

YOUNG

WINTER 1952 Number 5, new series

SOCIALIST

The Young Socialist Review is the official discussion organ of the YOUNG SOCIALISTS (previously YPSL) youth section of the Socialist Party - U.S.A.

R

CONTENTS:

Page:

Political:

D. McReynolds	- On Cooperation with the Socialist Youth League	4
O. Cahill	- The Role of the Party	1
V. Davidson	- Socialism against War and Liberalism	7
Luxemburg Tend.	- What now,.....?	12
Y.S.-N.E.C.	- Political Resolutions, September 20 & 21.	14
B. Denitch	- Notes on "Cooperation with SYL"	6
M. Harrington	- Notes on the Party	11

Organizational:

P. Winant	- Socialist Action	17
N. Sakell	- NAB Report	18
	- An appeal for comrade Mohring	3
	- Editor's notes and who's who	10
Ed. Committee	- List of available material	19

Other :

J. Greenstein	- Dada, Socialism and despair	22
	- Socialism and Sex	21

YSR is published by the NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE Y.S. at Suite 513 303 4th Avenue New York, N.Y. The YSR takes no responsibility for the views expressed in signed articles, those reflect the views of the author, not necessarily the Y.S.

Articles are solicited from all members of the Y.S. and the Socialist Party. The Editor will accept at his discretion articles by non-members.

FREE TO YIPSELS and SOCIALIST PARTY MEMBERS 15¢ TO ALL OTHERS.

In a previous issue of the Young Socialist Review, an article by the Luxemburg tendency ("The Future of the party and the role of the YS") contained a brief discussion of the incorrect attitudes on the role of the party current in the SP. This present issue furnishes a good opportunity to discuss the true reason for the existence of a Socialist Party and the role it must perform.

It should be obvious to everyone who thinks at all that the reason for the existence of the SP is not to win elections. It is debatable whether the primary purpose of a socialist party should ever be electoral. There can certainly be no debate about a socialist party in the U.S. winning elections. Most people seem to have realized this. The right-wing in the SP realizes it; hence their proposal to liquidate the party to form a pressure group in the Democratic Party ... a group which would amount to a more leftist ADA or a less senile SDF. This attitude is not a betrayal of previously held ideals. It is a logical outcome of their conceptions of socialism which envisages the election of good men (meaning themselves) who will enact laws and usher in a "planned economy" and a "welfare state" which will mean that we have a "cooperative commonwealth" or a "mixed economy" or "socialism". To them these terms are synonymous. Since these things, or somewhat diluted versions of them, are being brought into being under the aegis of the Democratic Party, that is the logical place for this faction to go. And that is where they will go. Obviously then, one's conception of what socialism is influences one's conception of a socialist party.

A group of comrades in the YS (the Luxemburg tendency) has been attempting to find new answers to basic socialist problems; one problem is the conception of socialism itself. There have been a few stabs in the direction of an answer in previous issues of the YSR, but no thought-out analysis of the problem. I do not propose to offer such an analysis here. Within the limits of this article I can only sketch the outlines of my conception of socialism.

Socialism, as I see it, has these aims:

- 1) To abolish the economic exploitation of man by man
- 2) To extend the productive forces in order to give man mastery over nature as far as possible
- 3) To put the control of man's economic and political destinies into his own hands.

This last aim is the most important. It is, in the words of Engels, "the leap from the realm of necessity into the realm of freedom". It is the realization of the most profound theory of Marx - the abolition of man's alienation from society.

This aim makes it imperative that the social revolution be conscious. This means that it must be made by the mass of the people with a full awareness of what socialism is and a desire to attain it. (I say "mass" and not "majority" because there is a tendency to confuse majority with "51%", which is not at all what I mean.) This means that the Bolshevik revolutions, both the successful one in Russia and the unsuccessful ones in Germany and Hungary, were not socialist revolutions since the mass of the people either

did not support them or supported them because of reasons other than the desire to establish socialism.

The tactics and strategy of the social revolution should be variable and the forms that a socialist party takes should be variable also. However, there are several absolute conditions that a socialist party must meet:

1) Most important, the socialist party must itself be aware of the true nature of socialism; it should propagate this conception and struggle toward making this conception a reality.

2) It should not be primarily an electoral party. It is difficult to speak of the true nature of socialism in an election campaign campaign and electoral and parliamentary action tend to take things out of people's hands and make them look elsewhere rather than to themselves for solutions to social problems. Hence, an emphasis is needed on direct action rather than on electoral action.

3) The party must orient itself and its appeal primarily to the working class, not from a mystique of the proletariat, although that is not to be condemned entirely, but from a recognition of these facts:

a) the workers are the people most oppressed in capitalist society and those who will have the greatest part in building the socialist society; hence it is absolutely necessary that they of all people have an understanding of what socialism is

b) since mankind is not composed of idealists, it is the victims of, and not the beneficiaries of capitalism whom we can expect to fight it

c) the workers are potentially the most powerful class in society

4) A socialist party must reject any conception of the conquest of power by a "vanguard of the working class", either a revolutionary vanguard who will seize power, or a reformist vanguard who will ooze into it.

5) The party must be sufficiently disciplined to make it effective and sufficiently democratic to make it flexible.

Outside of these important conditions it is not too important what form a socialist party takes. In most democratic countries, socialist groups of any size use the form of electoral parties for convenience, but this is by no means absolutely necessary. Victor Serge has said, "a trade union federation may conceivably play the same role (as a party); or an alliance, a front, or a bloc it is wise to attach more importance to realities than to words. The anarchist FAI in Spain has always claimed not to be a party, but it is one in the most effective sense of the word." In the case of socialists in the U.S. for example, it may be doubted whether an electoral party effectively propagates their aims.

It is hard to say which socialists groups in the world meet the conditions set down above. Probably none do entirely. But several socialist parties and groups (large groups) come pretty close to them notably, the SP in India, the POUM in Spain, the left-wing of the UPA in Ukraine and the left-wing groups in the social-democratic parties of all European countries.

The American SP compares badly with even these minimum conditions. Many of the party members, indeed perhaps the majority of them, have absurd ideas or no ideas at all on the nature of socialism. The SP has in the past, particularly the recent past, been almost exclusively an electoral party; so much so that when it became apparent the party

could no longer campaign effectively, many saw no alternative to entering the Democratic Party. The S.P. has directed its main appeal not to the workers but to the liberal petty-bourgeois. It is at least anti-putschist, but this has often been more the result of a worship of legality than a fear of dictatorship. It is notoriously one of the most undisciplined socialist groups in the world; and as for its vaunted democracy, it has been the result more of an intellectual indifference than a concern for a free exchange of ideas. 3

With views like these, why do I remain in the SP? And since these views are quite general among members of the Luxemburg tendency, why do any of us remain in the SP? I can claim to speak only for myself, but perhaps I can speak for other members of the tendency as well.

We are not members of the SP because we agree with its present position. We do not and cannot agree with it. We are members of the SP because it contains, along with the reformists, many honest grass-root socialists whom we can reach and are reaching with our ideas. We have good precedents for our action; notably the Pivert group in the French SFIO, which has a record far worse on every count than the SP. And with all the deficiencies of democracy in the SP that I described above, there is still more opportunity to spread our views in the SP than there would be in any other organization in the U.S. - including the ISL-SYL.

Practical conclusions, which could be formulated at the end of this article were mainly given before hand in the article, "The Future of the Party and the Role of the Y.S." so there is no need for me to reiterate them. I can only add that the need for left-wingers in the Party to caucus on a principled basis can hardly be exaggerated, and I invite correspondence on the subject of such a caucus to be sent to the Editor of the YSR.

AN APPEAL FOR COMRADE MOHRING (Editor of German third camp paper)

Dear Comrade;

Recently, we received a communication from Europe to the effect that Hermann Mohring, the editor of Pro-und- Contra, a German socialist third camp magazine has been kidnapped in Berlin by the Stalinists. There has been little about this in the papers. We mention it to you, not because there is anything we can do for Mohring; tragically, there is nothing that can be done. There is little probability that he will ever be seen alive again.

We can help his family. Mohring, his wife and children have been living in need for years. Now, with Mohring gone, his family faces actual starvation. The only help they can get must come from us and other socialists of our outlook. Clothes, CARE packages-- anything you can give will help.

The address of the Mohring family is : Anny Mohring, Berlin-Charlottenburg, Dahlmannstrasse 27 Germany. If it is more convenient, help can be sent to them through us. But whatever way they are aided they must be aided soon.

Fraternally,

DISTRICT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE NY-YS

Because of the current controversy in regard to ANVIL and the liason now existing between certain sections of the Young Socialists and the Socialist Youth League, I offer this article for two purposes: support of the liason, and a warning against taking it too seriously.

Let it be said in the beginning that I have been one of the first and strongest advocates of close cooperation with the S.Y.L. on certain matters - particularly ANVIL - and am currently seeking the merger of the Westwood Socialist Club with the S.Y.L. group and other students in a "common front" of the left at the University of California at Los Angeles. I hope then, that my friends in S.Y.L., to whom I am also submitting this article, will take the following comments as the thoughts of one who is essentially a friend. And I am sure that with this preface my Socialist comrades will realize I am writing, not out of the hysteria that sometimes seems to grip the New York situation, but from the relatively calm climate of the West Coast. I hope that the "left tendency" in New York will give this article careful thought.

Principled Unity

First let us recognize that S.Y.L. is strong. I didn't say large, but strong. Their members work hard and effectively. Who motivated the Politics Club, Focal Point, ANVIL? The Young Socialists? No - we must grant that the motivation stemmed in large measure from S.Y.L. This is the primary reason I have worked with S.Y.L. Not because I am in total agreement with them, but because they have proven effective workers. We need them in the anti-war movement. This is not opportunism, for we should not seek to "use them" so much as we must find ways of working together. The impertive today is principled unity on the left in face of war. Thus, all groups not in basic disagreement should be held together by some sort of liason. But I must raise certain questions with S.Y.L. and with those in Y.S. who so eagerly seek to embrace them as political brothers. There is a considerable difference between the people you choose to help you put out a fire and the people you choose to form a political organization. The fire today is war, and I would even work with Stalinists if it weren't for their distressing habit of using gasoline instead of water on the blaze. The S.Y.L. however, holds certain concepts that make closer unity difficult.

Vanguard Concept

Let us take some examples. The S.Y.L. believes, according to its speakers, that it is the vanguard of the revolutionary movement. I question whether in the current flux of political events, anybody is a vanguard. Certain ideals, beliefs and principles, yes - but an organization? No! I don't believe the S.P., much less the S.Y.L. is the vanguard. But let us examine this for a moment. The belief that a specific organization rather than a general philosophy. And what history now demands of the radicals is the effective dissemination of a new way of living together rather than an ineffective attempt at setting up an organizational vanguard. This "organizational vanguard" theory of the S.Y.L. makes closer cooperation impossible, because obviously all concessions must come from us and not from them, since vanguards don't (or shouldn't) make anything but tactical compromises.

Immature Radicalism or Bolshevik Sentiment

The S.Y.L. emphasis on secrecy is distressing to me. I am asked not to

5

mention in conversations with students - which of my friends belong to the S.Y.L. Why not? What sort of cops and robbers game is S.Y.L. playing? The S.P. - pacifist "left" here on the West Coast went through this stage a year ago (looking for dictaphone wires, using code names over the phone, meeting late at night, checking for "spies", etc.) but grew out of it as a sign of extremely immature radicalism. But the S.Y.L. takes its secrecy very seriously - amusing at it is to the rest of us that have been around longer. If it is only a passing stage I would not worry, but their top leaders adopt this position, leading me to believe they are back at the old Bolshevik game of conspiratorial activity.

I will skip over their support of democratic centralism and touch on their tendency to distort events - as when, in their paper, LABOR ACTION, they gave a very distorted picture of the Y.P.S.L. convention. Or in their apparent need to paint their opposition as "evil" or "opportunistic". Thus, my friend, Vern Davidson has become the devil personified for his opposition to S.Y.L. and they ask me here on the coast if he is psychotic or just vicious. I remember on one occasion when Vern and I had a slight fracas, arising over a mutually exclusive interest in a girl - a totally non-political quarrel that lasted a week and was reconciled over bourbon and gin - that in S.Y.L. circles in New York it was being reported that "Davidson and McReynolds have had a terrific fight" that paralyzed and divided the entire Los Angeles Y.S.

Their general immaturity disturbs me too. Particularly in regard to theory. The S.Y.L. is interested in theory. This is fine. I like a little theory now and then as much as the next man, perhaps a little better. But in the S.Y.L. you don't comment on the weather or women, but on the latest theory of the Master, i.e. Max. The world is not basically changed by theories but by theory and action combined. And the S.Y.L. is so busy being a theoretically correct "vanguard" that it appeals only to other intellectuals who are concerned with the state of theory. This leaves the "mass" to the Socialists and I am perfectly happy with the bargain. For example, they don't like the way the North American Co-op League is staying out of politics. So they criticize it for not being theoretically correct. But at U.C.L.A. no member of the S.Y.L. belongs to the co-op! On the other hand, the S.P. has always placed people in the co-op who have become active leaders of it. Which accounts for the tremendous impact of the small number of S.P. members have had on campus politics at U.C.L.A. and in winning people to a socialist position.

While I am very deeply disturbed by the S.Y.L. position on violence, I am equally disturbed by the Y.S. position and since my disturbance derives from the fact that I am a pacifist, I will wait and treat the matter in later articles.

In summary then, I would suggest (mixing metaphors a bit) that beneath the present democratic socialist banner, the heart of the Bolshevik still beats in the S.Y.L. And while I deeply respect and greatly admire the Bolshevik, I cannot agree with him because he is wrong. The attitude of the S.Y.L. towards secrecy, their inability to understand their own "left opposition" except as "opportunistic" and "unprincipled", their ego-inflating concept of being the vanguard, their defective position on violence, their immature attention to "theory" (a chronic Trotskyite ailment) and similar problems, make any liason simply that - a liason of related but non-identical groups. Yes, the S.Y.L. is active. Almost frenetically so. But I am not sure how deeply their philosophy penetrates the realities of the American scene and I am certain that those of us in the Socialist Party have reason to be proud

6
of our tradition of truly democratic, non-Bolshevik socialism and the part we have played and I hope will continue to play in the day-to-day struggles of the masses.

I have cooperated with the S.Y.L. and will continue to do so. But I hope to see them grow and mature in a psychological sense, to cast off their conspiratorial cloak and walk openly among the workers. Until such time I will continue to mark them down as a group of desperately sincere people who form nobody's vanguard save their own.

I would suggest that when they can stop playing the theatrical role of history's true elite and descend from their Olympian clouds to join the rest of us mortal socialists, that the liason can then become a somewhat closer bond.

In closing, let me make it very clear that I have never had anything but the most friendly and sincere personal and fraternal relations with the S.Y.L., that I like them, admire them, trust that this article will not unduly test their tolerance, and look forward to the day of their ultimate redemption from Bolshevik-Trotskyite sentiment to a much more truly democratic-socialist position.

NOTES ON "COOPERATION WITH THE SYL"

by Bogdan Denitch

I have some minor reservations about Comrade McReynold's article above;

1) We must recognize that the SYL, like the YPSL, has sectional differences. Specifically we know, for example, that the West Coast SYL is far more "Bolshevik" than other sections. For that reason - and perhaps because of the strong pacifist element in YPSL in Los Angeles - the differences between us seem greater than they are. Coupled with this is McReynold's over-estimation of the SYL's effectiveness. I refuse to believe that the SYL is any more effective, active, or disciplined than (say) the left wing of YPSL.

2) I do not believe that the SYL wants to be on the subversive list. The fact is that it is. Thus for them, the "conspiratorial pose" serves a legitimate function in attempting to keep the FBI in the dark about their activities, as well as attempting to protect their members. About the reason for the S.P.'s secret period - I do not know. I can see none.

3) Last and most disturbing - the question of attention to theory. Theory, in a political organization (as distinct from a moral fellowship), is not something you take or leave. It is the life blood of a socialist organization; all of our activity should flow from it. What bothers me about the SYL is not their attention to theory so much as their sectarianism, rigidity and apparant conviction that they and they alone are capable of theoretical thought. Study of theory is necessary; what is disturbing in the SYL is the tendency to substitute time-worn cliches for critical thought. The fact that so many of their members parrot Trotsky and Schactman impressively, with no understanding of political reality or background in other social-sciences or even "culture" (which produces much of their narrowness) often is mistaken for theoretical ability. Unfortunately, many members of the YPSL suffer from contempt (read ignorance) of theory. This is far more dangerous.

I look upon the SYLers as comrades. Their mistakes trouble me since we will all sink or swim together on the campus scene.

SOCIALISM VERSUS WAR AND LIBERALISM
by Vern Davidson

Facing the Socialist Party, indeed all the Socialists throughout the world, in 1952 is the decision whether to support America's war preparation and possibly (or probably, depending on your viewpoint) a war itself or to take a firm third camp position in opposition to war preparation and war. Secondly, we must face the decision on the adoption or rejection of a program of either non-opposition or actual support to liberals.

These two issues are in fact one issue - two inseparable parts of the central issue of life or death for the Socialist Party - which must be settled in April at our national convention.

War

There is in all modern wars the necessity to prepare both militarily and psychologically for the coming of the eventual conflict. We need not dwell on the military preparation, we can all feel the weight of this preparation only too clearly. Nor will I dwell on the traditional (and in my opinion, fundamentally sound) socialist opposition to war - it has been stated far better before and I hope will again be spelled out by the coming convention. Rather, let us examine the psychological preparation for war and its effect.

The tendency in any war is for each side to condemn as roundly as possible the opposition. In the last war and in the possible next war, this is easier than before, since there are political ideologies to involve which make the polarization of war camps far easier than if only the jargon of nationalism is at the disposal of the war maker. We have, then, the polarization of each side at opposite political poles, or what appear to be, or can be made to appear so by the propagandist.

The manifestations of this polarization are many and thorough. A country on its way to war does not state to its people: "The enemy has the following good points, but nevertheless the following bad points make it necessary to defeat them in war." No, we condemn in every way the political, economic, and cultural institutions of the "enemy." Witness in the Second World War the changing of the American flag salute from an extended hand because the Fascists used an extended hand in their salute. Witness the lumping of American pacifists and pro-German Bundists all as fascists. Notice the growing tendency to condemn all Marxists, progressives, and the color red. Notice further in growing inability to distinguish between Socialism and Stalinism.

The Second World War, then, was a progressive war. Fascism was on the right, or so we were told, therefore we must be on the left - liberal, progressive, and liberty-loving. The spokesmen for America and "the people's war" became the Henry Wallaces, labor leaders, and liberals. Defeat or silence awaited the isolationists and reactionaries. Conservatives became liberalized and like Senator Ball endorsed FDR or became in other ways anti-fascists. We passed FEPCs and labor pledged its all-out support to the war. Labor leaders conferred with Washington and helped make policy. We broke with Vichy and Franco - became strained with Turkey and Peron - befriended Socialist governments-in-exile and became allied with the USSR, the people's utopia (see Life Magazine, special issue on the USSR). As the war progressed and we recaptured Europe, it was the progressive elements that came out to meet us - anti-fascists, Socialists, Communists - it was the reactionary and fascist who fled.

For those who are ready to point out to me how really reactionary the war was - let me agree. The Socialist Party was correct in refusing to support the war; it was not a progressive war in the sense that socialism could expect to flourish long, or the people to gain in the long run; no war could be. Nevertheless, the outward manifestations were progressive, and labor did win immediate gains.

The Third World War will be a reactionary war. Reactionary not only in the long-run sense, in the sense of the Second World War, in the sense of all wars, but in the outward manifestations. The polarization of the war will be the exact opposite of the last. The Soviet Union is on the left and the U.S. must therefore be on the right. It is of no importance that the USSR is in reality as reactionary as fascist Germany - in the psychology of war they are left, we are right. The reactionary becomes the spokesman, the extreme liberal and progressive are defeated and other liberals become conservative. While McArthur and McCarthy set the way for America, Helen Douglas and Marcantonio are defeated, and Truman and Atchison chart the course along the lines directed by their reactionary opposition. Senators Douglas and Humphries vote for the McCarran Act containing an amendment for concentration camps made by liberal Senator Kilgore. The liberal does not raise his voice against war, the reactionary cheers it on. Liberal labor leaders act as government strike breakers. To be against capitalism is to be a Communist. F.E.P.C. is a Communist plot. Labor is frozen out of national planning except as puppets for the war effort. Internationally we cuddle up to Greece and Turkey, Franco and Rhee. We rush defense to every reactionary regime in the world. The Declaration of Independence is ruled "too exciting" to be used as propaganda in Asia. Our own people refuse to sign it because it is Communist. America recognizes a holy war by sending an ambassador to the Vatican.

To those who hold that there is such a difference between this coming war and the last that they could refuse to support the last and can support this one, I must answer, yes there is a difference, but in exactly the opposite way as you conclude. Because of the inherent nature of the coming war, all progressive voices must be silenced. Socialists are not needed by the war effort and will be the first to be broken or knuckled under to the capitalist war machine.

Agreeing that the by-products of war enumerated above are wrong, and opposing them, is to miss the point. You may sooth your own conscience by opposing these things while you approve of the war and rearmament, but you accomplish little else except to appear extremely foolish. One wonders at the mental condition of the Grand Old Man of Socialism as he mumbles incoherently, in a national column, that the "U.N." forces in Korea are killing innocent women and children, yet goes on to support the war. One reads the NEC's statement, that the Freedom Crusade is the popular rationalization for rearmament, with lifted spirits, only to realize that the nominal head of the Party was on the National Council of the Crusade and that no member of the Party leadership ever before publicly opposed the Crusade or differed with him - but that is exactly their dilemma - approve of the war - then how can you oppose the armament program - how can you oppose the rationalization for that program - and are you really not an enemy to the war you support by even calling the rationalization a rationalization? The liberal is more intelligent than the pro-war socialist. He supports the war and adjusts himself to the necessity of dropping progressivism "for the duration." The socialist wants the pleasure of being on the bandwagon for war and the right to snipe at his fellow travelers at the same time. A very democratic and admirable desire, but I think the liberal and reactionary are going to decide the best thing to do with the pro-war socialist is to take his pea shooter away or kick him off the wagon. No war is democratic, and this war for sure is not going to be.

One can find little comfort in pointing out that after the swing to the left in the last war we swung to the opposite direction. We might point out that a

swing far enough to the right would preclude the possibility of the pendulum being able to swing back to the left. Even more possible, there may not be anything to swing in any direction after the next war.

The Liberal

In evaluating liberalism today, socialists are unfortunately looking at one animal and talking about another. They are looking at the Twentieth Century Liberal and talking, or dreaming, of the Eighteenth Century Liberal. The latter animal is just about extinct - Altgeld, Darrow et al. In the backwoods you still run into an ACLUer of the old school or a wild Republican and very, very seldom a Democrat. By 18th century liberal I mean the liberal who took a progressive, principled position on certain basic issues of civil and human rights, and stuck to it come hell or high water. The 20th century liberal is the pragmatic liberal of the Democratic Party - his views shift according to the situation, staying just left of the opposition.

Men like Republican Senator Langer can be called honest 18th century liberals. Time and time again these men are in the Republican Party - they are far too old-fashioned for the New Deal. There appears to be one 18th century liberal in the Democratic Party of California. He, like all Democrats, said he believed in a free and open ballot, but he took this seriously and voted to put the Socialist Party on the ballot while the pragmatic Democratic liberals voted against it.

The 20th century liberal, then, is a dangerous ally - he has not set course and will wobble back and forth depending on where the conservatives take him. The most dangerous aspect of all is that with pragmatic liberalism it is the conservatives who must set policy and lead the destiny of the world. As conditions force the conservatives to the left, the pragmatic liberal moves over just a bit to the left - the Second World War. As conditions push the conservative ^{further} to the right, the liberal moves over to the right staying just left of him - the present.

The only means other than the manipulation of the conservative in forming a program for the liberal has been the radical. The liberal cannot disregard a radical viewpoint completely if it has a popular appeal and is thereby forced further to the left than he would normally go of his own volition - i.e. Roosevelt-Thomas in 1936, Truman-Wallace in 1948.

For those socialists who advocate non-opposition or support to liberals. must be aware of the type of man they are dealing with. This is not the traditional liberal that the socialist movement can well respect, this is the new liberal who scoffs at the sentimental old fools who called themselves liberal and meant it; these are the men who can defend or destroy liberty as the situation demands. These are the men who can be for or against the right of the workers to strike, who are today by necessity 100 per cent behind the war drive. This is liberalism of relativity.

We socialists have tried to expose the Stalinist type of doublethink, and have effectively done so, by pointing at the Stalinist labor leaders sellout of the worker by the no-strike pledge during the last war. We point with pride at men like Reuther who demanded the right of the worker to strike. Now we must be sick at heart to see the sellout by Reuther of the Douglas strikers in Long Beach. Truman says the strike is hurting the war and he wishes the men would go back to work. Reuther and the UAW brass meet and order the strikers back to work, wiping out weeks of work and ignoring the loss of wages and the effect this has had on the workers' attitude toward future strikes. We might really wonder at the similarity of the mental process of the 20th century liberal and the Stalinist.

We must be aware that if socialists are to support liberals or to continue to chart their program just to the left of the liberal, we are guilty of allowing the conservative to chart our course. We must see that it is the ridiculous situation in which the conservative says - This is my program - the liberal says - Me too only better - and the Socialist says - Ditto the liberal only a little bit more, but vote for him anyway. We must realize that we are in fact being reactionary in that we cannot chart our own course but must react to that set for us.

Against both War and Liberals

To support the present war drive and war while opposing the liberal is not good logic from any point of view. To support the liberal and not the war is impossible. Therefore we can clarify the position of the Socialist Party in an answer for both problems. We can support the coming war and the liberal and destroy the Socialist Party or we can rededicate ourselves to socialist principles in 1952 by fighting for socialism, against war and liberals with a socialist foreign policy presented by Socialist Party candidates.

EDITOR'S NOTES - on this issue:

Who's who in this issue;

David McReynolds is alternate to the YS NEC from Los Angeles; Owen Cahill is a member of the NCC and represents the Central Manhattan Circle on the DEC. Michael Harrington, a member of Cent. Manhattan Circle and one of ANVIL's editors is associated with the Catholic Worker; Vern Davidson, our ex-National Sec. is currently standing trial in Los Angeles for refusal to comply with the draft; Nicholas Sakell, of the Cent. Manhattan Circle is our International Secretary; Peter Winant, of the Boston Circle is alternate to the NEC; H.L. Small is a new member of the Cent. Manhattan Circle; Jules Greenstein is a non-Yipsel from the E.V. Debs Society of CCNY; Bogdan Denitch of the Luxemburg Circle is the Editor of YSR.

Let us hope articles keep coming in at this rate. I hope to hear from Chicago, from Berkeley from Wisconsin and other areas, but most of all I hope to hear from our new members. This YSR is the fifth since Fall 1951. All back issues are available (all but the Post-Convention one that is) so if your circle has new members write in for a bundle. There is no need for YSRs to gather dust.

As you may notice this issue includes a complete list of material available from the Educational Committee. Now, it is true that some of the stuff is no good. After all, the way we got some of the material had nothing to do with the Ed. C. but please remember...we have money tied down in the pamphlets; we need that money, you need the background.

By now almost enough material is coming in to put YSR on a duo-monthly basis, (which it was supposed to be on.) The shortage is in postage, paper and money... any of those three items would be greatly appreciated. You don't have to buy stuff from us to send us money. We will accept contributions; we need DOUGH.

I suggest that you sell this issue to the contacts that normally receive YSR; it helps pay the expenses and they are more likely to read it. (Of course we want the cash).

PART II OF THE ARTICLE ON TITOISM AND SOCIALISM WILL APPEAR IN THE NEXT YSR. DEADLINE FOR THE NEXT ISSUE, JANUARY 10. PLEASE SEND IN THAT ARTICLE.

These are notes - and only notes - on the future of the SP and the YPSL. Conclusions on such important matters should come about only after prolonged and careful discussion.

Two questions are involved; the future of the SP and the particular future tasks of the YPSL.

In both questions, one result of the presidential campaign is of the utmost importance; that the Democratic Party, particularly its liberal groupings, and the unions, now find themselves in opposition. This means that they will not be tied to apologies for the war actions of Truman, but will be in a position to criticize Eisenhower - probably for his continuing of the Democrat's war drive. It also means that the left wing of the Democrats will be more open to the socialist criticism of that war drive for which they were so recently the executors.

This means that the SP and the YPSL should redouble their efforts to form coalitions for action on specific issues, e.g. Franco, and to make a socialist criticism from within these coalitions.

This does not mean that the SP should necessarily enter into the Democratic or the Liberal Party as a caucus. Here are two considerations which are often glossed over:

- 1) Is the situation such that the Party will gain anything (influence on policy, an opportunity to educate)? Or will the socialists be swallowed up - with a polite thanks for Jimmy Higgins work? The SP backing of the Halley campaign and the experience of the SDF in the Liberal Party are examples of what can happen.
- 2) What value do we give to organizational independence and a principled position? By going into a mass party we go into a pro-war party. Is this not perilously close to the psychology of the liberals - most of whom will confide to you that they are "socialists after all"?
- 3) Can we gain everything positive by acting in coalitions on specific issues - and nothing positive from committing ourselves to an organizational set-up which propagandizes against our views? Will change come when Dubinsky gratefully invites a third camp socialist to sit in the councils of the Liberal Party - or when sentiment has been built up in the unions and the liberal movement outside of his centrally controlled political mechanism?

YPSL is, of course, vitally concerned with the direction which the SP takes. But the problem of the youth is particularly ours.

The same comment as to the opposition role of the liberals should apply in youth groups, on the campus and in the anti-war movement.

Here again, the forming of groups for specific tasks should be especially valuable. We should drop any "red card" psychology. The fact that someone pays dues is important - but it is also important that someone is willing to cooperate on committees. Our chief problem today is not to elect congressmen - we aren't going to in the near future. Our problem is to lay the foundations of consciousness for that future. Which means that we shouldn't think in exclusively organizational terms, but in those of educa-

(At the present time the Tendency is engaged in full discussion of several problems that were raised by the "Co-existence" resolution (see page 14 of this issue). Since the discussion is still in process, the previously planned article on Stalinism will appear in the next YSR.)

This article is a collection of notes on several topics.....

S.P. - The campaign and the aftermath:

Our general view on the nature of the S.P. are expressed in Comrade Cahill's article in this issue. The election being over however, several points deserve elaboration. In the first place, this campaign proves once and for all the complete idiocy of compromising with the right wing. After fighting hard to make sure that no third camp platform was adopted which would have made it possible for the anti-war left to really go out full-blast during the campaign, the right wing (with few honorable exceptions) either completely withdrew from the campaign, left the party, or (without leaving the party) backed the Stevenson campaign. This only strengthens our opinion that these people are waiting for the first opportunity to attempt to liquidate the S.P.

Now of course, working in other parties, e.g. the Liberal Party in New York will again come up for re-discussion. Several factors should be kept in mind:

- a) If the S.P. stays out of the lib-lab organizations it will continue to isolate itself and to lose most of the right wing which is still interested in politics. What will remain, presumably, is the left wing and the organizational loyalists (the no wing section). Political debate at that point will die in the S.P. since, while it is possible to debate those who disagree with you it is impossible to continue political discussion or to work with those who have no politics and who are unwilling to consider political thinking worthwhile.
- b) If the S.P. goes in, given its present condition - of no control over public spokesmen by the rank and file, of extremely low level of political activity - it may completely dissolve in the liberal swamp.

or

- c) If the S.P. goes in it may grow much stronger as a social-democratic tendency within the Liberal Party and the PAC's. This growing strength, however, would come mostly from the pro-war elements that are now working with the labor bureaucracy on the bureaucracy's own terms. This would mean the crushing of the left.

Politics however, is more than an analysis of probabilities; it is also a gamble ... "least" evils are not per se bad. Obviously, given our analysis, the worst possible thing that can happen to the S.P. is for it to become a small, pure sect. Therefore, we suggest that the proper procedure for us is:

- i) To begin organizing a nation-wide party caucus that will start a serious struggle for control of the organization.
- ii) Advocate going in, hoping that by the time the S.P. does go in we will have been able to organize such a caucus and that the caucus will be strong enough to prevent complete dissolution. And finally - since the

13

first two are "long shots" we must recognize that we need insurance. Therefore:

- iii) Concentrate even more energy on building the YPSL, since the League is already an anti-war socialist group. Begin to develop trade union contacts on our own - since the S.P. is neglecting to do so - and start to view the YPSL not merely as a youth section of the SP but also as an organization with a life, a program and a future of its own. The YSR must be turned into a theoretical organ of the entire left in the SP and the League. We must make sure to get YSR into the hands of the party leftists.

Some notes on "Co-existence and the Third Camp":

A debate will take place shortly in New York between the YS and the SYL on the recent YS resolution on "Co-existence". While a long analysis of this resolution is due in the next issue, we would like to note a few items.

- 1) Nowhere in the Co-existence resolution is there one iota of support for either of the war camps. All that the resolution says is that imperialist peace (as a possibility) is preferable to imperialist war not only because we have no great desire to die, but also because this peace offers us the only opportunity and time to build opposition to our own camp.
- 2) "Third Camp" is not a concrete, geographical concept. Rather it is more of a "useful political myth" analagous to Sorel's concept of the "General Strike". Third Camp is an ideological camp; Third Camp, as we said before, can be better understood as the camp of permanent struggle, since it is a dialectical concept.
- 3) The reason the resolution discusses revolutions in backward areas and the type of regimes that will result from such revolutions, is because an understanding of this is absolutely essential if one is to rationally oppose the war drive.

As to the "progressive transformations" that take place under Stalinism, please remember that the Austrian Marxists who were deadly foes of Stalinism never denied that, in the same sense that capitalism was progressive vis-a-vis feudalism (and this despite the terrible injustices of the system) Stalinism involuntarily serves certain progressive functions. Don't some people also know that accumulation of capital in a semi-colonial area produces progressive results too? Don't they know that is it not necessary to take the absolutely idiotic position that the worker's standard of living is falling under Stalinism (which it isn't) in order to prove the despotic, anti-working-class nature of the Stalin regime? More on this later.

Who will we recruit?

Some time ago the nature of the "liberals" was discussed in these pages. It was, for example, pointed out that it is the liberals, not the conservatives who are the advocates of NATO and the rationalizers of the permanent war economy at home. Davidson makes some very good points about the liberals and the Democratic Party - yet there are still those who seem to think that our primary appeals ought to go to those people.

(continued on page 24)

RESOLUTION ON CO-EXISTENCE

Carried by the YS-NEC on September 20, 1952

The repeated declarations of self-styled socialists against the possibility or desirability of peaceful co-existence between the two imperialist camps make it necessary for us to take a stand on this question.

It is true, of course, that no socialist who is, in fact, a socialist can but oppose the authoritarian nature of Stalinism and the regimes which attempt to force progressive transformations down the people's unwilling throats dictatorially. Revolutions in backward areas cannot be socialist, that is, they cannot create socialism. Whether led by the bourgeoisie who have learned a good deal from Lenin about elitist, i.e. bureaucratic revolutions, or the working class they will result in regimes that have to be collectivist and bureaucratic in order to accelerate the accumulation of capital necessary to break out of their colonial status. We support all the efforts of the masses - and particularly the workers - to transform such regimes internally, while we consider a restoration of the pre-war regimes neither desirable nor possible.

While we do not support the nature of independent stalinist states, and while we realize that independence from the Stalinist bloc may lead to an alliance with the Western bloc, we nevertheless support all attempts at self-determination within the Stalinist bloc. The growing tension between the two war camps however, makes it difficult for our comrades in Eastern Europe to struggle against their own bureaucracy, most particularly since opposition to the Western, i.e. capitalist bloc, is universal within the ranks of the European working class.

The continuation of the war tension forces the Eastern European workers to choose between restoring their old bankrupt regimes or backing the Stalinist camp, since at the present time they are offered no alternatives. In effect much of the support that Stalinism receives is opposition to capitalism. A reduction of the tensions which might result from Big Power negotiations however, creates other alternate possibilities. For example, that of neutralized Europe, which without U.S. intervention would be a socialist Europe. This would be the greatest blow to both Stalinism and capitalism and the greatest advance for the working class to date.

Domestically, it is important to realize that the basis for the present drift toward the garrison state is the permanent war economy, which attempts to shore up capitalism against its normal crises. Through this artificially supported economy, the capitalist bloc has provided full employment and a deceptively high standard of living, at least in the U.S.A. However, the strain of this re-armament is such on the weakened economies of Western Europe that the dislocations which occur may well develop into full scale depressions which would have major repercussions at home. Through the fear of war, the U.S. regime has been stifling opposition at home by the false posing of the need for national "unity". Increasingly the real costs of the re-armament are being borne by the workers; increasingly, the pattern of wage-freeze without price controls is lowering living standards of the workers.

We must also understand that the excuse given to the growing opposition from all quarters to the continued garrisoning of Western Europe and the integration of Western Europe into the North Atlantic bloc is the supposed threat of imminent war. This despite the obvious fact that Stalinism needs time to consolidate its gains. Thus, it should be obvious that despite the fact that any kind of negotiations would be, in effect, imperialist agreement at the expense of the immediate interests of the people, such agreement

(CO-EXISTENCE RESOLUTION -- continued)

would still have some immensely progressive consequences.

- 1) It could undermine the popular support for the permanent war economy at home.
- 2) It would make it possible to gain mass support for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from abroad; it would make it possible for our comrades abroad to overthrow their own bankrupt regimes once they stop receiving U.S. aid.
- 3) It would make the position of the Stalinist bureaucracy more insecure, since:
 - a) national independence movements would find it easier to become independent of Moscow influence,
 - b) the Stalinist parties of the West would be forced to support their regimes (in the interest of Soviet policy) and thus lose the support of the European workers.

We therefore judge that the slogan of "Big Power negotiations" should be supported. Apart from the obvious organizational advantages, there are political considerations: a failure to reach agreement would expose the attitude of the two imperialist camps (which both prefer the continuation of the cold war) to the progressive and labor opinion, while an agreement (which in this case would be made under pressure from below) would provide us with the time and the possibility of dealing with our own exploiters.

Naturally our support of such a slogan in no way alters our unqualified opposition to the two war camps.

RESOLUTION ON THE KOREAN WAR Carried by the YS-NEC on September 20, 1952

Today it is completely unrealistic to talk of opposition to war without discussing the conflict in Korea. It is obvious that neither of the rival imperialisms are seriously interested in ending the Korean War at the present time. The negotiations have been protracted by both sides as forums for accusations and counter-accusations. The U.N. negotiators have further shown their bad faith on the prisoner of war issue by failing to recommend to the U.N. nations the opening of asylums for those North Koreans who refuse to go back.

The present Korean conflict not only greatly aggravates the drift toward a shooting war, but also acts as the basis for tightening repression at home and truculence. This war, waged with the horrible weapons of modern warfare is against the interests of the Korean people who are, at the present time, the chief victims of this imperialist conflict. We reaffirm our belief that Soviet expansionism can be stopped not through war, but through the extension of economic and political freedom to the peoples of the world.

Therefore:

We reiterate our opposition to the war and declare that it has nothing in common with defence of freedom.

We demand the removal of all foreign troops from Korea as soon as possible.

We protest the failure of the Socialist Party to take a stand on this question

(KOREAN WAR RESOLUTION -- continued)

in its platform, as this failure can be mis-interpreted as support for this imperialist conflict.

We call on the socialists in the U.S. to effect immediate cessation of hostilities in Korea and withdrawal of all aid from the Rhee regime. Such aid as does go to the Korean people should be admired through the international agencies of the United Nations.

RESOLUTION ON SOCIALIST UNITY Carried by the YS-NEC on September 20, 1952

Although we recognize the prejudice with which moves to unify the fragmented sections of the democratic left are met (in our as well as other movements), nevertheless we must take a stand on this pressing question. It affects the functioning unity and efficiency of socialism on the campus; it weakens us when we most need strength.

Young Socialists (YPSL) therefore freely invite all young socialists of whatever conviction, so long as it falls within the delimitations of the YPSL statement of principles to join the YPSL.

We invite all ex-members of the Libertarian caucus to return to the YPSL.

We invite the subscribers and readers of ANVIL and Socialist Views to consider affiliating with the YPSL. We therefore authorize the NOC to negotiate the affiliation of any groups of people who might consider joining the YPSL. The provisions we make are the following:

- a) that all such people be eligible for membership in the YPSL.
- b) that they abide by the minimums of YPSL and SP discipline.

In return we guarantee the full expression of their views within the YPSL, their right to maintain contact; their right to publish their own publication.

We instruct the NOC to set up a Clearing House Committee which will attempt to initiate joint action between various groups of the democratic left on the campus and can act as the eventual negotiating committee for unity of all forces of the democratic left among the youth.

"Socialist Action" is the organization of active militant revolutionaries within the Socialist Party. Its aims are: to strengthen the Socialist Party organizationally by organizing new members, ideologically by seeking to bring the Party back to the principles of its founders, Marx and Debs.

Socialist Action members bind themselves to active work under the following conditions:

Each member will contribute at least one week's wages annually to the Party and one week's wages annually to the Socialist Action group. Comrades who are capable of giving more will be assigned more by their local circles. Anyone capable of luxuries can afford to give to the Party.

Each member must be thoroughly familiar with the basic socialist writings; he must understand the Manifesto, Socialism, Utopian and Scientific, and other works of Engels and Marx, Debs and Luxemburg. Members must equip themselves further by studying economics wherever possible. They must understand how the accumulation of capital, the internal contradictions of capitalism, etc. serve as the basis for understanding the present drive toward war and fascism.

Each member must devote a certain amount of each week working for the organization. He must accept all duties assigned him by the local, and where not organized into locals he should try to do whatever the national organization requests. In case of emergency he must be willing to be absent from work or school, regardless of financial sacrifice.

The group is restricted to Marxists and revolutionary pacifists. No member will take part in war, even in non-combatant activity.

Members must be willing to change jobs if the need of union organizing or penetration requires having a member in a certain factory; students will change schools if their education can be equally served, to those schools where the field for organization is fruitful.

Members will know who the militants in other locals are so that, especially before conventions, they can be organized into and work as a caucus.

Members will volunteer to take charge of educational meetings in their SP locals and use this opportunity to improve the present abysmally low standards of Party members. They should prepare talks on current issues, illustrating their meaning on the basis of Marxian analysis.

(NOTES ON THE FUTURE OF THE SP AND THE YPSL - continued from Page 11)

tion and specific action.

The New York YPSL is implementing this policy by organizing a center for radical elements. The local situation is ruling, but wherever such an approach is possible, it should be seriously considered.

Finally, both the Party and YPSL should redouble their efforts within the labor movement. The death of Murray and the new opposition role of the labor bureaucracy may mean that real criticism will flourish in the labor movement again. We must be ready for the chance to lead it.

N A B N E W S
International Union of Socialist Youth - North American Bureau

Welcome fellow socialists to the first edition of the I.U.S.Y.'s North American bulletin, "NAB NEWS". Through this publication, we hope to keep young American socialists informed of each other's activities. A large part of the responsibility of fraternal conduct will depend upon you. Please send any news item pertaining to the I.U.S.Y. affiliates to Nicholas Sakell, 139-11 230th Street, Laurelton 10, New York.

On the week-end of October 6-10, the United Nations held its 5th annual Conference of International Non-governmental Organizations on U.N. Information. The I.U.S.Y. had requested that its affiliates in America send representatives to this U.N. organization as I.U.S.Y. delegates. Members from the "Young Socialists" (formerly "Young People's Socialist League") and the "Student League for Industrial Democracy" willingly agreed to serve in this capacity. Vern Davidson, Nicholas Sakell (from Y.S.) and Harold Kurster (from S.L.I.D.) who were present are preparing a full report to I.U.S.Y. headquarters in Copenhagen. Unfortunately, circumstances made it impossible for the C.C.Y.M. to send a delegate.

In the middle of August, S.L.I.D. and the Y.S. sent fraternal delegates to the Cooperative Commonwealth Youth Movement convention in Toronto. Harold Lewack of S.L.I.D. and Vern Davidson of Y.S. came back with very favorable impressions of the work being done by the Canadian Youth.

The monthly newsletter of the C.C.Y.M. carried an item on the functions of its Hamilton, Ontario group. Besides the usual educational activities, the Hamiltonians are carrying on an active social program in an effort to interest more young people in the club. During the winter they participate in an organized bowling league. Dances are sponsored, to which the public is invited. When the right weather comes along, picnics and weiner roasts are held. It is even possible that next season the C.C.Y.M. of Hamilton will sponsor a juvenile baseball team. A considerable amount of useful publicity should be forthcoming from these ventures. In spite of the large amount of social activity, the C.C.Y.M. is not neglecting its intellectual functions. Guest speakers talk on such topics as "Race Prejudice", "The United Nations", "The Growth of the Trade Union Movement", etc. In addition, many new books have been added to the club's rapidly expanding library.

The Student League for Industrial Democracy is presenting a radio program, under the auspices of the Social Democratic Federation on Station WEVD (New York City). The first broadcast of the series was held on September 21st at 9:30. Featured as speakers were S.L.I.D. members Gabriel Gersh, Walter Weitzmann, and Harold Kurster. "Students look at the Election" was the topic under discussion.

On December 27 and 28, the Young Socialists will hold their National Convention. The location will be set at either Reading, Pennsylvania or Chicago, Illinois. All North American Bureau members of the I.U.S.Y. are cordially invited to attend.

The Young Socialists are continuing their fine work in the magazine "ANVIL". For those of you who may be unacquainted with this national student publication, ANVIL is edited by representatives of various campus clubs, including socialist, pacifist, and independent student groups. About one-third of the editorial board is composed of Young Socialists who are there representing clubs on many campuses in which they participate as active members. The Y.S. national organization as a whole, endorses ANVIL and sells it through its national office. The magazine comes out three times a year and costs 20¢. It is well worth it, and all I.U.S.Y. members are invited to buy a copy through the Y.S. national office, 303 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y.

Fraternally, Nicholas Sakell

november-December 1952

Basic- Theoretical:

Marx	: <u>Wage Labor and Capital</u> , a basic simple work on economics	15¢
Marx	: <u>The Communist Manifesto</u> ; the "founding statement of modern socialism. (Included a short modern commentary)	15¢
Eggels	: <u>Socialism Scientific and Utopian</u> , a good history of the pre-Marxist socialism and excellent introduction to socialism.	15¢
Plekhanov	: <u>The Materialist Conception of History</u> ,	20¢
Henderson	: <u>The Case for Socialism</u> ; a good basic text	35¢
	(study outline for the same)	15¢

Advanced Material:

Luxemburg	: <u>Reform or Revolution</u> , the classic answer to reformism	60¢
Luxemburg	: <u>Selections</u> , edited by the YPSL Ed. Committee	15¢
Martov	: <u>The State and Socialist Revolution</u> , a basic discussion of the Russian Revolution, and answer to Lenin.	60¢
Banakoek	: <u>Lenin as a Philosopher</u> , a critical examination of the basis of Leninism by a left-socialist.	50¢

Fabian Pamphlets:

G.H. Cole	: <u>The History of the British working-class movement</u> .	25¢
G. H. Cole	: <u>A Guide to the Elements of Socialism</u> .	20¢
Roper	: <u>Trade Unions and the New Social order</u> , a discussion of the trade unions and their functions under socialism.	25¢
Huges	: <u>Towards a Classless Society</u> , a discussion of the aims and achievements of the British socialists.	25¢

Foreign Socialist publications:

Scott	: <u>New Horizons for Socialism</u> (CCF- Canada)	10¢
Indian SP	: <u>We build for Socialism</u> (Indian Socialist Party)	25¢
" " "	: <u>Nationalisation</u> , a discussion of collectivism in a semi-colonial area.	25¢

Miscellaneous :

<u>One Way Only</u>	: Bovan et. al. - the basic statement of the Bevan group.	15¢
<u>Going our Way?</u>	: Bovan et. al. - more of the same.	15¢
Farrel T.J.	: <u>The Fate of American Writing</u> , a discussion of the role of big-business in mass communications and their effect on writing.	25¢
Comfort	: <u>Barbarism and Sexual Freedom</u> , a book by a well know English anarchist.	\$1.00
Woodstock	: <u>One Hundred Years of Revolutions</u> , a book on the great European revolutionaries by an anarchist.	\$ 1.25
Noble	: <u>the Negro and Films</u> : a book on the relation of jim-crow to the real mass-art media of our time.	\$1.25
Comfort:	<u>Youth for Freedom</u> , a statement of the anarchist position on some of the social questions affecting the youth.	75¢

- J. Gliksman : Tell the West, an account of the Soviet forced labor camps by a member of the Jewish socialist Bund who had some first hand experiences. 25 ¢
- A.F. of L. : Soviet Imperialism, by the international committee. \$1.00

League for Industrial Democracy pamphlets:

Laidler H. : Our Changing Industrial Incentives, a discussion of non-profit incentives in industry. 25¢

Laidler H. : A short history of american Socialism. 25¢

Alexander R. : The world labor movement, a short outline discussion of the trade union movement throughout the world. 25¢

Jugoslav (Titoist) Pamphlets : FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY:

Kardelj : Socialist Democracy, a discussion of the recent reforms in Jugoslavia as a way to democratization of the regime 25¢

Diljas : New Roads to Socialism, a good translation of the speech of Diljas to the Yugoslav student congress on socialism and stalinism. 15¢

Tito : Workers manage factories in Yugoslavia, a discussion of the worker's control from the Yugoslav point of view. 25¢

Tito : Political Report of the V th Congress CPY, a history of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia up to the break with the cominform. 50¢

Tito : Report to the III Congress of the People's front, an elaboration of the split and its implications. 25¢

Popovitch; The war of liberation in Yugoslavia, an "official" history of the Yugoslav Civil war. 25¢

FREE MATERIAL.....

Back issues of the Young Socialist Review (Spring and Summer 1952)

1952 Platforms of the Socialist Party.

Your Questions Answered (S.P.)

A Socialist Program (the Yipsel program)

IUSY Survey , the publication of the international union of socialist youth.

YPSL Song Books.

ORDER ANVIL FROM THE EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEE -YOUNG SOCIALISTS. SELL IT TO YOUR FRIENDS.

The growth of socialism in the United States has been hampered by the lack of imagination of the leaders of socialist thought. The appeal of the socialist has always been to the future, with a paradisaical vision of economic plentitude and true democratic freedom. That is - the level of appeal has been a mixture of future economic and social goods and leisure in a milieu of democratic-liberal sentiment. This has been good but not good enough.

In a time of comparative plentitude, or at least not economic deprivation, one cannot gain adherents as during a depression. The gaining of new people as potential socialists, as potential subscribers to the socialist program, has to be directed toward interests that are immediate and practical today. It has to be directed toward areas of circumscription of society that are vital to their individual happiness and which, if presented to them as political problems will give them an idea of the type of freedom that can be maintained in a free American socialist society.

The freedom of the legally of-age adult of both sexes to have sexual relations with whomever he or she wishes of the same or opposite sex, without fear of sanction is an important libertarian principle that is part of the law in many socialist and semi-socialist countries today, e.g. in Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, etc. It means, to the individual "deviant" that the fear of legal sanction, as well as illegal repression, blackmail, etc. are forever banished from his mind. It means an area of operational freedom that will enable the emancipated individual to work and think more effectively in his tasks of everyday life. It means the difference between health and sickness for thousands of people who are non-productive members of society today.

It can be argued that sexual deviancy is a mark of ill health in the first place, but it was also argued, with equal clarity and legality, at one time, that it was the mark of the devil - or at least the pagan god s. The point is this: whether we individually consider it right or wrong, healthy or unhealthy, to have a large or small vocabulary of libidinal expression, repression of such expression, or practice under fear, does not make for a whole, productive individual.

Propaganda aimed toward the sexual individualist should stress his importance as a political concern; it should point out his right to what the Declaration of Independence called "the pursuit of happiness". This soon will make more and more people aware of socialism as a constructive force in the transformation of America into a truly happy country where the individual rights of all its people (regardless of their departure from the Puritan "norm") are both observed and respected.

It may at first be considered jokingly but the principle is at the root of political effectiveness. Be concerned with what your people are concerned - that is, with real issues, not straw men - issues that hit at the very vitals of the people. Those who will see socialist literature on this level for the first time will be interested in the program as a whole, for they have already made the first step toward conversion. They have realized that their interests are our interests. Perhaps then more people shall consider what else we have to offer.

One of the most disheartening facts we are forced to face as radicals is the rapidity with which our most active and brilliant comrades are "burnt out". Among us are a large number of very militant socialists who are certain to become very unmilitant "ox-os". Some of our dearest comrades have already passed or are passing through the various stages of "Obliquism" and apathy to a point of cynicism or despair from which there is often no return. To accuse these people of being traitors, neurotics, degenerates, lazy, no good, or to toss them off with a curt "They-never-really-understood-Marxism-and-werent-very-good-anyway", may rationalize away our own discontent but in no way solves anything. Such explanations not only do not help us to salvage their immortal, radical souls: they obviate any attempt to prevent others from following their example. For when a member leaves the movement on the basis of political disagreements, we can argue with him politically - after all, this is our forte. But when he leaves because he has simply given up, he must be met on very different grounds, grounds which it is the intention of this article to discuss.

Why People Become Socialists

It is the most dangerous type of naivete to assume that all people become active, militant socialists out of purely rational, political motives. Though this is often the case, it is also true that almost any conceivable arrangement of oral, anal, and phallic neuroses could suffice to recruit a member. Some of our closest comrades are known to be suffering from birth trauma and a few have a very serious Orgone deficiency to boot. In any case, it is an inevitable dialectical truth that the reasons a person leaves an organization are closely related to the reasons he joined. One cannot become disillusioned if one never had illusions.

The Need For Absolutes

Among the most common illusions is the neurotic need of the young intellectual for an "absolute". Rejecting his inheritance of bourgeois culture and values, he is in a state of total, but inchoate revolt. Suffering a healthy period of acute adolescence, he is seeking an alternative to the irrational authority of our culture. As a reaction formation, he may reject all authority, rational as well as irrational, and become a wandering, minstrel bohemian, a Dadaist, or some form of anarcho-politician. Or, he may substitute one irrational authority for the other, and follow a line, usually Stalinist. Such an answer is easy - he doesn't have to go through the tortuous phase of formulating opinions and tastes. What he thinks and likes are decided for him by the Kremlin. Only a few adjustments as the line changes are needed to allow him to appear intellectual in a discussion and he doesn't have to read any books or listen to any music.

Of course, if he already has a few opinions and any degree of taste, he will reject Stalinist philistinism. At this point, he may turn to us. But whatever activity he may indulge himself in is still determined by his need to possess an absolute - one which will provide security for him and a guarantee that his hard work will not be in vain. He must be assured that he is adding a little to the formation of a perfect society in which there is none of the frustration, fear, insecurity, and unhappiness he experiences. Since we can make no such guarantee or give any such assurance, and since sooner or later he discovers that the Utopia he envisages is patently impossible, he gives up. This is not surprising. It is easy to struggle for a world which is perfect and absolute, but difficult and often unrewarding to fight for a world which is merely "better". After all, things may very easily get better

23

without him; it is solely a matter of degree. And so, the need for an absolute takes its toll.

The confusion which led to the comrade's fall was simple; he was unable to distinguish between existential and historical truth.

Existential and Historical Truth

An existential truth is a fact about man which is derived from the very fact that he exists. It is as immutable and ineluctable as existence. It is existentially true that life ends in death; that the human body clings desperately to life; that, because of this, frustration cannot be avoided; that the material universe is indifferent to man's need to survive; that man's potential cannot exceed the limits of his culture; that his capacity to enjoy pleasure outstrips his ability to attain it; that the learning process involves depriving himself of certain pleasures and needs; that he will interpret some events as painful regardless of the degree to which he protects himself; that he can never become equipped in time to fully withstand the shock of birth, growth, and death; that he can see the world only through his own eyes regardless of how much he may want to view it through those of his loved one.

There are an infinite number of such truths, many of which are unpleasant and will always remain so. They are accepted as immutable by the normal, mature person, and he constructs his ethic and goals within their limits.

Other truths are historical. They are sometimes pleasant and sometimes unpleasant, but they are always changeable. We are familiar with most of them: starvation in a land of plenty; wars when there is no reason to kill, etc. It is with these truths that Marxism and the dialectical approach deal. As socialists, we attempt to break down the unpleasant historical truths, always viewing them in the light of existential truth. Since we cannot efface the latter, we realize that any Utopia based upon their elimination is delusive. There is a limit to the human mind and to human progress, and, at best, we can only hope to approach this limit asymptotically. In order to prevent disillusionment among the comrades who cannot understand these elementary facts of life, they must be continually reiterated.

The Historical Fallacy and Despair

I have already spoken about those in the movement who cannot accept the existence of truths which are existential. Some of them never understand their fallacy and go on, in their pristine innocence, attempting to destroy all evil. Classifying all truths as historical, it obviously follows to them that all unpleasant truths about the world can be changed. Some of them are our most militant and active members. Others have belatedly seen their fallacy are overwhelmed by the consequences. These are the comrades who despair. When their Utopia crumbles beneath them, they find themselves psychologically inadequate to work for anything less. If they cannot have their absolute, they will accept nothing. Such people are usually unhappy and in need of psychotherapy. As they are, it is sad but true that they never should have been in the movement.

The Existential Fallacy and Cynicism

Of another group, it remains to be spoken. They are the ones who, after a brief fling and flirtation with socialism, leave because they take a diametrically opposed position. Instead of accepting all truth as historical, they accept all as existential. Ergo, people starve because they are too stupid to eat and nothing we can do can put enough brains in their heads to revolt;

261

discrimination exists because man instinctively needs to feel superior, and bigotry (evil though it may be) is inevitable; wars will always exist because man is innately predatory; etc. etc. Such people are the super-sophisticates, the cynics. They were early in discovering the bell-shaped curve from which they derived that half the people of the world had below average intelligence. And most obviously, since very few have their brain capacity, the world consists of dullards and morons. These are the chosen few, the "liberals", the cynics. There is no hope so let us calmly and amusedly watch the world go to pot. Toujours gai, what-the-hell, and all is vanity anyway.

Another group is also victim to the existential fallacy but clings desperately to its sense of humor and basic urge to revolt. In a broad sense, these are the Dadaists. Since all is vanity, all is utter and incomprehensible nonsense. Since all nonsense is equivalent (for how can any one nonsense be more nonsensical than any other), why make a pretense at making sense? Let us be nonsensically honest with our nonsensically selves. Therefore, pretend madness and maybe you'll find you're not pretending.

Such are the fallacies stemming from a confusion between existential and historical truth. They are easy to fall into since there are yet many areas in which science has not been able to separate them. Often, they fall into the area of philosophical thought and as social philosophers it is our duty to distinguish what is changeable and what is not. In the meantime, we know the more important truths and into what category they fall. They should be branded in red across the breast of every new recruit.

(WHAT NOW ? - continued from page 13)

This is naive. While it is true that, within the labor movement, we will direct our efforts more and more towards such people, we must also realize the type of people who - given today's conditions - join radical organizations. Social pressures are against it, and there are no mass radical groups that could compensate for this. Therefore, two types generally join: the highly politicized (who can only be found around the periphery of other groups) and the radical youth. There are, of course, exceptions to this but, in general, it holds true. The question is - where does the greatest concentration of radical youth exist? (We are speaking of the relatively non-political ones with the right "instincts"). Obviously, in the stalinist periphery (since the naive kids join on the basis of most laudable motives) and among the disillusioned YPAers. We believe that those are the people we should direct our recruiting efforts at, most particularly since the now CP line indicates that they will soon be ideologically homeless.

(Carol Donitch, member of the Luxemburg tendency, wishes to state that, while subscribing to the rest of the statement, does not agree with the last section, Who Will We Recruit?)

ARTICLES FROM ANY MEMBER ARE PRINTED IN YSR COMPLETELY UN-EDITED. WHY NOT AVAIL YOURSELF OF THIS DEMOCRATIC PRIVILEGE TO EXPRESS YOUR VIEWS?

*

WRITE FOR YSR

230