menace is a strong offensive against capitalism in its every manifestation. The germs of fascism lie in capitalist breakdown; fascism can be prevented only if the revolutionary socialist party takes advantage of that breakdown to strike blow after blow at the body of capitalism itself, destroying the germ with the bearer.

We can look to Germany again for lessons in defensism and its outcome. For how many years and how desperately did German Social-Democracy "defend" the Weimar Constitution against "the fascist menace?" But they failed to organize the offensive for socialism and now they are still on the defensive—behind the walls of concentration camps.

But if we want a still more tragic manifestation of defensism and its final implications, we may look to our erstwhile critics, the Communist International. Completely abandoning the

ETHIOPIA (Continued from page 2)

seems to be to ask the imperialists to surrender their imperialist rights. Whereas the attitude of revolutionary socialists is to struggle for the defeat of their own imperialist government.

It must be made exceedingly clear that in fighting against the Italian imperialists we are fighting for the interests of the Italian working class. The cause of the Italian workers is very dear to us and we shall do all in our power to help them free themselves from slavery of fascism and capitalism. The defeat of Mussolini is a victory for the Italian workers.

And it must be made just as clear that we are not at all interested in the King of Kings and the Conquering Lion of Judah. How shameful and disgraceful is the attitude of the Communists toward that slave owner and defender of the feudal lords. They act as if that slave driver represents the interests of the Ethiopian peasants and slaves. We defend the Ethiopian people against the imperialist designs of Italy but we are not at all interested in seeing that Haile Selassie remains as the ruler of an exploited people.

Revolutionary socialists in contradistinction to reformists and Stalinists will say clearly: **WE ARE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF MUSSOLINI BUT WE ARE ALSO AGAINST OUR OWN IMPERIALIST GOVERNMENTS AND THAT FIRST OF ALL.**

principle that the irreconcilable enemy of socialism is the capitalist state machine, we see these "communists" (motivated by a weak, non-revolutionary defensism) going the length of distinguishing between good and bad capitalism, good and bad imperialist wars, even bad and not-so-bad fascisms! And, mind you, asking the revolutionary masses to line up on the "good" sides, if they are not too dizzy to know which is which. It may be Comintern "dialectics" to conceive of good enemies and bad enemies, but it is sheer betrayal in the mind of any revolutionary socialist.

The height of confusion is found, however, in the new line of the Communist party of France, which now busies itself fighting fascism by "people's front" alliances with potentially fascist elements in France to prevent fascism from arriving in the form of a Nazi army from Germany. The seeds of French fascism lie in France and not in Germany and the only real defense against German imperialist aggression is the destruction of French imperialism through the socialist revolution. To make a truce with French imperialism means to act as midwife at the birth of French fascism. This is the ultimate logic of the purely defensive fight against fascism.

The present struggle in Terre Haute will not be the last one of its kind upon which the Socialist party will have to take a position. That position should be taken upon the basic socialist principle that the struggle for socialism is conducted against capitalism as capitalism, regardless of its manifestation under a democratic republic or a fascist dictatorship. The new Comintern line which expresses the distinction between bourgeois democracies and fascist dictatorships in the form of truces and alliances with the former in the field of the class struggle is suicidal for the cause of the socialist revolution. Those ideologically bent in the direction of compromise with ordinary prefascist capitalism are precisely the ones guilty of the careless terming of every violent expression of capitalist rule as fascism. Whether motivated by cowardice or a spirit of compromise or an inability to understand the forces with which they must deal, these people refuse to come to grips with capitalism as a whole and single out only its crassest evils for attack, branding these not as normal expressions of capitalism but as something else that has a bad name.

Revolutionary socialists will have to work hard to stop the spread of the idea that there are good and also bad capitalisms. Capitalism in all its forms is diametrically opposed to socialism; some people are forgetting that fact very rapidly. Those who are still undemoralized, those who still have the virility to fight an offensive battle against capitalism, economically and politically, on the basis of socialist principle will have to be drawn together. It is the historical function of revolutionary socialists today to gather together and build into a strong organization those whose opposition to capitalism is a matter of basic principle and not simply emotional reaction.

SUBSCRIBE FOR

S O C I A L I S T A P P E A L

RUDOLPH C. OLSON

Business Manager

4219 LINCOLN AVE.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Subscription: 50 cents 12 issues—25 cents 6 issues