



# SOCIALIST

# APPEAL

## IN THIS ISSUE

1935 CHICAGO ELECTION CAMPAIGN -  
----by Arthur G. McDowell

TWO RESOLUTIONS - - - - -  
-----by Albert Goldman

HUEY LONG AND THE WORKING CLASS MOVE-  
MENT  
-----Richard B. Whitten

OF WHAT IMPORTANCE AN ELECTION?  
-----Ernest Erber

FEBRUARY - 1935

ISSUE

# THE SOCIALIST APPEAL

Published every month by the APPEAL PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION  
4452 North Hermitage Avenue, Chicago, Illinois

PRICE 5¢.

Vol. 1

February, 1935

No. 1

## "THE SOCIALIST APPEAL"

The number of socialist papers and magazines thruout the country is surprisingly small, taking into consideration the number of members in the Socialist party and the support it has in the ranks of American labor and of the American people in general. For that reason, if for no other, the appearance of the SOCIALIST APPEAL in this modest form needs no apology.

The Appeal Publishing Association in issuing a mimeographed monthly (in the hope that it will soon come out in printed form) is certainly not coming into a crowded field and interfering with the circulation of some worth while socialist monthly. Especially in Chicago which is without any socialist paper of its own, weekly or monthly. Wonderful indeed would it be if every large branch in the Socialist party would issue some paper of its own!

In its present form the SOCIALIST APPEAL cannot hope to function as an agitational organ for a wide circle of non-party readers. It will be primarily a magazine for

party members and close sympathizers. This first issue furnishes an example of the type of articles it will include within its covers. Articles on current events - international, national and local - and discussions on party problems will form the chief contents of the SOCIALIST APPEAL.

It would be useless to conceal the fact that the APPEAL will take a consistently left position with reference to all current events and party problems. Nevertheless its pages will be open to all viewpoints within the party. Recognizing that the party is passing through a period of struggle between various tendencies and convinced that only a thorough and honest discussion will hammer out correct policies and keep the unity of the party intact, it will encourage contributions from all who have different ideas about any important question.

Unity of the party based on the principles of revolutionary Marxism and achieved thru free discussion will be the goal of the SOCIALIST APPEAL.

\* \* \* \* \*

### ROOSEVELT'S MASK IS FALLING!

Those American workers (and they are in the vast majority) who have a pathetic faith in President Roosevelt's intentions to improve their conditions, must be somewhat at a loss to explain his failure to initiate legislation really favorable to both employed and unemployed workers. Socialist workers have not at all been surprised by that failure. They have taken it for granted that Roosevelt, despite all his shrewd and meaningless verbal concessions to the masses, is essentially interested in keeping the wheels of industry going by satisfying the employers.

Undoubtedly he has stepped on the toes of a great many reactionary industrialists who are not even willing to make the small concessions granted by Roosevelt. He could not possibly fail to throw some crumbs to the millions of workers and middle class people who enthusiastically cast their votes for him. But these millions of Roosevelt's supporters are expecting more than crumbs and their disillusionment cannot be so very far off.

On the basis of having and retaining faith in Roosevelt, a worker could expect him to support the thirty hour week bill sponsored by the American Federation of Labor. A bill of that nature was actually passed by the Senate in April, 1933. To head it off, Roosevelt at that time promised great concessions through the N.R.A. The gains made by labor through the N.R.A. have been quite insignificant and it is because of that that the A.F. of L. is demanding a thirty hour week. Big Business has raised a terrific howl against such an idea and Roosevelt clearly has indicated that he sides with Big Business on that issue. He would pay far more attention to such a bill if the leadership of the A.F. of L. would mobilize the working class for a real struggle, both on the economic and political field, in behalf of the thirty hour week; but that is hardly conceivable as far as the present A.F. of L. leadership is concerned.

Another measure which those workers who voted for Roosevelt have a right to expect is an adequate unemployment insurance bill. The one proposed by the administration is so woefully inadequate that it can hardly satisfy anyone except the bankers and industrialists. After all his actions and hypocritical speeches about social security a measure was introduced which at the very most - in about three years, or so - will give an unemployed worker fifteen dollars a week for sixteen weeks, beginning with the fifth week of unemployment. Hardly anything to be joyous over.

Meanwhile, emergency public projects are to take the place of direct relief. But our great president was careful to assure the employers that wages on such projects would be lower than the prevailing rate, so as not to take away the incentive on the part of the workers to look for private employment. In order to do that, it will be necessary of course to pay wages considerably lower than the prevailing rate, which means in most parts of the country a miserably low standard of living.

It was not at all necessary for our president to assure everyone that he believes in the profit motive. That is painfully obvious. No wonder that the employing class is beginning to look upon Roosevelt as a veritable savior. The employers clearly recognize that Roosevelt has turned to the right and those of us who have known all along that the president's left phrases were only phrases, have a real chance to convince the American workers on the basis of Roosevelt's actions that there is nothing they can hope for from the New Deal.

#### HITLER WINS THE SAAR.

German fascism has registered another victory. The population of the Saar by an overwhelming majority decided to cast its lot with Germany - Hitler or no Hitler. The proletarian revolution has thereby received a blow. It would be folly to minimize it.

The workers of the Saar will experience the "benefits" of the domination of "der Fuehrer". Destruction of their organizations, a lower standard of living, concentration camps for those who in some way show their dissatisfaction will be Hitler's gift to them.

What explains the overwhelming vote in favor of Germany? First of all, the spirit of German nationalism pervading all sections of the population. Too many ties bound the people of the Saar with Germany and even the prospect of being lorded over by Hitler and his lieutenants could not sever those ties. But it must be recognized that a great many - if not a majority - voted not only for union with Germany, but also for union with Hitler. The middle class and part of the working class have not as yet been disillusioned by the rule of the nazis. No one can deny that the fascist terror and the tremendous advantages possessed by the nazis in the way of funds and organization influenced the vote; but it would be absurd to claim that the terror and advantages are solely responsible for the huge majority rolled up against the proponents of the status quo. The truth is bitter, but it must be accepted. As yet the spell of Hitlerism has not been broken.

Folly indeed would it be to draw the conclusion from the above that Hitler's position is impregnable and that he cannot be dislodged. The contradictions which he faces cannot be solved by fascism. By means of the army, police and concentration camps he can cling to power for a considerable length of time, but once he loses his mass base completely his position becomes extremely precarious.

It is useless to attempt to predict exactly when Hitler's downfall will occur. One thing is certain: it cannot occur without struggle on the part of the working class and a class that has been demoralized by a defeat without a struggle requires time to regain the necessary confidence and morale to wage a victorious battle.

STALIN FOLLOWS HITLER'S METHOD  
(But the Soviet Union is not Germany)

If there is any one thing that can be said to indicate that a socialist has revolutionary judgment and discrimination, it is his attitude toward the Soviet Union. To some it appears as though to criticize the Stalinist regime is equivalent to being against the Soviet Union. Others take the attitude that to uphold the Soviet Union is to condone all the crimes of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

A revolutionary socialist in a trade union has a duty to uphold the union against the employers, no matter who the leaders of the union happen to be. It is also his duty to struggle against a conservative leadership of the trade union, because the policies of such a leadership weaken the union in the struggle against the employers. The trade union belongs to the workers and not to the leaders, and criticism of the leaders does not at all mean struggle against the union itself.

Our attitude toward the Soviet Union and toward the Stalin bureaucracy should be similar. As against the capitalist class, to support the Stalin regime to the last. In so far as the policies of the bureaucracy weaken the Soviet Union and consequently the revolutionary movement in other countries, we must criticize it openly and severely.

The execution of over a hundred people, without an open trial, as a result of the assassination of one of Stalin's leading lieutenants, has shocked the revolutionary conscience of thousands of socialists. Coming as it did so soon after Hitler's purging of his storm troops, it has even provoked some socialists to declare that the Soviet Union is as bad as Germany.

Under no circumstances can we compare the Soviet Union to Germany, no matter how similar the methods used by Stalin and Hitler. Even though Stalin might put real working-class revolutionists in jail or even execute them, the Soviet Union is a worker's state and as such the distinction between it and Germany, a capitalist state, must be brought out at all times.

Two months after the event the real motive for the assassination is not yet clear. Immediately after Kirov was killed, the Stalinists let the whole world know that it was the plot of white guards. About a hundred people were executed and the inference was created that they were all participants in a white guard conspiracy. The stories seemed a little too grotesque to be accepted without question. All of the hundred executed were supposed to have been caught crossing the border illegally with arms in their possession. Later on, it was revealed that some of those executed had actually been in prison at the time of the assassination. Fascists in Berlin, Belgrade, Latvia and even New England were given out by the Daily Worker as originators of the plot.

Then came the information that the assassin was a member of the Communist Party and connected with the former Zinoviev opposition. Comrade Trotsky was of course immediately dragged in as the arch conspirator. To informed and intelligent people the whole thing seemed a monstrous hoax. That Stalin could sink so low as to accuse Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky of being responsible for a terroristic act could hardly be conceived.

And the most incredible part of the whole story is that Zinoviev and Kamenev at their trial "confessed". Of course their "confession" was simply to the effect that they felt themselves morally responsible because they had formed a secret opposition, thus presumably creating bitterness in the heart of the one who committed the crime. For this Zinoviev was sentenced to ten years and Kamenev to five years in prison.

In this respect the Workers Age (Lovestoneite paper) takes a somewhat similar attitude to Trotsky. In an editorial the profound suggestion is made that since Trotsky believes in a new party in the Soviet Union and since this will lead to a "civil war", some follower of Trotsky took the bull by the horn and started a little "civil war" of his own. Let us suppose that the Lovestoneites believe in the violent overthrow of the capitalist state. Should we then conclude that some innocent Lovestoneite might come to the conclusion that he might as well begin with terror?

Kirov's assassination appears to be the act of someone who became embittered and enraged for some personal reason, or because he saw an insolent bureaucracy lording it over the working class. Democracy and freedom of discussion having been suppressed, and no normal method of a change in the regime being possible, it can be expected that a high-strung and unbalanced individual might resort to an act of individual terror. It is a hopeless method of struggle and no sane revolutionist would ever advocate or condone it.

Stalin took advantage of the act of an unbalanced individual and executed and exiled those who were dissatisfied with his policies. Under the circumstances this seems the most plausible hypothesis.

Meanwhile, not only is the Soviet Union weakened by such a monstrous act, but the revolutionary movement everywhere. The prosecutors in the United States are certain to remark to juries trying communists, that "in this country we at least give some kind of a trial, while in Russia there is no trial at all for those who oppose the regime." And counsel for defense is compelled to answer weakly: "The United States is a capitalist country while the Soviet Union is a worker's country."

\* \* \* \* \*

HUEY P. LONG AND THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT  
By Richard Babb Whitten.

The post-war decline of world capitalism has accelerated the movement of industrialism in the United States from the northern into the southern states. The falling export trade in cotton, tobacco, sugar and rice, in a word, the crisis of southern agriculture, has created a huge, cheap labor market in the South. Mindful of this, industry (chiefly textile) has come into the South to cut the cost of production (wages) that it might better meet the keenness of national and imperialist competition. This is the background for presentday politics in the South.

Quite naturally such far-reaching changes in the economic life of the South have expressed themselves in its political life. Great unrest has gripped the masses. In state after state the old, "respectable" lackeys of the landlords within the Democratic party have been swept out of power by factions within the party basing themselves upon this discontent. Thus have the sons of the ante-bellum aristocracy, broken by the Civil War, been succeeded in the politics of the South by the Fergusons, Bilbo, Talmadge, Bleas and Long. The succession has not been uniform, but it has been a steady tendency riding upon the underlying economic currents.

Since space and title permit only a brief treatment here of one of these political movements, that of Huey P. Long in Louisiana, let us examine it. What were his methods? What has he done? How does he affect the revolutionary working-class movement in the South; and now, since a national force, how will he affect the revolutionary working-class movement in the United States?

Long is a product of the poor-white farmers in northern Louisiana, where he was born. Having a clever mind and being ambitious, he worked at odd jobs, attended for a while the University of Oklahoma and later finished law at Tulane University. He went back to Winn Parish and began to practice law. He soon entered politics and was elected to the Louisiana Public Service Commission. While holding this office, he fought for the right of common carriers for the small oil producers as over against the large oil companies. Thus, we see quite early the nature of his politics. Not against capitalism, but against the big capitalist corporations, for the small capitalists. This shows it to be a middle-class movement.

Unsuccessful in his first attempt to the governorship of the state, he was successful in 1924. As governor he launched a gigantic road and toll-free bridge building program. This served two purposes: Money for contractors and strengthening his support from labor through jobs, thus making a base for his political machine. His free school books also gave added support in the rural sections of the state. A new state capitol furnished a feeling in the backward masses that he was doing things. His efforts in behalf of the Louisiana State University have led to further support from the middle-class and the more "prosperous" farmers. How was this financed? Mainly by an "occupational" tax and an increased franchise tax on corporations. Here again a Populist attack on Wall Street, middle-class reformism.

But all of this was for the purpose of making complete his power in the state. On none of these jobs did union wages prevail. The Louisiana Federation of Labor is pitifully weak and in its stronghold, New Orleans, has only 4,000 members in all unions. Long has vetoed or has had vetoed all specifically labor reforms: ratification of Child-Labor Amendment, union labor on all state work, old age pensions, etc. Factory inspection is chaotic and politicalized. Accident and labor health laws are haphazardly enforced with the workers still getting the short end of the horn. A third of Louisiana's population, Negro and white, are on the relief rolls.

The state now has the second largest percapita debt in the country, the state debt being increased by Long from \$11,000,000 to \$150,-million. Since the vast majority of the workers of Louisiana, both Negro and white, own no property, the recent bill giving \$2,000 tax exemption on all property again helps the middle-class and the large real estate owners. Many of the wealthiest men in the state are the most ardent and loyal supporters of Long.

He has used every trick known to capitalist politics to dominate the state, from bribery and intimidation to fraudulent control of elections. Civil liberties mean nothing if they stand in his way. His opposition comes from corporation lawyers, old guard "respectables" in the Democratic party, sincere liberals in the intelligenzia and professional class, the Old Regular faction in New Orleans led by Mayor Walmsley, parts of organized labor, and the Socialist and Communists.

Now that he is in the United States Senate and has started his "Share Our Wealth" movement he becomes a national figure and a threat to the working-class movement in this country. He has an unquenchable thirst for power. All of his attacks upon the Roosevelt administration have been calculated to capture the inevitable disillusionment that will fill the masses with the failure of bourgeois reformism. All of the objective conditions are present in this country for a fascist movement. The subjective ones are obviously not present to a sufficient degree. Long knows this and is biding his time, but at present has only the intention of capturing national power legally. Successful in this, the fascism would come after he had attained power. Failing to capture the Democratic nomination in 1936, then may follow his new party and an open fascist role.

His demagogic "Share Our Wealth" program "gives" something to all the elements of discontent in the country, both in the working class and in the lower middle-class. For both he is going "to limit poverty" so that everyone will have "not less than \$5,000 free of debt". How? By limiting "fortunes to such a few million dollars as will allow the balance of the American people to share in the wealth of the land." To the aged "\$30 per month to persons over 60 years of age who do not earn as much as \$1,000 per year or possess less than \$10,000 in cash or property." For the industrial worker the sweet assurance "to limit the hours of work to such an extent as to prevent over-production". For the farmer and the religious, he is going to "balance agricultur-

al production with what can be sold and consumed according to the laws of God, which have never failed." Platform 6 is a hurried after-thought that says, "to care for the Veterans of our wars." This is an old fascist stunt, on the road to power. Veterans make good storm-troops.

Platform 7 shows the provincialism of the Savior. It reads: "Taxation to run the government to be supported, first, by reducing big fortunes from the top, thereby to improve the country and provide employment in public works whenever agricultural surplus is such as to render unnecessary, in whole or in part, any crop." He thinks only of the unemployed farmer but not at all of the unemployed industrial worker. This is a great weakness for a potential fascist leader. If Long took all of the \$25,000,000 income of all of the 46 millionaires in the country last year, it would not keep up unemployment relief on the present low standards for more than two weeks! But such is a program that will capture the politically undeveloped workers and farmers in this country.....unless.....

Unless we in the Socialist party carry on in this race with time, a mass propaganda and educational program among the workers and farmers, a program based upon clear, keen, socialist analysis of social, economic and political conditions and events, a Long or a Coughlin will win. Unless we lead the workers and unemployed in strikes and relief demands, a Long or a Coughlin will capture their feeling of hopelessness. Unless we build up militant share-croppers' and farmers' unions on sound revolutionary socialist principles and action, they above all will be caught in these fascist nets as in Germany. Unless we develop a revolutionary spirit and organizational structure, unless we teach fundamental revolutionary Marxist theory to our Party comrades, many of them will be captivated into these filthy chains. Unless we relentlessly expose the futility of the Roosevelt reformism to the masses from sound revolutionary Marxism, such as to convince the masses of the correctness of our position, a Long or a Coughlin will mislead them and gain their support. Unless we show the Negro masses and all other races what fascism will mean to them in this country, they will be lost in the deluge along with the whole working class, if these movements come to power. Let us strike fascism when it first shows its head, let us build a revolutionary Socialist party, let us turn the tide for the workers of the world in their march to international socialism.

\* \* \* \* \*

(The author, Comrade Whitten, is Secretary of Local New Orleans, Socialist Party.)

FATHER COUGHLIN - PEACOCK ORACLE  
By T. E. Rodgers

One cannot profitably discuss Coughlin's economics without first discussing his motives. It seems likely that in the beginning he was just an ambitious priest out to build a fine church in his parish and fill it with free-giving faithful; and when, as a result of his radio speeches, his fine church popped up like a jack-in-the-box and there was an accompanying shower of money and fan-mail, he undoubtedly was flabbergasted. But not for long. When the first post-office-ful of fan-mail arrived one can readily imagine him brushing the mail out of his hair and stuffing the money in his pockets as he scrambled to a Napoleonic pose on an exceeding high mountain, from which he could better survey - with popping eyes - the glory of all the kingdoms that lay before him.

Should he stick to his original mission of increasing the membership rolls and spook-dreading influence of his church? Or should he set out in his seven-league boots to establish for his yearning, self-conscious sect the socially acceptable front-door political influence of, for example, the Methodist Church? Pent up in nearly every Catholic's breast is a passion to see members of his sect accepted as trustworthy equals by the non-Catholics, who by the very nonchalance with which they have excluded Catholics from "front" positions up to now, particularly from the Presidency, have driven the faithful to such a frenzy of desire that it amounts almost to a psychosis. Power they have, plenty of it; but it is side-door, back-room power. They want to stick out their chests and walk in the front door.

Catholics know they are intellectually hobbled; they are vaguely conscious of the fact that if their minds were visible as their faces are the distortion would cause strangers to stare at them. For that reason, when they argue bravely with themselves and others that they are the intellectual equals of non-Catholics, the frustrating doubt lurking in their subconscious minds compels them to realize that they don't even believe their own arguments. This leaves them with an unshakable feeling of inferiority, which is the underlying reason why they become so vicious and often resort to fistcuffs in ordinary discussion with non-Catholics.

To prove that Catholics are normal human beings may be one of the chief motives behind Coughlin's desire for influence; if it isn't it certainly ranks well up toward his personal ambition to be a king-maker. It may be that both of these motives rank after his original aim to build up his church. The order isn't important; the resultant broadcasts could spring from any one or from all three motives.

A man well versed in economics and politics who fell into conversation with a ranter of Father Coughlin's type would, if he observed usual social practice, change the subject and get away from him as quickly as possible, feeling that it was unkind to permit the man to make such a jackass of himself even in private conversation. But when the ranter turns up with a chain of some twenty-five or thirty radio

stations, he cannot be dismissed as an object of pity; to the contrary, he then is a public menace, and it becomes the duty of all citizens who see through him to expose him ruthlessly for what he is - either a peewit or a skunk. One cannot be sure which he is: but since it is difficult to believe that he could be such an ignoramus as his speeches would indicate, it seems more likely that he deliberately set out to serve his church by befuddling the public.

And for the purpose of befuddlement, Coughlin uses a very old and very effective technique, perfected through the centuries by his church. He beats his breast, rolls his eyes, tears his hair, hammers the reading desk, and shouts invective in a perversion of the English language which seems to indicate that he wants his hearers to think he never has been anything but a cultivated gentleman. The whole performance is designed to make everybody believe that his heart bleeds for the welfare of everybody in the country except the bankers, communists, and socialists, whom he regularly takes time out to damn. Having spellbound his hearers into accepting him as a modern messiah, he can, to a considerable extent, lead them where he will.

An understanding of his motives makes sense out of speeches that otherwise would be meaningless. Building the church requires one kind of speech; achieving political and social respectability for Catholics requires a different kind of speech; and becoming a king-maker requires still another kind. These three kinds of speeches aren't mutually exclusive; in fact, to some extent they overlap; but they are sufficiently different to make Coughlin seem to rush off in three directions at once - to make it difficult to figure out what he is driving at.

Coughlin would have the public believe that the church wants for working people the same things the radicals (according to the church) only pretend to want for them, but that the church has no use for what they call the murderous, subversive, foreign, radical organizations. He says, in effect, put your faith in Mother Church, and then the Lord will provide at least one chicken in every pot, and the anticipation of the solid gold automobiles, with platinum appurtenances to be had in heaven in exchange for some self-induced holiness here will make everybody actually enjoy getting along with just a magnificent church and no car in the garage at all.

It is amazing the number of non-Catholics who can praise Coughlin and believe that after all they must have misjudged the Catholic Church in the past. How can so many people forget the old saying, "What you are speaks so loudly I can't hear what you say"? How can they overlook the cruel exploitation to which the church has resorted in every corner of the world where it has come into undisputed power? -- in Europe of the Dark Ages, in modern Spain and Austria, in Mexico and all of the other Spanish-American countries?

It should be axiomatic to all students of modern and medieval times that any Catholic clergyman lies who says that the hierarchy wants economic security and self-government for working people. The clergy knows perfectly well that the charity racket gives them their firmest grip upon their victims; that elimination of their pious

self-seeking charity can be brought about only by a degree of enlightenment and co-operative organization among workers that would destroy the church; and that self-government presupposes unfettered, rational thinking, which is the exact opposite of the irrational catechising and timorous half-learning which the church, by its spook-dreading influence, forces upon its communicants.

Where is a more degraded man than the one who meekly agrees that he is not intellectually competent to judge the value of any printed thing he may run across - who will explain to you seriously that Mrs. O'Flaherty's boy, Timothy, who was just an ordinary back-of-the-yards kid, underwent some magical transformation, during the hocus-pocus of ordination, which gave him special powers to judge the fitness of all writing for his parishoners, of whom our man is one? Naturally the church is in favor of self-government for such people, because it means government by the priesthood, who tell their victims what they may read.

And in this connection, it would be laughable, if it weren't serious, the way Coughlin furthers the common American notion that radicalism is strictly foreign. As though the Catholic Church were not the most foreign institution in the country, acknowledging supreme allegiance - not just formally, but seriously with religious sanction - to the Italian pope in Rome. What kind of "Americanism" is that?

Of course we're supposed to overlook the Catholics' foreign allegiance because it is under the guise of religion; we're supposed to be tolerant. Few Catholics know that the word toleration means anything besides permission for Catholics to hold and spread their intellectually crippling religion. They believe in freedom of speech for themselves and all who agree with them, but not for anyone who disagrees with them. And it is astonishing how many non-Catholics can remain quiescent when the church clamps its medieval censorship down upon non-Catholic and Catholic alike in a great city like Boston, where the Watch and Ward Society decides what books and magazines the intellectually free and civilized citizens may read.

Coughlin says he and his church would not reduce the wealthy but elevate the poor. That sounds nice, but where has the Catholic Church ever done anything but the reverse? He says the Constitution was designed first to protect property rights and only incidentally to protect human rights, which is unquestionably true; but then he goes on to say that his National Union is for distinguishing between the right to own and the right to use property - which sounds about as rational as Hitler's distinction between capital undefiled and capital defiled. He is going to perform the miracle - and Catholics, it seems, are still supposed to believe in miracles - of leaving the great industries in private hands and at the same time eliminate excessive financial riches for the few. Presumably this will be accomplished by inculcating in our industrial masters the benevolent religion of the peon masters of Mexico and the feudal slave-drivers of the Middle Ages.

He wants a permanent program of public works, on which he would pay the slaves a wage on which they could exist but which would not be

commensurate with wages in private industry. That program is fine if you are sure you will never be unfortunate enough to be one of the public-works slaves to be knocked about from pillar to post - just as the laissez faire theory is fine if you are cunning and brutal enough to win out in the dog-eat-dog fight.

Principally Father Coughlin and his church are interested in protecting anybody who will contribute to their racket - as evidenced by the fact that Harold Stuart's large gifts were sufficient proof of his unimpeachable character for Cardinal Mundelein to testify in his behalf in the Insull trial when nobody but the jury was in doubt of his guilt as a swindler. This would seem to be out of line with Coughlin's attacks upon bankers, but Coughlin goes after them with a fine frenzy because he knows that under the capitalist system the evil, greedy bankers are like the weather - everybody talks a great deal about them, but nobody does anything about them; and it makes him sound like a real friend of the people to attack the bankers - who probably furnish part of the money to keep him on the air.

There are so many holes in the case for Coughlin that to enumerate them would require a big book. It is possible, however, to point out the chief reasons for his success: 1) Everybody knows that something serious is the matter with our economic machine; thus he has an eager audience. 2) As mentioned in the beginning of this article, he uses all the tricks of the religious and political mountebank, centering his attacks upon the big bankers, the most popular bogymen extant. 3) He sounds intellectual when he discusses economics with much heat and little light; he talks monetary theory, in which field, because of the complicated nature of the subject, laymen, who have neither time nor inclination to study, can be easily hoodwinked. It isn't likely that he can be so ignorant about money as he sounds; therefore he must be deliberately bamboozling the public. 4) He uses a new medium, radio, which because of the one-way nature of the discussion, makes it possible for a speaker, by fiery oratory, to hammer home wrong ideas week after week without the interference of hecklers who could quickly expose the speaker's falsehood.

Not the least of the reasons is the last one. Coughlin is vulnerable at hundreds of points, but the only way he can be fought is by means of the same medium he uses, a chain of radio stations. If the radicals want to fight Coughlin and the avowed fascists - the lily-livered variety that Preston Bradley is, as well as the real ones whom he is front-man for on the Crusaders' hour - they must get on the air. Combatting radio with meagerly circulated printed matter illustrates the industrial and social lag behind technical development that Marxists talk so much about.

\* \* \* \* \*

TWO RESOLUTIONS

By A. G.

Like a flock of vultures hovering over what they hope is a carcass the official and unofficial communists (right, left, centrist, upper, lower, etc.) watch the Socialist Party with mouths watering in expectation of grabbing a chunk out of it. Here and there some well-meaning but not well grounded Socialist Party member falls into the claws of one of the annointed groups and this whets their appetite. To convince their own members that the labor of hovering is not in vain, and to convince some young and innocent Socialist party members to forsake a "dying party", the leaders of the various communist groups must prove to themselves and their followers that the Socialist party is turning to the right.

A simple method is followed. First convince everyone that a left National Executive Committee is in control; then produce what is obviously a right resolution and one can prove to everybody's satisfaction that there is a right turn.

The left wing socialists within the Socialist party are under no illusions. They know that the NEC is not under the control of the old guard but they are also aware of the fact that it is not under the control of the revolutionary Marxists. Only three members of the National Executive Committee can be counted in the left wing camp and under such circumstances a rational human being not under the influence of false hopes can and must expect actions and decisions on the part of the NEC which are distinctly of a right character. But Stalinists, Lovestoneites, and leaders of the new-born Workers' Party are under the necessity of saying to radical workers in general and to left wingers in the Socialist party in particular: "See, we told you so! The left turn in the S. P. is a fake. It doesn't exist. Come and join us, the only true representatives of the revolutionary gospel."

A false and absurd approach. The strength of the leftward currents in the Socialist party is not at all adequately reflected in the NEC. These currents have just begun to show themselves. They will gather clarity and momentum with time and provided the revolutionary Marxists do not run away from them.

Let the vultures continue to hover and remain hungry!

. . . . .

The two resolutions which the Stalinists, Lovestoneites and Workers Party people (it would be an insult to Trotsky to call the latter "Trotskyites") so gleefully seized upon to prove their contention that the Socialist party has moved to the right, are the ones passed at the last NEC meeting and which deal with the united front and with the Revolutionary Policy Committee. It would be folly to conceal the fact that the resolution on the RPC represents a dangerous step to the right; we are the last to defend the majority of the NEC for adopting that resolution. But we are certain that the left wingers in the So-

cialist party will not permit this resolution to go unchallenged. They will certainly paralyze any effort by the reactionary right wing to expel members of the RPC merely on the ground of membership in the RPC.

But we shall deal first with the united front resolution. In general the left wingers can concur with that resolution. The resolution is obviously a compromise in the effort to avoid an inner-party struggle on the united front issue. We must openly recognize it as such. From the point of view of abstract principle it is not correct to permit such an important tactic to be left to the individual states. But a Marxist does not judge a tactic from the point of view of abstract principle. It is necessary to consider all the factors involved. When one takes into consideration the inner-party situation a compromise on the united front policy with the communists was essential and correct. ESPECIALLY IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT THE UNITED FRONT IN THIS COUNTRY DOES NOT MEAN UNITING THE WHOLE WORKING CLASS BUT UNITING AN INSIGNIFICANT SECTION OF IT WITH THE VAST MAJORITY OF THE WORKERS NOT THE LEAST INVOLVED IN THE UNITED FRONT. We must retain the principle of the united front; we must not close the door to it. The formula worked out by the NEC is as good as any to prevent an inner-party struggle on that issue and at the same time to retain the united front in principle and to permit local united front activities. Should the New York right wing insist upon fighting on that issue now it would be isolated.

If the resolution erred somewhat, it erred on the side of leniency to the "splinter groups". When Lovestone appeared before the committee with a united front proposal he should have been given a lesson on the united front in a short reply which should run somewhat as follows:

"Dear Comrade Lovestone:

The united front as you undoubtedly know, has meaning only if it can lead to action. Action, dear comrade, requires masses. You undoubtedly got the point.

Comradely, . . . . . "

It must be said in passing that it is wrong in principle to demand of the Communist party that it give up its "theory" of social fascism before entering into a united front with it. The NEC resolution makes such a demand. If circumstances occur which justify a united front with the communists we must come to some agreement with them on THE FORM OF ACTION without requiring that they give up any of their theories no matter how insane they may be. Just as we cannot permit them to dictate to us what we should think of them. The very necessity of the united front springs from the fact that we disagree on vital principles. Freedom of criticism should not be abrogated even during the united front. Unfortunately, by criticism, the Stalinists mean lying and slander. This explains the origin of the idea that during the united front no criticism of the parties in the united front be permitted.

While the revolutionists within the Socialist party can readily support the NEC resolution on the united front they must on the other hand severely condemn the resolution on the Revolutionary Policy Committee. That resolution considers the theory that "armed insurrection is a proper Socialist method of achieving socialist aims as a dangerous departure from socialist principles and tactics". The NEC goes on to say that "such doctrines are not only in conflict with the position of the Socialist party but are subversive of its aims and purposes."

Had the majority of the NEC remembered the declaration of principles adopted at Detroit it would have remembered a clause contained in that declaration to the effect that "if the capitalist system should collapse in a general chaos and confusion which cannot permit of orderly procedure, the Socialist party whether or not in such a case it is a majority will not shrink from the responsibility of organizing and maintaining a government under the worker's rule." If the above quotation means anything at all it means that the Socialist minority must obtain power through an armed insurrection. How else could a minority achieve power? Without attempting too extensive an analysis of the quotation it at least gives rise to the inference that there may be some circumstances justifying an armed insurrection. It can therefore be said that those members of the NEC who voted for the declaration and also voted for the resolution placed themselves in an inconsistent position. They should publicly state that they have either changed their minds on the declaration or they overlooked that point and made a mistake in voting for the resolution.

The phrase "armed insurrection" occurs in an article in the "Revolutionary Socialist Review" which gives excerpts from an "Appeal to the members of the Socialist Party". The "Appeal" published in April, 1934, contains no such phrase. Whether or not it was inserted in the "Excerpts" or whether the "Appeal" was changed to include the phrase we are not in a position to state. We shall assume that the change was made with the consent of the members of the Revolutionary Policy Committee although several members of that committee have asserted the contrary to be the truth.

What caused the authors of the "Excerpts" to insert the phrase, "armed insurrection"? Suspicious people have intimated that the phrase was inserted with the express purpose of getting members of the R. P. C. expelled and thus add to the membership of the Lovestoneites. No evidence has been presented to prove that contention and we must therefore dismiss it. Obviously the leaders of the R. P. C. wanted nothing left to inference and imagination. They wanted to show in detail exactly what the Workers' Councils would do to achieve power. A praiseworthy intention but neither correct nor necessary under all conditions. It is worth a whole lot to keep the party legal and to do that it is certainly worth while to refrain from using the term "armed insurrection". We are of the opinion that the leadership of the R P C committed a grave error in changing the original "Appeal".

But the left wing Socialists outside of the R. P. C., in spite of their serious disagreement with the R P C, must insist upon the right

of members of the Socialist party to advocate the idea that armed insurrection is a proper socialist method to achieve power. This does not in the least bind other members of the party and does not commit the party as such to advocating the necessity of armed insurrection.

It should not be necessary to remind those members of the N. E. C. who voted for the R.P.C. resolution that they laid down a fundamental policy with reference to a certain doctrine and to certain members of the party. The NEC is not authorized to do so. Only a convention of the party is in a position to formulate fundamental party principles. And only when a thorough discussion is conducted by party members on the principle upon which the convention is to take a position. The NEC is to carry out in action the fundamental policies laid down in the convention.

When after the formation of the Industrial Workers of the World the question of the right of those who advocated sabotage to be members of the party came up, it was settled not by the NEC but by a convention. And no other procedure can be tolerated by those cherishing democracy and freedom of discussion within the party.

Nor is it any justification for the resolution to say that it does not provide for the expulsion of members of the R. P. C. because of their membership in that group. When a resolution declares that a certain doctrine is subversive to the aims and purposes of the Socialist party there follows only one logical conclusion with reference to those who advocate that doctrine. It may be that Comrade Thomas for instance did not see the logical implication of that resolution but the right wing of the party does see it. The New York old guard immediately set into motion the machinery for expelling the R. P. C. members from the party. They will begin a witch-hunting campaign which will not be limited to members of the Revolutionary Policy Committee.

A serious campaign must be carried on against the resolution by every left-winger in the party and any attempt to expel anyone because of membership in the Revolutionary Policy Committee must be fought to the last ditch. The right to present a minority viewpoint and to discuss freely is at stake.

\* \* \* \* \*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

## OF WHAT IMPORTANCE AN ELECTION?

By Ernest Erber

How unnecessary for a Socialist publication to carry an article considering such a closed question, think old-time, old-line party members! Why, elections are all-important! And so they almost are. Yet there are reasons for considering the whole question. Especially are there reasons during this time of increasing militancy, of shift to the left, of general condemnation of much that existed in past socialist thought and practice,

In rapid flight from the theories and tactics that led to defeat, confused thought arises on many questions. To flee from the conservative, bureaucracy-ridden A. F. of L. unions, misguided comrades embrace dual unionism. In deadly fear of political alliances with non-socialists, bewildered comrades oppose the formation of a Labor Party. In an effort to block all tendencies toward reformism, unthinking comrades discourage the fight for immediate demands. The tendency of a moving object to continue in a straight line until another force counteracts it is clearly seen here. The job of the Marxist is to apply the counteracting force at the correct time; to halt the pendulum in the proper place. This must be done without the least regard for labels such as "left" and "right".

In the matter of elections, the confused reaction to the old outlook and methods manifests itself in two distinct forms, each flowing from its own theoretical criticism of the past. The first group are those who regard the failure of the Socialist movement to grow rapidly and achieve significant victories as the result of the defeatist attitude of old leaders and of mistakes in technique. The defeatist attitude led to inactivity. Inactivity led to dogmatism, sectarianism, isolation. The mistakes in technique were that the Socialist party propaganda did not speak the language of the American worker, the propaganda efforts of the party lacked dramatic appeal, the programs were not simple, direct, and detailed enough, the party submerged the individual leader when it was leaders that the masses follow.

The second group examines more fundamental errors that led to failure in the past. It examines the theoretical basis of the movement. It considers its maneuvers and strategy. It considers the trade union question, the question of degeneration into reformism, the frequent recurrences of outright betrayal by people put into public office, the illusions created by electoral victories. Then it decides the failure was caused by reliance on victory through the ballot, by the development of labor politicians, by the clinging to peaceful methods of struggle, by illusions about democracy and legality.

The first group adhere to all the basic concepts of the road to power held in the past. They seek to make it a road to victory,

first by putting at the head of the party a younger, more enthusiastic, active leadership; then by winning more votes for the party by utilizing every technique that will gain additional votes. Forget the class struggle and give the voters a blue print of the road to socialism. Appeal for the support of your candidate on his superior merits. Hide the party if it helps your man get more votes.

Outside the Socialist party the extreme and classic example of this attitude and this sort of a campaign is seen in Upton Sinclair and his Epic plan. In the Socialist party this attitude is seen in many tendencies working in the direction of Sinclairism and Epicism within the framework of the party.

In our present aldermanic elections the "Waltmire for Alderman Club" and its support of an individual is an example of this tendency. Do not the non-socialists who support Waltmire as a good man know he is a socialist? Sure they do. Then won't they support him as a member of the Socialist party (and not despite his being a member of the party)? Then why not direct their support of an outstanding socialist in the community to a support of the Socialist party in the community. Why not a "Socialist for Alderman Club" and campaign? He would not get as many votes as a socialist, object the supporters of new techniques and more militancy. This objection raises the question, the answer to which must establish the purpose of the Socialist party in going into an election and give the answer to the title of this article, "Of What Importance An Election?"

If the "logic" behind the tactics of concealing everything and of presenting the most alluring platform, in order to get elected, were carried to its logical conclusion, the Socialist party should organize as a secret conspiratorial organization which would run innocent-looking candidates to fool the public until it had control of the government and then could shout, "Surprise!" as it uncovered itself and the social revolution would have been accomplished. Even the most naive supporter of the "get votes at any cost" school reject the possibility of sneaking up on the capitalist class when it isn't looking.

The second view of elections that developed as the pendulum swung away from the old tactics, is one that takes an infantile left attitude toward elections as being useless and at best unimportant weapons in the class struggle. This is the reaction to seeing the futility of an electoral struggle in the decisive periods when Capital and Labor lock horns in life-and-death struggle. The old situation which saw party branches remain dead for months until election time made them beehives of activity has been replaced by a situation

in which many branches see no increased activity, no increased enthusiasm, no increased interest at election time. This attitude, in its failure to distinguish between the power of the ballot to bring the final victory and the use of the ballot as a tactical weapon, is as pitiful as the attitude of the men of action and new approaches.

The importance of an election to a revolutionary party lies in the fact that it (1) gives the party the opportunity to reach the masses when their political consciousness is at a high level; and (2) serves to measure the political shifts and tendencies caused by changes on the economic and political scene.

We must utilize the election to place before the workers the program and demands of the Socialist party in sharp contrast to those of the capitalist parties.

We must capitalize on the greater readiness of the workers to read political literature, attend political meetings and take part in political discussions to familiarize the worker with the Socialist movement.

We must use the election as the time to rally all our forces, all the support we have built up in constant work on the industrial field, among the unemployed, in the fight against fascism and war, etc.

We must use the election to teach workers the political nature of all their demands, the connection between their employer and the state, the connection between their status and the economic system.

We must direct all the discontent expressed in the outbreak of strikes, the unemployed demonstrations, the anti-war movements, in all the struggles for various demands that we supported, against the political powers and the ruling class they represent.

We must closely analyze election results to read from them the shifts in the moods and sentiments of the masses. The German elections preceding Hitler's conquest of power should have been gold-mines of information for the leaders of the German working-class.

Are elections important? Need an answer be given after these facts have become clear?

\* \* \* \* \*

\*

\*

## THE 1935 ALDERMANIC AND CITY ELECTION CAMPAIGN

An examination into the tactics and aims of Local Cook County Socialist Party as a political organization of the working class, in the current election campaign.

By Arthur G. McDowell.

In the period of the rapid, almost mushroom growth of the Socialist Party in the years before the war, a quite simple faith actuated the bulk of the Socialist Party. The Socialist Party as such was to grow in numbers, influence, and political office, until finally sufficient power was attained to establish socialism in the United States. Thus, independent labor political action to the Socialist meant that the labor movement should support the Socialist Party. Victory for the socialists in the struggle with Gompers in the A F of L was expected to lead to a situation somewhat akin to that already attained in Germany. There a vast membership party gave a vague lip service to the revolutionary philosophy of Marx, while actually carrying out a reformist agitation and program in accordance with the needs and demands of the trade union movement which the Social-Democrats dominated, but whose machinery and immediate interests at any given moment, actually dominated the theoretically-"Socialist" party, even in conflict with the most fundamental principles of socialism.

The socialist attempt to capture the trade unions in the United States was either defeated by Gompers or diverted by socialist participation in dual union movements. In time of World War crisis, the trade unions therefore went their way and the American Socialist party, its own, instead of as in Germany, the socialists going to the trade union way also. The government war persecutions shattered socialist membership strength in the populist American hinterland, and the majority of the new foreign language federation strength gained in the post-war period, as a reflection of the revolutionary upsurge in Europe, was carried off by the various communist splits.

The Socialist party was left extremely weak, and with its preponderance of strength in the industrial states, and the leadership pretty completely in the hands of the active leadership of the traditionally socialist trade union sections, particularly the Jewish needle trades. Various factors, including the depressed prestige of the German movement among American socialists as a result of its war record, turned socialist attention and admiration more to the English model where the Independent Labor party (closely associated with the American Socialist party internationally during the war) was a Socialist party within a confessedly non-socialist Labor party.

In 1924, without any adequate preliminary preparation, the Socialist party was swept into the LaFollette movement. The party's weak-

ness matched with its close attachment (dependence) on the trade unions in its few strongholds, places like New York, betrayed it. The mistake was not in the Conference for Progressive Political Action, but in the kow-towing to trade union officialdom which prevented the Socialist party from playing an independent role and perhaps forcing a permanent national federated Farmer-Labor political party. As it was, a promising movement dissolved without issue, leaving the Socialist party even weaker than before and with a distorted conception and a bitter taste of mass farmer-labor political action.

As a result, the nominal position of the Socialist party from that time forth has been approximately that "if the trade unions and basic organizations of farmer and worker start a labor party, we will not refuse to go along or stand in the way". Obviously this negative attitude was scarcely worthy of being called a policy or tactic. The 1934 convention did little more than rephrase this stand a little more positively and socialist delegates at the 1934 convention of the A F of L were active in support of a motion for independent political action of labor for the first time in many years. This was more the result of logical association of tactics in the minds of the socialists who as an element had for two years been becoming steadily more active and aggressive in the trade unions, than of a positive party policy on the labor party question.

To clarify the question, let it be stated clearly that the belief of the writer is that there is positively no hope for the American Socialist party imitating German or French development. The Socialist party is not going to become the mass labor party. Some federated movement of trade unions with some farmer allies is logical to the point of complete exclusion of the other possibility.

The question then is the nature of the function to be filled by the Socialist party. It is obviously our job to lead this farmer-labor movement when it emerges, to heavily influence its immediate as well as final program, to determine its tactics and policies in the direction of socialism. How can this be done?

First, it will be necessary for the socialists not merely to accept the development when it comes, but to be the leaders in the agitation which brings it about. This involves a much clearer and more positive trade union policy and program than before. Second, it will be necessary for the socialist organization to be ready to offer something much more essential to the very life of the new movement than either a platform or philosophy, for both of which the Socialist party has rich experience and tradition to draw upon. However there are scores of groups with some baggage of this kind hanging around the fringes. If the Socialist party, as a group, is really to occupy the unique position of leadership that it is capable of, it must be able to offer a rising farmer-labor party concrete experience and machinery for the carrying out of the indirect action constituting political activity.

It cannot be too much emphasized that political action in the sense of electoral agitation is a very indirect type of action as contrasted with the relatively direct type of action involved in trade union activities. It requires techniques with which the bulk of organized labor and its leadership are not familiar. The staging of political rallies, financing working class political party work, platform and publicity drafting, literature writing, public speaking, and organization of a press, those require special abilities and training all too seldom found in the trade union movement itself.

There are various sources from which the labor party when it comes can draw those abilities. First, they can by high wages hire experts away from the similar capitalist organizations, but even were staffing with that kind of talent advisable, it could not be financed on a scale large enough to fill the need. Second, the "politicians" in the trade union movement will undoubtedly come to the front. This group is almost completely corrupted by training in and commitments to the old capitalist parties. Third, there are the fringe opportunists, at bottom thoroughly middle class and reformist in philosophy, like the LaFollettes who have something immediate to offer. Fourth, there are the "wildmen movements" like the Townsend Planners. Fifth, there are the radical groups of which the Socialist party is easily the most significant, bound together by a definite philosophy and with a fairly clear-cut economic program covering the entire range of present-day industrial civilization.

The socialist organization's chief strength is its ability to offer the services of trained people accustomed to carrying out necessary political activities on a voluntary basis without the distorting influence of individual economic interest in one form or another. Surveying the varied groups which would under American conditions elbow to the front the minute the labor movement officially enters upon a political action course, the most important question that can today be raised in the Socialist party is, "to what extent is the Socialist party preparing a disciplined idealistic membership trained to perform those functions indispensable to the life of a mass labor party actually contending for political office and power?" An analysis of the Chicago organization and its activity is in order.

The Socialist party, Local Cook County, is in the municipal election campaign of 1935, in Chicago. It is in to the extent of preparing and filing petitions to nominate an alderman in eleven wards as compared with eight in 1933. It has progressed definitely to the extent that an organized committee of party lawyers, this year, issued nomination forms after careful study and prepared instructions for petition workers based on detailed study of objections to petitions sustained in the contest of two years ago. In six out of the eleven wards, legal objections were filed by the socialist organization against other candidates' petitions, as a bargaining point. Finally,

a serious attempt has been undertaken to place a city-wide ticket under the party name on the April election ballot at a cost of 60,000 signatures of registered voters in Chicago, gained by February 26th.

Platforms, petitions, letters have been printed, time and energy of regular and special party officers invested, and in short, the main force of central socialist organization exerted in the direction of carrying on the activities of a political party under the conditions of a capitalist political democracy. On the surface, this would seem to be the most natural thing in the world. When one youthful critic of the Socialist party a couple of years ago, complained that the Socialist party in the heart of industrial Pennsylvania was "too politically minded", the veteran party secretary rejoined coldly, "What do you expect a political party to do, knit?"

As a matter of fact, the assumption made by the party secretary in that remark is not made by the Socialist party membership as a whole, certainly not in Cook County. A few facts should give an index to the actual attitude governing the activity of the majority of the party members. There are on the rolls of Cook County over 1,000 members by count and around 700 by average dues payments. In the drive for petition signatures to put up a state and local ticket in the fall of 1934 the record shows less than 150 party members took part in the petition drive which was barely successful in getting a place on the state ballot, and less than 200 worked or watched at the polls on election day. Less than 30% participation in minimum political activity.

Again, in the campaign to put up aldermanic candidates 15 out of the county's 31 branches did not participate or attempt participation. Two of the wards, the 40th and the 9th whorereal voting strength was shown two years ago, did not even seriously attempt to nominate candidates this year. The entire North District including seven branches does not have a candidate in a single ward. The strong Upper North Branch started out to nominate candidates in three wards and ended up ignominiously without filing a single petition. At the beginning of the year it might be remarked, 17 out of the county's 31 branches did not in name or in conscious purpose correspond to any definite political sub-division.

The answer to the query of what do you expect the Socialist party to do would seem to be answered neatly by the overwhelming majority of party members as "knit". This is not quite a full and fair verdict. The county did stage a public reception for Julius Deutsch as a gesture of international solidarity and opposition to fascism in the course of which they brought nearly 3,000 people together in spite of some of the year's worst weather. Over a thousand dollars were raised to make the meeting possible and a success. A considerable if not very intensive program of education of members and sympathizers has been carried on through branch meetings, forums and

street meetings. Chicago is unique among cities of its size in having a Labor College officially endorsed by the central labor body and the pioneer work there was done by socialists. The Chicago Workers Committee on Unemployment has set standards among organizations of the unemployed and socialists have played an honorable part there. All of this and more can be said but it will not justify the continued existence of the Socialist party under the guise of an organization serving at present or at some future date hoping to serve as a needed political instrument for the working class to attain immediate aims or ultimate socialism.

Some sense of this was developed in the County Central Committee discussion which preceded the decision to attempt to get 60,000 signatures for a city ticket in the face of the fact that County could barely bring forth its half of the 25,000 quota for a state ticket last November. It should be remarked that the real drive of sentiment for this political action at any cost came from the active trade unionists in the county body. Two points were typical of their discussion. First, that in order to maintain respect for the Socialist party and preserve existing support in the organized labor movement it was vitally necessary that the Socialist party make a serious show of political activity. Second, that sentiment for independent labor (class) political action was growing and should be capitalized by attempting to federate sympathetic labor bodies in direct support of the socialist campaign.

Those favoring political action in the municipal campaign carried the day by a heavy majority. The action was independent of any decision handed down from a national or state convention. Responsibility for activity devolves clearly upon the local organization. If we are not to fail again to rally the party membership to support of this solemnly undertaken program it will be necessary to get over the critical importance of a Socialist party membership trained in political activity, in view of the fact that the next logical forward step of the labor movement as a whole will be a political step. There is only one school where political training is secured and that is out in the words and precincts doing the mechanical work.

The 1935 campaign has two main drives: (1) To bring about maximum participation of the party members in routine political activity through the quota of signatures for each member to secure and (2) To continue the work of involving sympathetic sections of the labor movement immediately in political action, under our own banner. The first means training our membership, widening its field of contacts from which recruiting can take place and preparing the socialist organization as a whole for coming developments by making it more "politically minded". The second drive does many of the same things but above all strengthens our base in the trade unions and increases our skill in working in cooperation with the mass organizations of labor. We will assess our success or our dismal failure according to the degree we attain our set objectives. For the sincere socialist there can only be one test of his or her devotion and that is by measuring his or her revolutionary spirit against the size and primitive nature of this political task. By our performance let us be judged.

\* \* \* \* \*