

NEITHER WASHINGTON OR MOSCOW

AGAINST BOTH IMPERIALIST WAR CAMPS

YOUNG

SOCIALIST

R

E

V

I

E

W

The Young Socialist Review is the official discussion organ of the YOUNG SOCIALISTS (previously YPSL) youth section of the SOCIALIST PARTY- USA

EDUCATION

Titoism and Socialism - Bogdan Denitch	page 1
Who Am I? (Part II) - Bert Herman	" 9
Educational Supplement (LID) - Educational Committee	" 12

DISCUSSION

Future of the Socialist Party and the Y.S. - Luxemburg Tendency	page 5
On the Position of the Party - Peter Winant	" 13
Socialist Unity and the Schactmanites - Bogdan Denitch	" 16
ANVIL report - Answer to Siteman - David Senes	" 18

THEORY

Tasks of World Revolutionaries - Peter Winant	page 21
Editors Page and WHO'S WHO	" 8

YSR is published by the National Educational Committee of the Young Socialists, Suite 516, 303 Fourth Ave. New York City. The YSR takes no responsibility for the views expressed in signed articles, which do not necessarily represent the views of the Young Socialists.

FREE TO MEMBERS AND INTERESTED SOCIALIST PARTY MEMBERS.

Bogdan Denitch,
Editor

181

TITOISM AND SOCIALISM

by Bogdan Denitch

In view of the problems raised by the existence of an independent stalinist state - and particularly the fact that it is viewed with some sympathy by some socialists - I feel that the question of Titoism ought to be subjected to full discussion.

The present article is submitted in three parts, to be continued in the following issues of YSR.

- PART I The historical background of pre-war Yugoslavia, the development of the partisan movement, and Tito's accession to power.
- PART II The Tito-Stalin rift, the economy of Yugoslavia, and the nature of the present regime.
- PART III The effect of Titoism, its relation to the world power conflict, the relations between Tito's Yugoslavia and the socialist parties, the relation of Titoism to the third camp.
-

PART I BACKGROUND OF TITO'S ACCESSION TO POWER

Yugoslavia was created by the treaty of Versailles. Within its borders were included the old states of Serbia and Montenegro and the former Austro-Hungarian provinces of Bosnia, Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia, Dalmatia and Voyvodina. From the outset, the two problems facing the new state were a) the national question*, and b) the relations of the major powers to Yugoslavia. While Yugoslavia was included in the loose system of Anglo-French alliances and in the "Little Entente" (Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia), its national question created continual internal friction that was ably exploited by its neighbors. Of the neighbors, Bulgaria laid claim to Macedonia and helped the local terrorist independence movement (IMRO); Italy claimed the Dalmation littoral and supported the Croatian USTASHI** (fascist national independence group); while Hungary acted as a satellite of Italy and laid claims to the Northern provinces of the new state.

The failure of the bourgeois democrats to solve the national question and the constant turmoil that the parliamentary regime suffered as a result led to the military dictatorship of King Alexander, based on the Serbian administrative caste and the suppression of the nationalist and labor movements.

In political terms, the basic forces in Yugoslavia were:

- the PEASANT PARTIES, numerically the strongest, with the Croat Peasant Party representing the national aspirations of the Croat people;

* Before the war, the Yugoslav population was divided as follows: 8,250,000 Serbs, 3,750,000 Croats, 1,250,000 Slovenes, and 900,00 other minorities. The Croats were predominantly Catholic, the Serbs Orthodox. ** The USTASHI were financed by the Italians, trained in Hungary, and were responsible for the assassination of King Alexander and French minister Barthou in 1936.

- the "DYNASTS", i.e. the administrators and politicians who rose to power after the establishment of the new state and who controlled the state machinery, acting for both the local and foreign bourgeois interests;
- the WORKERS' MOVEMENTS, badly divided and weak; and finally
- the NATIONALIST GROUPS, usually extremely reactionary and based on an amalgam of the "unemployed clerks" (i.e. the educated petty bourgeois which could not be employed within a state that was as yet unindustrialized), and the national groups.

After the assassination of King Alexander, the regency, under Prince Paul, initially relaxed the dictatorship and in the 1938 elections, the Croat Peasant Party joined with other bourgeois parties to form the government. In 1939 an agreement was reached between the Croat leaders and the government majority, giving the Croats a degree of local autonomy. Unfortunately it was already too late. Although the regency leaned toward the British, the pressure of the Axis combined with the Allied defeats soon forced the weak and vacillating government to seek agreement with the Axis. Early in March of 1941, Yugoslavia signed the Axis Pact.

The Workers' Movements:

The trade union movement in Yugoslavia acted almost continually under conditions of semi-legality. The social-democrats mostly controlled the "semi-legal" unions which, by terms of a compromise, were permitted to elect their own officers and conduct their own affairs in exchange for a no-strike pledge. Under the dictatorship and the regency, strikes nevertheless took place, though in each case the state violently interfered on the side of the employers.

Before World War I, small socialist parties developed in what was to be Yugoslavia. The ones in the ex-Austrian provinces developed under the influence of the Austrian social-democracy, while the Serbian SP had a record of unqualified opposition to the war. After the war, the influence of the Bolshevik revolution combined with the very low standard of living of the Yugoslav workers and the tremendous prestige that Russia had traditionally had in the south Slav provinces made it inevitable that the bulk of the old socialists would help to form the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.

The history of the CPY is somewhat obscure, but some salient facts stand out. The Party was under almost continual suspicion in the Comintern as being "infantile-leftist", and despite its rather large popular support (during the period of legality it elected a significant number of deputies), it was continually re-organized from abroad. The interference of the Comintern, which continually purged the best elements, combined with active police suppression and the growing isolation of the party so decimated its ranks that by World War II it was limited primarily to the "Spaniards" (i.e. those who had fought in the Spanish Civil War and were scattered throughout Europe) and the students. During the whole period however, Russia AS RUSSIA was regarded with the greatest friendliness by the peasantry.

The Socialist Party was even weaker and seemed limited to a small segment of the trade unionists and some intellectuals. Politically, the Party had a good record of opposition to the dictatorship, but in the trade union field it had been forced to compromise in order to stay alive and was consequently viewed with some suspicion by the more militant workers.

3
During the war, the SP split over the question of whom to support - Mihailovich or Tito - and the bulk of the Party, with its total leadership supported Mihailovich. Topalovich, the head of the SPY, acted as secretary of the "Liberation Committee" which was organized in Mihailovich-held territory. Consequently, after the seizure of power by the Titoists, the Party was declared illegal and the trade unionists were jailed, being replaced by the "new" men who had developed in the Partisan movement.

World War II and the Civil War:

The immediate reaction to the signing of the Axis Pact was a popular revolution in Belgrade which replaced the old government with a pro-Ally one composed of conservative and bourgeois elements. The German invasion forced the Government to flee to London and the armies, riddled with fifth columnists, collapsed in a matter of weeks. The Axis Powers divided Yugoslavia into several parts, parceling sections out to the various neighboring states with the exception of Croatia, which was permitted to form an independent pro-Axis government under Pavelich - the head of the USTASHI movement. The Roman Catholic Church backed the new state.

To properly understand the Civil War that followed, one must understand the massacres that followed the establishment of the puppet Croat state. Between 600,000 and 800,000 Serbs were massacred within the borders of the new state while an equivalent number was deported to the Italian and German occupied sections. Thus the guerilla resistance which soon flared up had the dual character of occupying the Axis troops and of defending the local peasantry as well.

Initially, the Communists were neutral, but upon the attack of the USSR in June, the Partisans began to form, with the student element as its backbone. The Mihailovich movement was based, on the other hand, on those elements of the regular army that had managed to escape capture and on the local peasant militia. The London Government soon included Mihailovich in the cabinet as War Minister.

What followed was confusing. The Partisans felt that the main task of the resistance was to draw troops from the Russian front (and of course, to lay the foundations of future Soviet power in Yugoslavia). Thus they exposed the local population to continual punitive expeditions of the Axis troops. When liberating a section of the country, the Partisans set up "People's Committees" which so antagonized the peasantry that in many cases the Partisans were driven out. Mihailovich, on the other hand, engaged in limited holding operations, holding his main strength in waiting for an Allied landing in the Balkans.***

The Allied strategy, combined with the political deals which determined the future role of Yugoslavia as being a part of the "Russian zone of influence" soon shifted Allied aid to Tito. The volume of this aid, in addition to the support given by the BBC broadcasts in London, assured a victory for the Partisans. The

*** For lack of space, we cannot discuss in full the propaganda campaign in England and the USA aimed at proving that the Mihailovich movement collaborated with the Axis. As a matter of fact, a great number of ex-fascists ended up in the Tito government and army (e.g. the official "poet laureate" of Yugoslavia, Nator, was also the poet laureate of the fascist Croat state up to 1943). This proves nothing except that charges of collaboration are easy to make. There is no evidence to suppose that the Mihailovich movement was anything but a mass-based, anti-stalinist resistance movement which included the bulk of the peasantry.

question was definitely settled when the Russian troops entered Yugoslav soil and Allied aircraft began giving ground support to the Partisan units. 4

The national question played a role in the Civil War too. While the Croat state supported the Axis, by 1943 when the Allied victory seemed inevitable, more and more of the Croat units started coming over - in each case to the Partisans, since the Mihailovich government refused to make deals and insisted that all war criminals would be prosecuted. (This meant the bulk of the Croat army since it had served on the Axis side.) The pressure applied on the London Government by the British forced it to include elements that were "willing to compromise" and eventually, an uneasy alliance between the new London Government and Tito was established. After the war, when Tito had consolidated his power, the elements that had supported him in the London Government were purged.

What is most important to note is the fact that Tito owed his accession to power not to the Russians but to the Western Allies who supported him heavily with arms. Thus the Partisan movement could claim to have come to power independently unlike the various satellite governments in Eastern Europe, many of which were directly installed in power by the incoming Red Armies.

The organization of the new state:

The text of the Yalta agreement demanded the inclusion of a few democratic leaders in the new government. This was done, but they were so isolated that within a year not one of them remained in the cabinet and the last opposition paper died "for lack of pulp paper".

The familiar pattern of the police state soon became evident. The secret police OZNA was organized on much the same lines as the Russian NKVD and followed the same routine. The "People's Front", controlled by the Communist Party was the sole political "party" - the trade unions were "responsible for the maintenance of discipline and raising the production" and integrated into the state structure.

The "People's Courts" rapidly eliminated most of the older union and peasant leaders and the monolithic structure of the dictatorship solidified.

The regime, however, could not avoid one major snag - the under-industrialized state of the country. Forced collectivization met with such peasant opposition that the pace was slackened; nevertheless, the peasants maintained their opposition and the food-plan has not once been met in the seven years that the regime has lasted.

The Soviet policy of forming "joint corporations", where the Russians had a majority of interest, to exploit the natural resources of the satellite countries; the fact that the USSR was interested in maintaining the satellites in semi-colonial status as suppliers of raw materials, soon brought the interests of the Yugoslav bureaucracy into conflict with that of the Soviet Union. The regime felt itself stable enough to afford a break - but a break to have occurred had to be based on some real needs of the bureaucracy. The need soon became apparent.

(END OF PART I - PART TWO WILL APPEAR IN THE NEXT YSR)

Bibliography for this topic appears at the bottom of page 116

Repeated criticisms of the tendency's theoretical and organizational articles appearing in YSR have been primarily based on the assumption that we were dealing with problems which were "irrelevant and abstract" - e.g. the question of the third camp and party democracy. In our opinion, on the other hand, it is today, in the period when we are slowly rebuilding and redefining the socialist movement that such discussions should take place. When we are in a position to act, the trend will be - as it has been in mass-based social-democratic parties - to completely ignore theory and concentrate on the problem of attaining power - and keeping it. At such a time there will be too much of a tendency to consider problems of union democracy, workers' control, and party discipline from the pragmatic point of view, i.e. "does it work?". The question is not "does it work?" but rather "what do we want to do?". As we stated before - the problem is not power, but power for what - and we are afraid that the answers so far given are insufficient. That is the purpose of the YSR - that is the purpose of the discussions and the continual education that goes on in the YS. We do not know the answers and are desperately trying to think our way through. That is the purpose of rediscussing "old" questions - questions that have never been adequately answered and applied to the American scene.

.....

ELECTORAL ACTION - NECESSITY AND PURPOSE

As we have tried to explain before (February YSR), there are essentially two reasons for supporting electoral action today. One, based on complete bankruptcy of political ideas is based on the assumption that a) the SP is in fact a political party today, and b) the only "real" role for a political socialist organization is to run in elections. Considering our present strength and the essentially apolitical nature of the two-party system, this is simply stupidity. However, it is dangerously indicative of the fact that large sections of the SP can conceive of no other alternative to political action than organizational suicide.

There is, however, a second reason for supporting political action. It is based on the fact that during election years people tend to listen to political discussion and are more receptive to our approach. Also, electoral action is a sort of shorthand that explains (on a very low level) why we bother to talk politics. This can be expanded: our basic difficulty is not in communicating ideas but rather in communicating purpose. Thus, while many people might essentially agree with us they can see no reason why they should bother to do anything about it. Also, during a campaign, while we cannot talk about socialist theory we can answer some basic questions; what is wrong with the two old parties, what do we propose to do tomorrow, etc. Most important of all - it is easier to talk a person into identifying with us by voting for us first. After that the bond is created between the party and the individual and the next step - that of identifying with the party is easier to take. Also - and this is important - because of the weakness of the Party we rarely have the opportunity to talk to people about socialism - election time provides such an opportunity and permits us to reach a large audience. (Of course, it must be understood that at its best, electoral action can only be a supplement to regular party work.)

If the second reason for electoral activity is accepted then it is clear that the size of the campaign becomes irrelevant. For example, the question of

6

being on the ballot is unimportant (since a write-in campaign gives you as good an excuse for talking to people as any.) What is important is the number of people we talk to and the type of periphery we develop from the campaign. Thus, instead of measuring our success by the number of votes we get we should consider the number of people we recruit, the number of sympathizers we contact, etc. In other words - the extent to which we strengthen our organization.

A RAISON D'ETRE FOR THE S.P.

When considering the reasons for the existence of the SP, we tend to confuse the present SP with what the SP can easily become. It is not probable that in the near or distant future the Party will become mass-based, or even that it will develop into some kind of effective electoral instrument. What is possible is that the Party will develop into an effective propaganda organization which will be able to go into the mass organizations of the people and help crystallize the demands of the workers and the minorities to a point that will make a labor party in America a real demand of a large segment of the population.

To do this, of course, the Party needs a redefinition, a re-orientation. The present SP is composed of so many diverse elements that any kind of unified action is almost impossible for it. In line with the American tradition of "keeping the party together by compromise", it has avoided taking a clear stand on some of the most pressing questions of the day. Its program is not the basis for unified action - it is a statement that was watered down to the extent necessary to keep within the same party people who support as well as people who violently oppose the Korean War.

After this election it is probable that some sort of re-orientation will take place within the party. The realistic potential of electoral activity becomes almost useless when we find that in some twenty states no minor party can even get on the ballot - when we also find that only a small section of the Party membership is actively involved in the campaigns. It might be - and this we must face - that no form of activity is capable of involving the bulk of our members actively. In that case the sooner we start building a "new" party within the SP the better, since it becomes more and more obvious that without a disciplined, active party we cannot afford to go into the PAC's and engage in organized trade-union activity.

To talk of the democratic nature of the Party and ignore the fact that in reality tradition makes this democracy very shaky (since our party's structure presupposed an active membership) is to ignore reality. There can be no sort of control over the policies of our leadership unless the rank-and-file is active the year round. For us to pass resolutions at conventions - and then permit the election of a right-wing NAC to administer them is effectively to leave things as they are. True, we have a good constitution - but that constitution is applied so rarely (the argument being "we cannot afford ... etc. etc.") that for all practical purposes it does not exist.

We need a socialist party - but we do not need an exclusive club that maintains an organization for the sake of tradition. We need a party that can act as a political body, a party that is democratic enough to permit full, free discussion all year round, a party whose press reflects the policies of the membership, not of the New York committees. And, most of all, we need a disciplined party.

(more)

FORMATION OF AN SP LEFT-WING

7

The question of a left-wing caucus in the Party has been raised year after year. The only trouble is that today the term "left" is used so loosely that we must first define what we want and then start caucusing for it. For example, at the last convention in Cleveland the left-wing concentrated its fight on the question of a campaign - which was essentially a tactical question - rather than on the question of war and of party discipline, which were principled questions. This meant that, for the sake of "unity" during a campaign (a unity which is, incidentally, non-existent), they sacrificed a socialist program. In order for this not to happen again it is essential that full discussion start long before any conventions. It is essential that the left-wing work out a concrete program ahead of time.

Essentially, the right-wing will not be defeated - it will slowly drop out (as per Kreuger). If you are interested in hastening the departure of some of the more objectionables, the way is simple - activity - any activity, since they will refuse to string along if the SP continually embarrasses them instead of slumbering quietly. In other words the question of the program is not too important. What is important is that the program be heard - only then does the program embarrass those who disapprove of it. Anyway, since the left is the only section that really gives a damn about the continuation of the SP as a political entity (with some notable exceptions), it will perforce do the bulk of the recruiting of new people. The same process changed the YPSL within one year.

The purpose of a left-wing should not be to wage useless factional fights today, but rather, to recruit and to continually present its views before the membership. This second is rather difficult, since, for example, though the main question discussed at the convention was the question of the third camp, if you merely read the CALL you would not even know that the question existed. What we therefore need is either an internal organ that will actually come out with some regularity, or an arrangement whereby we can get some space in the CALL. (You know - there is no real reason that things should remain in the hands of the same old people despite what the convention decided. For example - has there been any change in the line of the CALL since the convention?) Until we get a Party Bulletin - and this will be difficult - the YSR is probably the only place where completely free discussion can go on.

To form a caucus, and we favor such a caucus, we must start now. Immediately after the November campaign we suggest that some form of a "round robin" start making the rounds so that we can work out a program together. In the meantime, we need communication and contact.

THE NEED FOR THE YOUNG SOCIALISTS

Today the YS probably has a better future than the Party. Being based upon students and being relatively homogenous, it is a growing section of the Party and thus relatively free of pessimism. The new ranks of the Party are being trained here, and in the atmosphere of free discussion and expanding organization we can possibly avoid the mistakes the SP made. As a matter of fact, the best single contribution we are making to American socialism is the fact that YS is discussing the issues that do affect the future of the Party. And despite the outrage of some people, we will continue to discuss political ideas, no matter whom they happen to be embarrassing at the moment.

(more)

The left-wing of the Party is here - the Young Socialists forms an organizational nucleus from coast to coast. It is almost solidly left-wing and can provide the backbone for a national "left-wing". In the meantime, the YS activities are creating an ever increasing number of third camp socialists who realize the need for effective organization.

EDITOR'S PAGE

The National Executive Committee decided by a mail ballot that the YSR is to remain available to close contacts of the YS. In view of that will all circles please send in their bulk orders for the YSR to the Educational Committee--preferably at least a couple of weeks before the next issue which will be out around October 15.

While the YSR is free we suggest that Party members and contacts who want it on a regular basis send in whatever they can to help pay for the paper etc. (i.e. we still need dough)

The comrades from California have responded to our fund appeals... how about the other sections ?

If you wonder about the appearance of this issue, about the relative neatness and legibility, you must have noted that the stencils were not typed by the Editor. The thanks should go to the Student Sec. Carol Denitch (nee Holman) who labored over this issue.

Who's who in this issue: Peter Winant is an NEC alternate from Boston; Bert Herman is a member of the Central Manhattan Circle; David Senos is an alternate to the NEC, on the ANVIL staff and active in NY District; the Luxemburg tendency is the N.Y. "majority"; Bogdan Denitch is a member of the NEC recently elected National Organizer of the League.

The lateness of this issue is a usual inexcusable, the reason is the ballot drive in New York state which is still going on ...

Please, please, please send in the lists of your contacts to the N.O. Ditto for reports on the campus conditions.

HELP THE CAMPAIGN --BUY AND DISTRIBUTE THE S.P. PLATFORM --

If you have not received your issue of the LEFT (Educational Com. publication) don't worry it is n't out yet. We have decided to wait until the end of the ballot drive.

ORGANIZE AN INDEPENDENT COMMITTEE FOR HOOPES AND FRIEDMAN START NOW

BUILD THE YIPSEL

(A number of good comrades have suggested that the first part of the article talked down to its audience. Sorry! I hope they understand part 2)

You will recall that we left our hero (the human race) in a terrible spot: the Christians, the Rationalists, and now the Freudians, all consider him too awful for words. They are all buds from the same classical flower, with the Rationalists materializing "sin" into "evil"; and the Freudians materializing "redemption" into "sublimation".

Socialists reject the evil sub-stratum theory, but think that it is, in a sense, an accurate picture of some personalities in a class-divided society. Their reasoning goes like this:

Patterns of behavior appear in human beings as a result of a) physiological potentialities (or limits) and b) past situations actualizing some aspects of this potentiality. Moreover the past (and present) situation represent some actual aspects of the environment. Adapted to groups, the statement reads: Each group has an actualized structure appearing as patterns of behavior under conditions of social interaction.

Thus we can see that if past situations have succeeded in actualizing "evil" aspects of personality - through debasing social experience - the remedy is to eliminate these debasing experiences. However, the first law of class society is its ever increasing conflict, and from this stems attempts to consider man endowed with creative as well as evil drives. (The bourgeoisie is unwittingly admitting the creative role of socialist struggle in liberating man's potentiality!)

One result of considering man basically egocentric is to consider babies and children to be monsters, for they haven't yet learned to "sublimate". What this is, is a warping of a basic fact, namely, that babies are notoriously ignorant. As soon as they learn that they can get what they want by waiting, they learn to wait. And as soon as they learn that man's physiological system functions best by cooperation (sociocentrism) rather than by competition (egocentrism), they're perfectly willing to be creative people. But alas, if you've ever seen some hysterical mother pull little Junior by his ear (perhaps with some hypocritical promise or endearment) or some irate father teaching his child to go back and fight like a man (daddy gives eye-gauging lessons, but wait until the recruiting officer offers napalm!) you can see why Junior might be skeptical about the rewards of cooperation.

Bluntly put, the essential anti-humanism of our social and economic system is reflected down to the last detail in every material and formal aspect of family upbringing. Parents love their kids in just the same way that business men love workers or bigots love minority groups: By God! They know what's best for them; they've got to know their place; and we'll show them what's what!

Here are some of the personality types that emerge under our economic-family system:

- 1) The people who accept competition; repress cooperation; and are in social positions where it pays off to owe allegiance to this

social system. They have no anxieties; they're just sadistic and power mad;

10

2) The people who accept competition; repress cooperation as much as possible, but who are in social positions where it doesn't pay off. They have doubts, are anxiety ridden. They try to be sadists but are inefficient at it; this is your conventional neurotic;

3) The people who accept cooperation when it pays off; competition when it pays off. They are the opportunists who swing with the tide. They're found in all of the social levels, generally as followers with a low order of creativity. (Note - We are using ideal types, labeled "competition" and "cooperation", roughly paralleling the types "egocentric" and "sociocentric". Concretely, we would refer to domination habits reflecting the current monopoly capitalist ethos, or those in opposition. - B.H.) Demagogues love them. Their positions become more untenable and anxiety filled as the class struggle deepens and as they see they're lack of attainment as they grow older. Sociologists call them "anomic".

4) The people who basically accept cooperation and who analyze the anti-social and anti-personal meaning of competition. These people are in a position to liberate their highest potentialities - sexually, aesthetically, politically.

The various personality types are by no means restricted to any one class, although we are able to trace the general influence of economic position on family types and hence on personality. In general, the shopkeeper will have habits reflecting fourteen haggling hours a day, and his struggle to retain the remnants of his declining social position, The skilled worker brings back the habit of his union solidarity, the combination of skills, and his group's self-decided, struggled for, and enforced work and pay rates. However, almost all but the most disciplined and educated socialists are sabotaged on all sides by the incessant din of the dominant ethos; and even the socialists must bring up their children with the children of madmen. Further, as noted above, the various anti-humanist psychologies can hardly be trusted to provide the proper perspective.

To recapitulate - even those in the best social positions, the best of militants, etc. are relatively inadequate in the development of this major "means of production". This tends to warp a social transformation. It can be attacked by a) learning the proper methods of direction b) focusing attention on present social failures, e.g. need for nurseries, improper school techniques, medieval sex laws and practices (a crucial area), etc. c) plans for a socialist use of productive facilities to re-orient family structure immediately upon the accession of socialism.

We have not specified what the socialist family will be like. We have indicated that it will constitute a different type of educational instrument, outlawing incorrect habits of dominance. We have indicated that cooperation helps turn the trick and that different housing, nurseries, schooling, etc. is indicated. However, a much larger conception is really indicated. Man has known various kinds of families other than the monogamous. The "extended families" of China have hundreds of members (sometimes thousands). Families have been polyandrous, polygamous, or almost indiscernible in relation to clan obligations. What will socialism produce?

191

The trend toward freer sexual relations (paralleling the emancipation of women by the factory system), the institution of divorce, and so on, show that an old style monogamous family, even one of the "companionship" type, rather than a patriarchally dominated one may well be swept over. This is hardly compatible to many religious socialists as well as to just plain socialist workers who feel that they can isolate "moral" things from their socialism. It may well be that any relationship in which the dominant unit is "father-mother-kids" orients to an unhealthy dominance situation. Perhaps the solution is the acquisition by a larger social group of the "parent-image" role. It is quite likely that the old line of persecution of socialists as "atheistic free-lovers" intuitively recognized the significance of the socialist challenge to the social order. This is what socialists must explore for it is from the acceptance of the "easy" capitalist solution to family problems that a real threat of corrupt power, bureaucratic degeneration, or socialist managerialism may spring. If the answer to the question, "who am I" is so closely connected to this basic social institution, then we must explore it to its roots, in order to give a creative, socialist answer.

A HISTORICAL NOTE - - PERSPECTIVES GROUP

Leafing through the back issues of the YSR, we found that in May 1943 the magazine contained an interesting appeal to the Yipsels to support a "non-caucus" Perspectives group. The brief outline of the program attached read as follows:

- 1) The growth of an all-inclusive state apparatus is the greatest challenge facing the movement. The tendency of all potentially progressive forces to be drawn into it is to be fought against.
- 2) The way to fight the growth of reaction is not through press ure groups, functioning in the nation's capital, but by building independent forces that can struggle militantly against each encroachment of its rights. From this flows the need to organize from the bottom and consider our strength not in terms of how many leaders take cognizance of our work.
- 3) That in order to function effectively in the coming period there is the need of a disciplined party, a party that will be able to function as a spearhead in the struggle of the mass organization.
- 4) The problem of socialist power must be taken seriously. But we do not believe in the concept that the party must take power for the people. On the contrary, we state that the party's function is to help the organization of the masses develop socialist consciousness so that they can act for themselves.

The Perspectives group had among its members Comrades Myers, Zatinsky, Becker, Travers Clement.

We might add that we still agree with the statement as far as it goes ... and the need for a disciplined party (point 3) is greater than ever.

Editor

LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY, 112 East 19th Street, New York City

The LID was originally started to acquaint students and intellectuals with socialism. In its more recent past, however, the LID drew progressively to the right and became a meeting ground for the labor bureaucracy, the right-wing SP'ers and the lib-lab intellectuals. The LID as an educational organization has published, and still publishes, pamphlets dealing with political, economic, and social problems and many of these pamphlets are very useful source material. We list the more recent and interesting pamphlets. For a full list, write to the LID at the above address.

OUR CHANGING INDUSTRIAL INCENTIVES by Harry Laidler (Educational Comm. 25¢)
A somewhat dated but still very useful brief study of non-profit incentives for production. Forms a part of the answer to the question of "why would people work under socialism".

SOCIALISM IN U.S.A. by Harry Laidler (Educational Committee 25¢)
Very brief but basic study of the origins of the American socialist movement. Essential as basic reading material despite the fact that it was written from Laidler's own extreme right-wing viewpoint. In its discussion of the more recent past and electoral action it is the apologia for the Social Democratic Federation and the right-wing of the Socialist Party and for that reason should be read and understood by every Yipsel. RECOMMENDED.

WORLD LABOR TODAY by Robert Alexander (Educational Committee 25¢)
Again - granting the viewpoint, which in this case is a pro-Western one in the present world conflict - an excellent and very necessary study of the world labor movement. As an outline study of the European, Asian, and Latin-American movements, it fills a badly needed gap in the knowledge of most of our members. RECOMMENDED

- We list some other pamphlets available from the LID or the Educational Comm.

LABOR PARTIES OF LATIN AMERICA by Robert Alexander 15¢
Good basic reference work but somewhat dated.

EDUCATION AND THE NEW SOCIAL ORDER by John Dewey 10¢

BRITISH HEALTH SERVICE by Julius Manson 25¢
Answers some of the usual questions about the functioning and structure of the British health service program.

FORWARD MARCH OF AMERICAN LABOR by Wolfson and Glazer 15¢
An outline of the history of the U.S. labor movement from the business union point of view. Good for distribution on campus and should be in every Yipsel's library.

WORKERS' CONTROL? by Lirone White (Fabian Society publication) 25¢ from LID
A good discussion of the problems involving direct worker's control of the factories. Incidentally, we suggest that you contact the Fraternal Bookshop at 303 Fourth Ave. for a full list of the generally excellent Fabian Society pamphlets available.

SOME THOUGHTS
ON THE
POSITION OF THE PARTY

(Since this article was written in March, many of the ideas contained are out of date, especially since the convention)

In examining the way in which the world situation ties in with party policy we would do well to study the history of our movement.

In 1917 our party heroically opposed the imperialist war. In those days, when French and German socialists decided that they were French or German first and socialists second, and went off to shoot each other in true comradely fashion only the American socialists and the Russian Bolsheviks (among the warring nations) did not betray the interests of the working class. We faced persecution manfully and were united by it; our legislatures were unseated and our leaders went to jail. Eugene Debs announced: "If I were in Congress, I would be shot before I would vote a dollar for such a war... I am opposed to every war but one; I am for that war with heart and soul, and that is the world wide war of the social revolution!"

In 1942, on the other hand, the Party equivocated; it agreed to disagree; it followed a policy of compromise which pleased neither side, and our membership dropped by about three-fourths.

Many of us were mistaken about World War II. We had read all the books revealing World War I as an imperialist war, but we had not read an exposé of the existing war. It is an inevitable misfortune that studies such as Prof. Beard's two recent books can only expose wars that have already occurred. And so many of us thought we were fighting a war against Fascism, and went off to fight in a jim-crow army against Nazi racism, and in alliance with the world's greatest dictator, against Nazi dictatorship.

Many of us were mistaken about World War II. But, comrades, let us not make the same mistake twice in one generation!

Yet the tragedy of 1942 was repeated again in 1950. Again the Party compromised its anti-militarist principles. The majority of the NEC, contrary (as I believe) to the opinion of the majority of the Party, and without a referendum of the membership, endorsed the Korean slaughter. And again after taking eight years for our return to 1942 number we had a drastic decline in membership. Surely we should learn something from experience.

Parties do not exist for the sake of preserving an institution. They exist to serve a function. If they are not serving a function they die. It is our function to provide a party which takes an attitude of opposition to capitalism and its policies. If the Party is worth preserving, we must adopt a clear cut anti-war stand. Only we can give the voters a chance to vote for peace; if we do not do this we will not be serving any function at all. The policy of non-ecism did not get Wilkie or Dewey elected; it will do even less for us. If somebody wants to go along with the Administration foreign policy, only adopting a somewhat critical attitude towards certain phases (support of France, Chiang etc.) there are organizations such as SDF or ADA doing

exactly this; we would be only duplicating their efforts if we adopt their outlook. But there is a vital need for a party combining electoral activity with a militant anti-war stand, and only we can do this.

There are some who think that we should not get too far out of step with the majority of the labor movement. They do not quite dare to be different because they are afraid of being isolated from the main current. They feel that America is for some reason exempt from the economic laws of historical development which exist in the rest of the world. They say we should not sing songs about "soul" when the workers are eating ice cream. They seem to think that in periods of prosperity we should put away the red flag, and if a revolutionary situation develops many years from now, we should get it out again, if we can remember where we laid it and if the moths have not eaten it up in the meantime.

It seems to me that this view is short-sighted. It is of course, hard to remember the pangs of hunger when we have been well fed for a number of years. Yet as socialists we should have that knowledge of economic laws to see that the present situation is purely temporary; as internationalists we should recognize that conditions which in one particular country seem to violate these laws are artificial, that the world is in a state of revolution, which we would appreciate if we did not confine our attention to the American scene. If we see flowers growing in a greenhouse in December, we should not thereby suppose that it is warm outside.

The reason for the present conservatism of American workers is that they have been bought off by the temporary war prosperity, and have acquired petit bourgeois political ideas along with their television sets. But we should recognize that these conditions cannot go on forever. We should be preparing ourselves for the inevitable depression. And when the crash comes the workers may be ready to see that they have been mistaken, but they will look for leadership to the party which has kept its record clean, its policies consistent, and its banner flying. The defeatism of many party members demonstrates the narrowness of their contacts; surely the receptiveness of Negro people today to the socialist program is evidence that, where we go organizing among the people who do not participate in the war prosperity, the militant anti-capitalist message is the only valid one for our party.

It follows then that we must adopt a platform that is militantly anti-war. It should include planks for the immediate expropriation of industries working on war unprofitable. We must have a clear cut anti-imperialist stand against any aid to nations which do not give their colonies independence. We must repeat over and over again that it was the American foreign policy that brought on the present mess: that it was American aid to Chiang Kaishek that caused China to turn Stalinist; that secret war time deals for dividing the spoils among the victors were the cause of a divided Korea that support of Syngman Rhee was a contributory cause to the outbreak of civil war; that Korea was not worth fighting over in the first place, and that the war could have been brought to a close a year and a half ago if the UN had not crossed the 38th Parallel into North Korea, thus bringing China into the war. We must point out that we socialists always opposed the policy of joint occupation of defeated nations which has caused so much trouble in Germany and Korea, and that we favored instead, the encouragement of local

revolutions against the defeated Axis occupiers, in order to establish popular governments dependent on neither the West nor the Stalinists. We must select as our presidential candidate a man who shares these views, for if he expresses his own opinions instead, what good is the platform? The voters would then continue to be confused about our views. The candidate must be someone who would rather be right than president: as long as he will not be president anyway, he might as well stand firmly for the right.

PETER WINANT, BOSTON

GENUS LIB-LAB - A CASE STUDY

Some years ago the WHY? magazine published an article on the genus lib-lab where it discussed the characteristics of the liberals around the NATION, NEW REPUBLIC, ADA, etc. We feel that it might still be of interest to our readers. The characteristics of the genuine lib-lab are given as the following:

- 1) (Belief in) the class mediation function of the state; if perchance it serves the "big" people, says the liberal, this is temporary deviation from its true function. He does not recognize the state as inherently a class instrument.
- 2) Acceptance of leadership. Here it can be noted that the very people who are disgusted by the acceptance of leadership by the fascists and the stalinists do exactly the same in their prostration before the "democratic" messiahs (e.g. F.D.R.)
- 3) Acceptance of any method, no matter how authoritarian, to obtain economic security. What is worse, they try to make it seem as if bureaucratic decisions represent popular will, no matter how many degrees the bureaucrats are removed from popular control.
- 4) Naivete about the nature of capitalist motives. They assume that the capitalists will bow down before popular will, once demonstrated by the election of a labor party to power, for example, and will acquiesce quietly to a program of social transformation which will end their profits.

These are very, very common characteristics that apply to a large section of the liberal movement. Perhaps you have noticed some of them in the Y.S. and in the Party????

ORDER FROM THE EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEE

Selections of Rosa Luxemburg	by Educational Committee, YS	15¢
Reform or Revolution	by Rosa Luxemburg	60¢
State and the Socialist Revolution	by Martov (answer to Lenin)	65¢
Materialist Conception of History	by Plekhanov	15¢

in preparation:

Titoism and Socialism	by Educational Committee, YS
This is the Y.S.	by Educational Committee, YS

BUY ANVIL BUY ANVIL BUY ANVIL BUY ANVIL BUY ANVIL BUY ANVIL BUY ANVIL

The relationship between us and the Schactmanites is ambiguous. In the eyes of the right-wing, the distinction is difficult to make, and what is more, too many - far too many - of our own people do not know why we are in the YS rather than, say, the SYL. Usually, as a matter of fact, the reason given is the "personalities" and the "types" that are found in the SYL (completely unpolitical approach) or a self-deluding statement about us being "large" while the Schactmanites are a "small sect". The second reason certainly is false - our respective sizes are almost identical, and as far as sectarianism is concerned, the SP is so far ahead in this field that it has few competitors.

No - there are real reasons for being in the YS (assuming you are a revolutionary socialist). These reasons must be considered and understood.

In the first place, let me state that I consider the political aims of the present SYL and YS almost identical. The differences lie in the field of tradition and organizational approach. The tradition, being the less important point, is most simply disposed of. Just as the SYL (in my opinion, stupidly) occasionally defends the tradition of the bolshevik revolution - a tradition that is both undemocratic and unsocialist in some aspects, so we occasionally defend (read "apologize" for) the countless betrayals of social democracy the world over. It is the easiest thing to answer our argument about the bolshevik suppression in Kronstadt with the equally sorry tale of the role of Noske in the German social-democracy, the role of the French and German parties in World War I where they sold out their principles, etc. As a matter of fact, the crimes of the two traditions more or less supplement each other - one a tradition of haste at the expense of the workers' democracy, the other a tradition of fear and weakness at the expense of the workers.

The question of organizational differences is far more important. There is the old bugaboo of the trotskyist raiding, a bugaboo based on a correct estimation of the fact that the SYL and the trotskyist movement as a whole is more concerned with the problems of political power than the question of nice organizational manners. The point at hand, though, is the fact that this rigid application of the approach used in Russia to the United States soil is as stupidly sectarian as the views of some SP'ers regarding cooperation with people who "had had a totalitarian tradition when we were young".

The basic point however, is one of effectiveness. There are a limited number of things that a socialist can do today - and basically, the rightness or wrongness of organizations can be settled by seeing how good a socialist job they do. (Incidentally, I completely accept the definition of the SYL as a democratic socialist group). Now in my opinion, we (the YS, that is) are in a position to sell revolutionary socialism and the third camp better than they. The reasons are as follows:

a) SYL is a cadre organization. This means that we are able to recruit people that the SYL would not or could not touch. This means that we can get young people and teach them instead of looking for "little Lenins". This means that we can grow more quickly and consequently spread our ideas more widely. On the other hand, it is true that in the era of political oppression that is on us we need a cadre type organization in order to survive. There we can make two points: i) we will stay off the "list" longer, thus being able to operate legally, and ii) cadre quality people can be developed within a looser organization. In other words, instead of working on the people outside YS and bringing them in when "ready", we bring them in and while they learn they also help

(more)

build the movement. Thus, our equivalent of the SYL periphery is our new membership - which is far closer to us and far more active than any periphery can be.

b) We do not have the label of "trotskyism" and its tradition to live down. Since the American workers have not yet been sold out by social-democracy it does not have as bad a name here, and it is easier to explain our faults away.

c) SYL is too rigid politically and as such, cannot attract people who are not as dogmatically sure. Also, their handling of the stalinoids is bad and they are consequently unable to draw much from the ex-CP'ers and YPA'ers. This is important, since a whole generation of people have been educated in radicalism at the time when naïveté about Russia was the norm: thus they present an important body to recruit already radical people from.

All these elements combine to bring me to the opinion that "our" way is the better and more effective way.

Now the question of unity. IF there was any common sense in the SP when approaching this problem it would be in effect today. However, we are tradition bound in the extreme. The SP prefers to cohabit politically with the Social-Democratic Federation and various Jewish socialist groups with which its members have personal and/or sentimental bonds despite the fact that those organizations have ceased to be either radical or socialist in any sense of the word rather than work with other socialist groups which developed from other political traditions. The attitude of the SP makes the question of unity impossible in the foreseeable future. True, on the campus of necessity we will cooperate, just as we will cooperate on ANVIL and on anti-Franco picket lines, but unity itself is today out of the question. However, there is another way of looking at it. When and if a Labor Party is formed, the socialists (all real socialists) will work as a left-wing within that party. This means that it does not matter where the socialists are trained, so long as it is a democratic socialist, anti-war training (revolutionary anti-war, that is) since we will all end up together anyway.

BIBLIOGRAPHY for Tito article, compiled by the author: (See page 4)

- David Martin ALLY BETRAYED (Prentice Hall, 1946)
- Louis Adamic MY NATIVE LAND

The first is pro-Mihailovich and is written by an American socialist.
The second is the "official apologia" by one of Tito's major supporters in the States.

As background to pre-war Yugoslavia, I suggest:

- Rebecca West BLACK LAMB AND GREY FALCON
- Anton Ciliga RUSSIAN ENIGMA (the sections dealing with the CPY)

The 1951 Convention of the YPSL, in considering the question of ANVIL magazine, passed the following motion:

Motion (Koponen): "Whereas the YPSL now lacks and needs a publication and the YPSL now supports a militant socialist, anti-war position, and the magazine ANVIL has asked for our endorsement and participation on terms to be negotiated with us:

Therefore be it resolved that the YPSL in Convention assembled endorses ANVIL and directs the YPSL-NEC or a committee thereby appointed to meet with the ANVIL board and (here the specific conditions are laid down).

When the above requirements have been met, the YPSL members shall sell ANVIL, write and submit articles thereto, campus groups of the YPSL may affiliate, and members shall form or organize student anti-war groups affiliated to ANVIL. YPSL members in other student groups shall democratically seek to have such groups endorse and affiliate with ANVIL."

After a month of negotiations, the YPSL N.O.C. minutes mention ANVIL again (January 19-20)....

"ANVIL (Report): All conditions laid down by the YPSL Convention have been met with the exception of incorporation, which appears impractical. A Committee of Helman, Denitch, Senes, and Holmes held two meetings with the present group of editors, etc. The YPSL is to designate three representatives to the editorial working Committee and business staff help ... All copies to the circles and the members will be mailed out thru the YPSL office.

Motion (Denitch): That we consider the terms of the agreement have been met and that we now endorse ANVIL.

PASSED, Gangel abstaining. "

This seemed to end the long struggle to have the YPSL endorse ANVIL, the struggle that began with the first issue of ANVIL and California League's endorsement of the publication. As soon as it became evident that the third camp, anti-war viewpoint was now dominant in the YPSL, endorsement of ANVIL became a foregone conclusion.

There were a number of factors that made it logical to endorse ANVIL:

- its "open" nature, i.e. the fact that it was a political forum expressing most of the views of the democratic left. Articles appeared from the federalists, pacifists, liberal and socialist students;

- its mass circulation of around 5000 which makes it a most potent instrument of propaganda on the campus;

- its generally high level; and finally ...

- the essential agreement between the policies of its board and the YPSL.

.....

People criticizing ANVIL's "inefficiency" forget that no student/^{publication} of a political nature - not even that of the stalinists - has either lasted as long or approaches ANVIL's circulation and level. Incidentally - it is interesting to compare the efficiency of ANVIL with that of the CALL. ANVIL, for practical purposes, pays its own way; the CALL is the biggest expense on the SP budget (not to mention the fact that ANVIL sells to non-politicals and on newsstands.)

The basic attack on ANVIL, however, (Siteman article in June YSR) is based on two propositions:

- 1) The undesireability of associating with the Socialist Youth League, which is also involved in publishing ANVIL, and
- 2) a-"The poor organizational sense and practice of the Yipsels who are involved in ANVIL and the Federation" (ANVIL's publishing body, Ed.)
 - b-"The lack of understanding of the nature of pacifism and even of an anti-militarism or anti-one-war-or-another-attitude." (Siteman)

The first proposition is easily disposed of. The ANVIL board is composed in the following fashion: one elected editor for each endorsing campus club, a smaller board of managing editors elected by the New York Federation Against War. Of the four clubs forming the Federation, two are clearly not SYL controlled and the other two are heterogenous in control. The SYL and YPSL representation are about even, with a few independents (pacifists and liberals) forming the balance of power. What is more important - never - not once, has there been a dispute on the board which was decided on the basis of political block voting, i.e. in each case, both the SYL and YPSL editors voted as individuals. (Also, there has never even arisen the question of political disputes).

The strength of the SYL (and for that matter - the YPSL) on the ANVIL board is the result of our failure to broaden the base sufficiently by including non-socialist clubs in the Federation. A failure which, one might add, was greatly contributed to by Siteman's efforts to prevent the War Resister's League, of which he is a board member, from allowing their campus people to endorse ANVIL. If Siteman is concerned with "SYL control" of ANVIL, the solution is simple - broaden ANVIL's base.

As for the second proposition, we can make a few observations. For an SP'er, any SP'er, to talk about the poor organizational sense of the Yipsels while ignoring the SP's miserable record, is to show complete blindness to facts. True, the YPSL is not functioning as well as we would like it to, but compared with the SP, it is so immensely more active in proportion to its size, it is

(more)

growing so steadily, and its effectiveness increasing so rapidly that comparison is impossible. As simple examples we can cite the facts that the "inefficient" YPSL has a) organizers in the field, b) an internal discussion organ, and c) has almost doubled in number in one year -- not to mention the fact that it is matching the effort of the SP in the ballot drive despite the fact that the SP is more than ten times larger in size and resources.

The YPSL lack of understanding, or rather Siteman's lack of understanding of YPSL's position, is amusing. WE are inconsistent because, if you please, we oppose World War III and both war camps without necessarily being pacifists. Siteman, on the other hand, (such is logic) supports the pro-war right-wing of the SP and is a pacifist. A lack of understanding and confusion certainly does exist ... the only question is where!

The specific criticism of our function/^{ing}were in one or two instances well taken. It is true that we should function more efficiently on ANVIL, we should sell more copies, etc. etc. and we are taking steps to see to it that we do. As for the safety of our mailing lists, Siteman need lose no more sleep over this question, since the present ANVIL address is John Holmes' office (Holmes being the ex-National Secretary of the YPSL).

Siteman's main attacks were not directed against ANVIL but rather against "bourgeois" realism. He talks of the non-existent bulletin of the North American Bureau of the IUSY as the substitute for ANVIL; he talks of the need for the YPSL to work with SDA, WORLD and SLID -- a policy we have followed without any break. He talks about non-existence of the Federation Against War, etc. etc. Not being metaphysicians we cannot delve into these abstract theses and must regretfully pass on to one more concrete suggestion of Siteman's -- namely that the SP re-establish control and supervision over the YPSL.

Our only answer to Siteman's paternal concern for our moral and physical well-being can be "please put your own house in order first daddy; then come tell the YPSL -- which is doing quite well, thank you -- how to improve its own

.....

IN CONCLUSION

- Federalists, liberals and pacifists write for ANVIL. We need good articles from you.... WRITE FOR ANVIL.

- The cost of ANVIL to us is nil. In return we reach over 5000 students with our program of peace in freedom and opposition to both war camps.

.....

Sell

ANVIL

Get your club

to

sell ANVIL

PRESENT-DAY TASKS
OF
WORLD REVOLUTIONARIES

"The English working class is actually becoming more and more bourgeois, which...is will calculated on the part of a nation which is exploiting the whole world." Engels in a letter to Marx in 1858.

"There is no working-class party here,...and the workers very quietly enjoy together with (the bourgeoisie) the fruits of the British colonial monopoly and of the British monopoly of the world market." Engels in a letter to Kautsky in 1882.

"The last three wars...have progressively raised the American standard of living, while lowering living standards in the rest of the world. The class struggle has thus been internationally polarised. The whole population of America has become a "capitalist class" in relation to the rest of the world." resolution of the Young Socialist, 1951.

Marx has said that history repeats itself, the first time as a tragedy, the second as a farce. Never has this been more clearly shown than in the way that the United States has taken over the rôle traditionally played by England in world affairs. It is a farce because, in full view of the decline of England as a world power, America learns nothing and follows the same policies, except that America does its "muddling" on a truly American, mass-production basis.

For centuries England grew strong by playing the balance of power, and grew rich by exploiting the world. Favourably situated on an island, British statesmen supported first one continental power, the another in a 19th century version of Caesar's "divide and rule". Its far-flung Empire enabled England to maintain a "favourable" balance of trade by living on the interest of its enormous investments abroad. And exploiting the masses of Asia and Africa, England was able to enjoy one of the world's highest standards of living, so that even the British working man was able to share, though in a small way, in the profits of running an empire.

Which country is it now who plays the balance of power? What nation supported Russia Against Germany and China against Japan, demanding unconditional surrender and complete disarmament, only to turn around four years later to criticise the conquered territories for their unwillingness to re-arm fast enough against its former allies? (At least the British had the propriety to wait ten or twenty years before changing sides.) Who now is growing rich at the expense of the rest of the world, not only through investments and trade, but through selling armaments to other nations to use against each other? Like England of old, America is geographic favoured. Always an arsenal, never a battlefield, America grows richer while the world grows poorer. (This is why words fall on stony ground when we speak to the American worker.) And, like the British Empire

the sun never sets on the American dollar. As the Arab remarked, as he watched American troops building an air-field: "For isolationists, these Americans certainly get around."

An Indian socialist told me last month: "I feel sorry for you Americans. It took England two centuries to become the most hated nation in the world; you Americans have nearly caught up with them in five."

It was only eight years ago that Wendell Wilkie toured the Middle East and spoke of the great "reserve of good will" toward the United States among the people there. Today that reservoir is dry. What has caused such a rapid change? Before these countries came into face-to-face contact with dollar imperialism they thought of America as a revolutionary force, based on new methods of production, new ideas of democracy, and an ally in their struggle to rid themselves of colonialism. Today they are sadder but wiser, having been shot from American tanks in the possession of the British and French imperialists. It is not surprising that the people of this area are just realising today that America ceased to be a revolutionary political force some three generations ago. In the same way we should not be surprised if they are likewise unaware of the reactionary nature of Stalinist imperialism, whose Russian counter-revolution is only about twenty-eight years old.

We can therefore expect that if America continues to follow the same policy over a period of years, we may then see a world in which a wealthy America stands alone in the midst of an impoverished world hostilely united under the banner of Stalinism. What is the process by which this will happen?

It is self-evident is so full of internal contradictions that, except in the American garrison state, it cannot long continue to operate. We also know from the experience of the last ten years that when capitalism continues to exist through artificial means beyond its appointed time that we get not socialism, but Stalinism. Only a workers government can defend itself against Stalinism and only if the workers can come into control of the Western world can Stalin's world conquest be checked.

(This gives rise to a peculiar paradox: whenever capitalism fights to maintain itself the more inevitable it makes Stalin's eventual victory; while on the other hand, the more aggressive the Stalinists are, the more they increase business of war production strengthens the capitalist system. The power struggle thus reinforces itself leading up to the final cataclysm. The only alternative to annihilation therefore is socialism.)

Thus in India and Indonesia, where the popular revolution was able to throw off the colonial rule before the Stalinists could capture the working class, conditions are favourable for democratic government and a strong socialist movement. The same is true of industrial countries such as Germany and Japan, which have a genuine labour movement. In China, on the other hand, the Kuomintang dictatorship permitted no working class opposition to organise, so that the people had no choice but to turn to the Communists for deliverance from oppression. The same is true in Indo-China, where the only way for the people to fight for independence against the U.S. aided French aggressors is to support the Stalinists.

It is thus a question of timing. We may lay down the following rule: wherever capitalism and imperialism are eliminated early enough for the people to organize their own government, a proletarian movement will have some hope of independence and eventual success. But where capitalism is artificially maintained, and where the aspirations of the common people are denied, there Stalinism will capture the working class. The task of organizing the working class and the peasantry (for the peasantry appears to form the class basis of Stalinism wherever it has been successful) before the Stalinists do. It may be already too late in Malaya and the Phillipines; there is more time left for us in the Middle East and Africa.

This lays a historic rôle upon us as revolutionary socialists, for it is up to us to act as leaders of the Third force, which alone can save the greater part of the world's population from Stalinist or imperialist exploitation.

We must:

1. Wake the American people to the dangers of the American foreign policy. There must be no more aid to colonial powers or reactionary native governments. It is in the power of the United States, as controller of the purse strings, to insist that France free Tunisia and Indo-China, that the British come to terms with Iran, Iraq and Egypt, and that South Africa end Apartheid.

(N.B.: Since writing this three months ago, the author has come to believe that it is unrealistic to hope for a capitalist country to adopt a socialist foreign policy, or for the American people to wake up so long as they are "bought off" by war prosperity. Nevertheless the attempt should be made in order to educate that section of the working class which is not participating in war prosperity, and in order that after the capitalist policy has brought ruin people can recall that it was we that warned them at the time what would happen.)

2. We must send trained leaders into the critical areas of the struggle, particularly such places as Malaya, Indo-China, the Phillipines and Africa. We cannot do this by ourselves, because the masses would be suspicious of accepting an American as their leader. But we have a wonderful opportunity of training natives of those countries who are now students in American universities, as revolutionary leaders. (It is no accident that the leader of the Indonesian Socialists is a former Yipsel, having joined when he was a student in the United States in the 'thirties.) Our Young Socialist circles, which often seem so ineffective in terms of numbers, may change the course of a continent if our ideas are planted on fertile soil. Yipsels in every university must actively seek the friendship of foreign students, setting up oriental student clubs wherever possible, which would be ostensibly social clubs (since most foreign students are afraid of being deported if they openly identify themselves with a political movement), but would really serve as centers of indoctrination and training, possibly including the study of existing revolutionary movements in those countries, and a thorough study of the economy of the whole region to encourage interdependence among Asian countries and independence from the Western and Stalinist blocs. The building of an international third force can also be encouraged by closer relations with revolutionary socialists in other lands through a greater exchange of students, and through the setting up, in

various countries, of summer work camps similar to our Socialist in Industry program, to the summer work camps of the Yugoslav People's Government.

3. The Socialist movement must make a clean break with reformism, especially in countries which are on the verge of a revolutionary situation. Wherever the Communist parties have grown to large numbers (as in France, for instance) it is because the socialist parties have come under the domination of petit bourgeois elements who are less revolutionary than the Stalinists. Where the masses are ripe for revolution, we must place ourselves in the vanguard of the workers' movement. Both our immediate demands and our statements of our final goals must be more radical and far-reaching than those of the Stalinists, whom we should be continually exposing as phony "reds", disguised fascists, traitors to the revolution, agents of a reactionary imperialism.

The greatest task facing revolutionary socialists today, is the building of the international peoples' third force. Now, in the time of balance between two rival imperialisms, is the critical decade in which the revolution may triumph in many lands. If the opportunity is lost and either power came extends its rule over the whole world, all chance of proletarian victory may be lost for centuries. Now is the time to tell the world: Workers of all lands, unite!

-PETER WINANT, BOSTON

AN ORGANISATION CANNOT FUNCTION WITHOUT FUNDS!

ARE YOUR DUES PAID?? DON'T DELAY. SEND THEM TODAY!! 205