

PROLETARIAN BULLETIN

AUGUST, 1933.

COMRADES:- With the Convention only a month away we are still not very well prepared, especially in a financial way. Locals that have money to send for Convention Fund should not put off any longer.

There is still a lot of pre-Convention discussion to be gotten out in the Bulletins. Much of it has come in very late altho the open discussion period has been on since Feb 1st. Several more sections of the Bulletin will be necessary,

The Convention will open on Saturday, September 2nd at 10, a.m., in the headquarters of Local Detroit.

PRE- CONVENTION DISCUSSION.

Some Remarks On The Articles Of Comrade O'Brien (by Stanley Novak, Local Detroit)

Comrade O'Brien in his numerous articles has touched on many problems within the Party. However, to the disappointment of many Comrades, he has failed to make his criticism constructive or to work out a definite position for strengthening the Party on the various questions upon which he has touched. Reading Comrade O'Brien's frequent articles, one cannot help feeling that they contain little more than mere words. If the accusation he brings concerning the mental poverty of the N.E. C. is correct, then his articles may be accepted as a substantiation of his own charges.

It is very evident to many comrades that there is considerable dissatisfaction within the Party concerning the present policy and leadership. This is noticeable even in the articles of such urgent defenders of the present policy as Comrade O'Brien. The dissatisfaction of the membership does not at times manifest itself in as constructive a criticism as one might desire, but it is sufficient to establish the fact that there must be something seriously wrong with the present structure of the Party, and that its policy must be out of date on many vital questions. It is extremely important to the future of the Party that the coming Convention examine very carefully and critically the structure, tactics, and leadership, regardless of what trouble and time such work may require.

Comrade O'Brien takes severely to task all Comrades who dare to question the soundness of the present Party position and who may have enough courage to bring up questions that appear to them to be important. But Comrade O'Brien fails to

make any kind of analysis on the questions put forth by the Comrades he criticises, or to formulate the problems that in his opinion are facing the coming Convention. Are we to conclude that everything is in perfect order in the Party, that nothing could be improved that no changes of any kind are needed, since such an old and leading member as Comrade O'Brien has so very little of a positive nature to offer at this time?

We must encourage the membership to take full advantage of the discussion period to express their opinions, their criticism of the Party's position and leadership freely in the Locals and in the Bulletin. Without frank self-criticism we cannot build the necessary revolutionary leadership. The leadership of the Party must very patiently and carefully consider the criticism and opinions advanced by the membership.

The style of criticism made of the various articles by Comrade O'Brien is harmful to the development of self-criticism within the Party. It will discourage the membership from expressing their views. Comrade O'Brien does not give any satisfactory answer to the questions put forth by the Comrades he criticises. The criticism is too severe, in some cases almost personal (e.g. that on Bergstrom).

"The weakness of our Party is that those who have theoretical ability have to do so much of the concrete work of the Party that they have little time for theoretical study," writes Comrade O'Brien, in the June Bulletin. He makes no attempt to explain this state of affairs. Is it not in itself proof of the fact that our Party is badly lacking in correct organization in division of work, and in planning?

In the opinion of the present writer, the growth of our Party is badly hampered by several serious shortcomings that must be eliminated at the coming Convention if the Party is to make further progress:

1. Duality in the national structure of the Party. The National Secretary is elected by the Convention and claims to have certain authority and responsibility to the body that elected him. According to the Party's Constitution the National Executive Committee has power to make decisions on all matters between the conventions. When differences of opinion takes place between the National Executive Council and the National Secretary the latter claims to be responsible to the Convention and that he is not an office boy to the Executive Council. Is the National Secretary responsible to the National Executive Committee and does he work under its jurisdiction, or is he responsible to the Convention only? This dual authority at the head of the organization has greatly hampered the work of our Party. The Convention must clearly define just who is the only and final authority in the Party between Conventions. In the opinion of the writer, the National Secretary should be replaced by the Secretary of the National Executive Committee, elected by that body and completely responsible to it.

2. Too great centralization of the Party's work in too few hands. In the national office power lies chiefly in the hands of one man, the National Secretary. The leading comrades have too little confidence in the ability of the rank and file in carrying on the work of the Party. They monopolize too large a share of the responsibility. The attitude of the leading comrades discourages the rank and file in assuming responsibility in the Party.

- 3 The leadership is not giving sufficient time to the work of the Party. The Party needs at least a half dozen comrades to work full time in the National Office.

4. We are behind in our study of theory and tactics; on some vital questions we are completely out of date.

5. The Party's position is too general, too indefinite on many important questions.

3 6. Poor planning in sending speakers, organizing new locals, and raising funds---all this presents a serious and practical problem that must be solved.

These are a few of the outstanding shortcomings of the Party, all of which must be remedied by the coming Convention of the Party if it is to grow in size, effectiveness, and significance.

Party Leadership

(Anthony Bielskas, Local Grand Rapids)

The center is the guiding body of the Party between Conventions. The center can only give proper guidance to the Party when it is composed of the best informed. To give guidance it is necessary to know how to apply Marxism to the objective conditions, the center lacking this cannot give proper guidance to the Party.

The center should be composed of such members who can write, speak and organize. They should know the difference between scheming and planning, also what are reform and revolutionary measures. Lacking the understanding of these differences the center leads the Party into "blind alleys."

The delegates at the Convention will have to make a careful selection of those for the center. They must examine the qualifications of the candidates that are nominated for that body, they must study their weaknesses and also their strength. They must see, as Lenin once wrote, "It must see clearly, as if on the palm of its hand, the whole activity of every candidate for this post; it must become acquainted with their individual characteristics, their weak sides and their strong sides, with their victories and their "defeats" (Lenin on Organization, in a letter to Iakra, Nov 25, 1903) ".

A center composed of members with an understanding of the objective conditions and the correct application of tactics can lead and build the Party. As the rank and file are the reflection of its leaders, if the leaders do not understand, then it necessarily follows that the rank and file will not understand the objective conditions and the tactics to apply in the struggle.

The Party must be informed of this fact, that the present N.E.C is a very weak one. Some of those on this body lack considerable understanding of the Party's position on many questions of vital importance. This ignorance has been an obstacle in the path of the introduction of division of labor in the N.E.C.

At the present time we have one member, Comrade Novak, who advances the theory that we should abandon the principle "that the members themselves should know the Party's position on all matters." Let us look at this as a premise to reason from, and see where it would lead us to.

If the Party took such a position, it would logically follow that, the center would be like the Pope of the Catholic church. The rank and file of the Party would be believers instead of knowers. The Communist Party is like that. We should be just the opposite. The rank and file should study and know the Party's position on all questions. By having this knowledge the rank and file can check up on its leadership. The rank and file should know its leaders. They should know who to keep as leaders and who to get rid of. The rank and file should study the position of the Party on all matters and not leave that to a few. The more members understand the position of the Party the stronger the Party will be. Comrades, we must build a strong Party. Let us insist that every member must learn the Party's position on all matters. Let us build a vanguard of the working class and not merely a vanguard of the vanguard. Comrade O'Brien was correct when he wrote "New deals appear to be one of the characteristics of decline." The Convention will have to be alert so that no tricky "New Deals" are put over.

Comments On "Critisism"
(by John Durhin, Local Detroit)

Whether the Party is to make progress in the future or continue as in the past will be largely determined by the program adopted at the coming Convention.

If some of the articles appearing in the Bulletin under the heading of pre-Convention discussion are to be taken as a criterion this coming Convention should prove not only very interesting but very necessary--if some of the statements especially those made by Comrade O'Brien are correct.

Referring to the May issue of the Bulletin, Com. O'Brien makes a rather remarkable statement to the effect that "The mental poverty of the N.E.C, and its E.C is manifest". Truly a strange situation where the mental capacity of our Party leaders is a debatable question. Coming from a member of the N.E.C such a statement carried considerable significance, however, it is well to remember that a vivid imagination is one of the characteristics of the Irish.

The tribulations besetting Com. O'Brien's "Modern Marxist from Africa, India or China... in determining which party he would join.", while sounding childish and apparently harmless convey certain innuendos aimed at Local Detroit. These insinuations having been made through the medium of the Bulletin the privilege to comment on them likewise, is accepted.

Comrade O'Brien would advise his imaginary Marxist "to read the theoretical articles contributed by local Detroit". As a modern Marxist our Chinese comrade would no doubt be also interested in practical application. In this respect he would find Local Detroit in marked contrast to those locals whose greatest achievement, in their own estimation, consisted in a presupposed ability to professionally diagnose economic and political trends, and whose chief occupation as far as revolutionary activity was concerned was their participation in scholarly discourses with other equally learned and mostly in agreement with them. The paucity of theoretical articles contributed by the members of local Detroit to the "Pro News" might possibly prove a disappointment to our visitor from afar, but such disappointment would undoubtedly be overcome by the consolation derived from reading the articles contributed by Comrade O'Brien, which are most conspicuous by their absence.

No doubt, while "seeking concrete evidence" our modern Marxist from the jungles (Why import a Modern Marxist from Africa, Indian or China? there are several that we know of in the U.S both modern and antedeluvian) would make some interesting discoveries.

For instance, the cause underlying the "thriving" conditions of Local Chicago. This would prove a very valuable undertaking provided the Party as a whole was advised as to the findings. Our visitor from the Wilds would then face the most difficult task of all, that of finding one concrete suggestion offered by Comrade O'Brien in his voluminous writings as to how the Party may be made to function more efficiently in the future. His "criticism" is entirely negative and brings to mind the story of the Irishwoman who upon seeing her son's regiment on parade was heard to exclaim "The're all out of step except my son Patrick"

In the June issue, 2nd. edition, caustically criticising an article by Comrade Wass, Detroit, Comrade O'Brien attributes Wass's opinions to influence from association. "My personal opinion causes me at this time to think that much depends on influence from association." Well; Well; can it be possible that Comrade Bergstrom's association with Comrade O'Brien has in any way been responsible for Bergstrom straying from the path of revolutionary rectitude as defined by Com. O'Brien?

"The weakness of our Party is that those who have theoretical ability have to do so much of the concrete work of the Party that they have not sufficient time for theoretical study." Too bad; Com. O'Brien's modern Marxist would be very interested and would be well advised to seek concrete evidence as to how the decisions of the last Convention were carried out with respect to the Marxian Labor College, The Class War Prisoners, The Participation in Parliamentary activity, Unemployment movement, Auxiliary Organizations, etc; What "concrete" work did our tired theoreticians do to carry out the decisions of the last Convention relative to placing the Party on the ballot? What auxiliary organizations did our over-worked intellectuals help to build? If it is a fact that this work was only undertaken by those active comrades in Local Detroit who according to Com. O'Brien stand so sorely in need of "theoretical directing"?

N.E.C.

While brevity may be the soul of wit, patience is sometimes a virtue. With a brief statement to the effect that the present 15 members N.E.C. ~~did not~~ "did not bring the desired results", Comrade Al. Renner, Detroit, advocates a change to a 7 member N.E.C. Com. Renner, as a member of the present N.E.C should certainly be in a position to explain what he believes to be the deficiencies in the present set-up. However, if the shortcomings of the Party leadership are not the result of "mental poverty" and can only be attributed to a weakness in the organizational structure of the Party, I would offer the following suggestions;

That provision be made in the Party Constitution for the setting up of a Central Executive Committee. That this committee be selected by the N.E.C. That the Central Executive Committee select, and be responsible for, the proper functioning of the Central Executive Committee Secretary. That the editing and publishing of the "Pro News" be under the supervision and control of the Central Executive Committee. That there be only two separate funds; the Press Fund and the Party Fund.

Com. Renner's suggests that only members who are in a position to devote "a major portion of their time accept office" to which I would add that only members who can devote all their time should serve on the Central Executive Committee.

Comrade Mary Wright has expressed sentiments long held by many members of our Party in relation to the Third International. Our position must be determined not on the basis of what we believe to be the situation in Germany or China but what we know of the activities carried on by the American Section of the Third International.

Should an irresistible force strike an immovable object the result is problematical, but when one possessed of a single track brain throws his mouth into high gear the results are likely to resemble the conglomeration of rambling irresponsible statements similar to those advanced by Comrade Babbitt in his "criticism" appearing in the first July Bulletin.

Along with vituperation, the predominating features are a series of contradictions which not only reflect the morass of confusion in which Comrade Babbitt is floundering but also reflect his understanding (or lack) of Communist tactics. Give an ear to this mouthful of dialectics; "The class struggle and the everyday struggle are two distinct things, altho the class struggle develops out of and includes the every day struggle." Even the most rabid metaphysician would find difficulty contending that two things are distinct when one develops out of and includes the other.

Speaking of the everyday struggle he says "As workers we must participate in the struggle to a certain extent... but with persistent propaganda and education we must teach the workers to fight for themselves." The measure of our influence amongst the workers will not only be determined by our ability to formulate correct tactics but also to the degree in which we apply them in the every day struggle. Confining our "persistent propaganda" to the four walls of our local headquarters, where from a high intellectual pedestal we can discuss platitudinous ponderosities, will not inspire the workers to fight for themselves, no matter how much comrade Babbitt may so desire it.

Comrade Babbitt appears to be mystified as to the reason for calling a Convention. If the situation in the Party is one half as bad as comrades Babbitt and O'Brien would have us believe that in itself would prove the necessity.

And will further state that the situation in Local Detroit has produced a running sore, spreading into other local of the Party (sometimes by underground methods) a dangerous disease "stifling the life of the Party." This is a typical example of the wild rambling assertions for which comrade Babbitt fails to offer any corroboration or substantiation.

The one bright spot in an otherwise gloomy article is the encouraging news relative to local Flint. It is to be sincerely hoped that this local will soon be in a position to help the members of local Detroit in the job of "breaking down the confidence of the workers in capitalism," especially in the neighborhood of Flint, Mich.

Com. Babbitt charges local Detroit with "Failing in their conduct of Forums" By what process of mental contortions he arrives at such conclusions it is difficult to say. The following facts, taken from the records of the Forum, will to some extent explain the "failure" of the Forums conducted by local Detroit. During the 1930-31 season the aggregate attendance at this Forum was over twenty-one thousand, total collections amounting to something around \$1030, over 60% of the speakers being Party members. This work resulted in much valuable contact being made and proved a good recruiting ground for the acquiring of new members for the local. Early in the season of 31-32, individuals like Com. Babbitt began harping about the "sloppiness" and "petty bourgeois" complex of the Forum. As a result the policy was changed. University

7
professors (with one exception) and bourgeois intellectuals were not invited to speak, they were taboo. Soon this policy resulted in the attendance being confined to our own members with a sprinkling of C.P and I.W.W.

Irrespective of what Com. Babbitt may say to the contrary, local Detroit realizes that our first task is the building of a Communist party, whose members must have a thorough understanding of Marxism, the more thoro the better. We are under no delusions about revolutionary ideology arising out of the every day struggle. Revolutionary ideology develops with understanding. We fully understand the necessity and importance of study classes as a medium in acquiring a Marxian education. While a communist must have an understanding of Marxism an understanding of Marxism does not presuppose a communist. Study classes are a means to an end, not the end itself.

Comrade Babbitt has made plenty of noise while loudly denouncing local Detroit, but he too is strangely silent on suggestions of a constructive nature designed to facilitate and improve the work of our Party.

An Answer To Comrade O'Brien's Criticism Of My
Thesis On The Depression.

(by M.A. Larson, Local Detroit)

Picking up the second Section of the June Bulletin, and reading the three criticisms of Comrade O'Brien upon the work of other Party members, one can scarcely escape the impression that he is excessively concerned to see to it that everything shall always remain in the Party exactly as it has been to date. It seems obvious that he considers the past theorizing, position, and tactics of our Party on every point as nearly perfect as may have been or may still be possible; and that no one except extremely old comrades, and no "mushroom" growths, may raise a voice without being decried or derided.

I consider such an attitude unfortunate, and most inimical to Party progress. And briefly I beg the courtesy of the Bulletin to point out two or three weaknesses in Comrade O'Brien's criticisms.

In his first paragraph he implies that I had said that those who said the crisis was due to the falling rate of profit were ejected from the Party because they maintained that theory. The fact is that I said no such thing, nor did I imply it in any way. This looks like a cheap way of manufacturing a flaw in my article.

After two or three vacillating paragraphs, Comrade O'Brien practically if not categorically denies that the income of the bourgeoisie has been reduced during the period of the depression. To me it is amazing that a man of Comrade O'Brien's reading and experience can still maintain such a vulgarism. It is true that interest payments, being a fixed charge for indebtedness, which always tends to grow larger even during a depression, have not declined in the same manner as industrial profits; but it is also true that the extreme, later difficulty of collecting these payments are largely the cause of the panic that seized bank depositors during the first months of this year and finally brought on the closing of all banks in this nation. But even here we may see the depression at work, for according to the Survey of Current Business (a government publication, the most complete authoritative, and up-to-date obtainable), we find the following facts:

Year	Monthly average interest and dividends pay- ments, millions of dollars.
1925	340
26	365
27	464
28	502
29	632
30	716
31	685
32	561

But when we look at the reports of industry, we find a tale that completely corroborates my theory. Had I felt permitted to take more space, I would have quoted more figures in my personal article; but I will cite a few more here. According to the Survey of Current Business, the ten most representative groups of corporations, including railroads, public utilities, telephone and telegraph companies, and seven industrial groups, had the following profits in millions in the years indicated;

Year	All 10 groups	Railways & Public Utilities	Seven groups of Industries.
1925	2,812	1952	868
1926	3,196	2160	1036
27	3,084	2098	996
28	3,544	2316	1228
29	3,992	2556	1436
30	3,040	2180	869
31	1,344	964	380
32	787	797 (Deficit)	-101

1. All 7 groups had deficits except foods and oils.

These figures speak for themselves. The 1929 Census of Manufactures, covering 210,000 industries and involving 10,300,000 wage workers, shows a Surplus Value of 20 1/3 billions. But representative industries operated at a loss in 1932, and we may rightly assume that industry as a whole did likewise. This is the more remarkable, and constitutes a profound comment upon the present depression, in view of the fact that industrial profit declined only from 11 billions in 1919 to 8 in 1921, the period of the last panic; but during the present one it has declined from 20 billions to less than nothing! Furthermore, it is still more significant to notice that during no panic previous to 1921 did the quantity of Surplus Value decline at all; for example, in 1914, it totalled almost 4 1/2 billions, which at that time was a new high record.

In addition we might cite the fact that according to the March, 1932, Bulletin of the National City Bank of New York, the average rate of profit for all corporations declined from 13% in 1929 to 3% in 1931, on a smaller valuation. It should, however, be unnecessary to do more than to call attention to the tremendous decrease in production-levels from 1929 on to prove that bourgeois profits must have declined enormously; for, industrial overhead remains the same, the profit on each unit manufactured declines, as well as the number of units; thus, there is a double decrease, which is again intensified by more desperate competition for the remaining market. General motors profits dropped from 254 millions in 1929 to 9 millions the first quarter of 1932. Today capitalism has not only ceased to expand; it has ceased to be able to expand; the system is now in the clutches of a condition of which there was never before anything more than a mere premonition.

Further, on, Comrade O'Brien tries to show that there was probably no rising movement in working-class standards of living between 1866 and 1914, and cites strikes as proof of his position. Comrade O'Brien should know that strikes are most frequent when capitalism is expanding, when there is considerable demand for labor. When the unemployed army runs into many millions, men on the job are not likely to go on strike. The point is, that between 1866 and 1900, American capitalism was rapidly and continuously expanding, wealth was increasing by leaps and bounds, railroads, cities, and industries were being developed, -- in short, there was work, work work. The master class then did all in its power to encourage immigration. Between 1900 and 1914, American capital was no longer in its hey-day of growth, but yet expansion was continuing along a slightly different line. Between 1922-1929, a new period of reconstruction ensued as an aftermath to the war and in consequence of this country's advantageous economic position in the world; also it was propped up by artificial causes for prosperity. But today, capitalism has played its trump cards, one after another; all attempts now to enliven it are like attempting to galvanize a corpse into life again.

The Proletarian Party must recognize these kindred facts, and shape its program and policies accordingly; what applied 25, or 15, or 10, or 5 years ago no longer applies, --- and the Proletarian Party must project spokesmen who see this as clearly as sunlight and evaluate it correctly.

The Detroit Merry-Go-Round
(by Carl Babbitt, Local Flint)

The opinion has prevailed and been expressed by the N.E.C members of Local Detroit for sometime that our Party was suffering from serious shortcomings; organizational and theoretical weaknesses, and that certain new developments and conditions had arisen that we must recognize. Therefore, they maintained, a Convention of the Party was necessary to meet this situation.

The N.E.C in January decided to hold a convention and in February the pre-convention discussion period opened.

It then became the duty of these N.E.C members to explain to all the members of the Party in the Bulletin what these organizational and theoretical weaknesses were and to explain these new developments and conditions they maintained existed. Also it was their duty as members of the N.E.C in the position of leaders of our Party to suggest to the membership what should be done to improve our program and tactics, to eliminate our weaknesses so as to strengthen the Party to meet these new conditions. But what happened? Four months of the pre-convention period elapsed and not one word appeared in the Bulletin from the N.E.C members in local Detroit.

Finally they hawmed out of their slumber and in the June Bulletin there is an article from Comrade Landgraf and in the second section of the June Bulletin Com. Renner has an article. Now let us analyze these articles. First, Com. Landgraf; He starts out by saying; "The Proletarian Party has reached a stage in the revolutionary labor movement of America to seriously take stock of our Party structure. While it may have filed the bill in the past, etc, etc". Then in the second paragraph he says; "That the Party machinery needs overhauling and a planned program on organization put into effect is obvious." Then note what follows; "This is the work of the coming Convention." What is the pre-convention discussion period for? Why pass everything on to the Convention?

10 It is obvious to Com. Landgraf that our Party machinery needs overhauling and he feels that the present Party structure will not fill the bill, then the responsibility falls upon him as a member of the N.E.C to tell the membership how this overhauling is going to be done and to make suggestions for the planned program that he speaks about. But Com. Landgraf entirely ignores his responsibility and is satisfied to leave everything for the Convention.

All Comrade Landgraf has to offer is this; that we should start to build a new organization, the Marxian Labor College, with dues-paying members and officials. If the Party structure is so weak as he contends and needs complete overhauling then Com. Landgraf should devote all his time and ability to accomplishing this overhauling job before he thinks of starting another organization.

Our study class work is part of the Party activities and should never be organized on a dues paying basis with separate officials. This class work should always be under the supervision of the committees of the Party and should always be free to all workers who show a desire and willingness to study Marxism. The Marxian Labor College is a good name to apply to this branch of our Party activity.

Com. Landgraf concluded by advising the members not to fall asleep on the job. In reply I would advise him to quit dreaming and abandon his utopian schemes for ideal or perfect organizations. We must realize as materialists that we cannot build an organization out of our imaginations. The building of a revolutionary Party is a process. We must understand the social conditions and build with the material at hand. Some of this material is good, some not so good, some bad, and a lot of it is rotten. But this material like everything else in the universe is subject to change and the bad may become good and the good bad.

Comrades Renner entitles his article "New Methods" To Meet Changing Conditions", and all through his article we search in vain for a word about these changed conditions, or the new methods. As a result of the miserable failure of the Forum in Detroit this past season Comrades Wass and Howard made this statement to me: "Forums are no longer effective we have to devise entirely new methods." And now Com. Renner repeats this same thing in the Bulletin. What are the new methods? Why don't the Comrades of Local Detroit tell the Party members what new methods we must use, and explain these changed conditions they talk so much about?

All Com. Renner has to offer the membership in his article is this. In place of the present N.E.C of 15 members, functioning on the basis of democratic centralization, he recommends an N.E.C of 7 members, to function on the basis of bourgeois bureaucracy. He says: "Each member of the N.E.C to be a specialist in his field and to have full charge of all Party activity in his field and to have the power to appoint a Comrade in each district to work under his supervision." What a wonderful outfit that would be. It is just another utopian scheme.

The rules, regulations and plans necessary to perfect an organization are formulated and adopted as the organization grows in size and influence. The activity of the membership cause this development. But many of the members think they can formulate plans and perfect an organization out of their imaginations.

Com. O'Brien recommends the reduction of the N.E.C, to seven members and explains why he thinks this should be done. Com. Renner agrees with Com. O'Brien on the reduction but fails to give the reason why he thinks this should be done. It is important that the membership should know why these members in local Detroit want the N.E.C reduced to seven members. These members have certain ideas as to how the Party should be run. Some of the other members on the N.E.C have opposed them, particularly the National Secretary.

Because the National Secretary dares to have opinions and ideas opposed to their's and has the courage to stand on his own feet, they recommend that the office of National Secretary as constituted at present be abolished. According to them the the National Secretary of our Party should not be a National Secretary performing his duties as outlined in the Constitution He should merely be a dummy without ideas or opinions; a flunky to obey their orders. The Party must be run as they think it should be run, and if the majority of the N.E.C makes decisions against them, then the N.E.C should be reduced to seven members, and these seven members should live in or close to the city where the National Office is located (preferably Detroit). Each member to be a specialist in a particular field, and to have full charge of all Party activity in his field, and the National Secretary's job should be taken over by one of these seven members. Then we would have seven bureaucrats and a National Secretary who would obey their orders without question. Then the Party would be run as they want it to be run.

I think that in the coming Convention these "babes in the woods" will find out that the other locals in the Party will have something to say about how the Party should be run and will not allow it to be run as Local Detroit has been run.

The idea of developing specialists is a good one and would be practical if we had about 100,000 members. Com. Renner erroneously assumes that the development of professional revolutionists means specialists in a particular field. A professional revolutionist is one that has the ability and the courage to devote all his time to the revolutionary movement. To maintain and build our Party this type of member is necessary. Com. Renner says ; "We must develop them", but makes no attempt to offer any suggestions as to how this can be done. Like Com. Landgraf he is satisfied to say "This is the work of the coming Convention We must understand that there is a vast difference between a professional revolutionist and a professional "politician." One devotes all his time to the movement with the spirit of sacrifice and loyalty, the other manuevers to land a job in the organization for mercenary reasons.

It is interesting to note that Com. Renner stresses the importance of having a specialist to work among the farmers. Farmers and farming seems to be a bugaboo with some of the members of Local Detroit. Altho there are approximately half a million wage slaves in Detroit and over half of them unemployed, a fertile field to carry on Party activity, many of our leading members there have almost entirely abandoned the task of building up local Detroit. Instead of devoting themselves to Party work they have developed a peculiar affinity for farmers and farming, and to prove that they are practical revolutionists have become "sons of the soil." Perhaps this group of sod-busters is the embryo of the Committee of Agriculture of the future Proletarian State. Com. Wass recognizes the importance of delegates coming to the Convention prepared, with something in their hands and heads, so I would suggest that these revolutionary farmers of Local Detroit prepare a thesis on the Farm Problem for the coming Convention.

A pre-Convention discussion period is for the purpose of criticising and discussing our own weaknesses and short-comings, to make recommendations and suggestions and then to make decisions as to what should be done, so we can come together in a Convention, prepared to strengthen the Party.

But what has happened? The N.E.C members in Local Detroit, who prior to the decision to hold a Convention continually complained and harped about our weaknesses and wanted a Convention to remedy the terrible short-comings they maintained existed in the Party, have not offered the membership in this discussion period one single suggestion for the improvement of our Manifesto and Program or an intelligent idea for to strengthen or expand the Party. Why? I know these members have some definite opinions about what they want done. They have expressed them to me. Why don't they tell the membership? Why haven't they the courage and honesty to tell the members in this discussion period that they think Com. Keracher should be removed as National Secretary, and the National Office moved to Detroit?

There is nothing wrong in thinking that the National Office should be moved to another city, or wanting the present National Secretary removed if these changes are for the purpose of improving the Party, but it is the duty of these members to tell the membership why they think this should be done.

What advantage is there to the Party in having the National Office in Detroit? Why should Comrade Keracher be removed as National Secretary, and who in their opinion is better qualified to hold the office? Instead of honestly discussing these matters with the membership in this open discussion period they are satisfied to remain silent for four months and then in the final month of the discussion period they write articles for the Bulletin and talk vaguely about "The Need For Change", and the "Need for new methods", and that "The Party needs to be overhauled."

Instead of honestly and fearlessly criticising the ideas and actions of individuals they disagree with, and putting forth their own ideas for the improvement of the Party, so that all our opinions and disagreements could be intelligently discussed, they remain silent on these vital matters. What kind of a game are you playing?

In the second paragraph of Comrade Landgraf's article he reveals a little of the situation existing in Local Detroit. He speaks of the windy business meetings and how every issue that comes up reflects a personal conflict and that new members leave, confused and demoralized. But instead of turning the searchlight upon themselves, and shouldering the responsibility for their local conditions, Comrade Landgraf tells us; "The Party machinery needs overhauling". Inferring that the Party is responsible for their windy business meetings, and their inability to eliminate confusion and demoralization among the members of Local Detroit.

The confusion and demoralization prevailing in Local Detroit is largely the result of the miserable failure of the N.E.C members there, and they cannot escape the responsibility for those conditions by talking about weakness in Party structure, etc. It certainly will be one of the tasks of the coming Convention to clean up the mess in our largest local.

Proletarian Bulletin

AUGUST, 1933.
(Section two)

Pre- Convention Discussion
(by Fred West and George Snider, Local San Francisco)

Regarding The Pro News:

Comrade Fishler says the condition of the Pro News is explained by the negligence of the party members, this is true to a great extent, and as he stated "we are all responsible for ~~###~~ this." But the Marxian position of the paper and the type of articles have deteriorated of late so badly that if something is not done we would be better off without the paper.

There are different ways of writing news. If the paper were coming out daily or weekly then news could be written as news, but at the rate of once a month it is no longer considered news, and should be written from a (purely) theoretical view point, analytical in character and summed up with the lessons learned and the ACTION to be taken. As an example of the poor grade of articles we should point to the May issue with the article of E.A. on inflation, there we have a purely bourgeois vulgar interpretation of "Going off the gold standard" and worse than that; the bourgeois theory of "more currency being issued against a given gold reserve as being inflation. The printing of such statements in our official paper must be held against the editorial board even more than the writer (although the writer in this case is also a member of the board).

In the June issue we have a typical Trotskyist analysis of the Mooney Convention, to-wit;- The Convention is controlled by the C.P.--they want to cram in all their pet slogans, etc, etc. After all this exposure of the Mooney Convention "we are to support it". THEN WE GET NO ADVICE ON HOW TO SUPPORT IT.

The article on the farmer is another garbled affair; no analysis for the proletarian's guidance, no direction of how we should approach the farmer. The statement by the C.I. on Germany without editorial comment capped the climax of PARTY CONFUSION, LACK OF UNDERSTANDING AND LACK OF COURAGE, to place the C.I. in its correct opportunistic and nationalistic category. Since a few months after our last Convention to C.I.'s purely nationalistic program in Germany has been, if not so bad as the S.D.F., at least, very close to it. The famous United Front of the C.P. of G and the Nazis against the Prussian Diet, their appeals to the petty bourgeoisie, their national fights against the Versailles Treaty, the Dawes plan and the Young plan have reaped the reward of seeing their masses trained in nationalism, finding their rightful place in the national fascist party of Hitler.

Says the C.I. in effect; the Versailles system--caused tempestuous outbursts of nationalism and German chauvinism--culminating in the Nazie Party. But what did the C.P.G. expect to accomplish by watering to this nationalistic "against the Versaille system" of the Bourgeoisie. Did the C.I. or the C.P.G. expose their problem as the problem of the German bourgeoisie under the yoke of the imperialist.

The C.I. Party in America has basically the same opportunistic and nationalistic stand with their Bourgeois Black Repulli

"appeals to professionals, councils for the protection of small depositors and small business men, farmers moratorium, red-blooded rights of the governed" (veterans liaison committee), farmers and workers government and ex-service vice-president. #

All these sloppy demands have a fundamental basis which is petty bourgeois nationalism. Is there really much difference between this and the "defend the fatherland" of the Second International ?

The Pro Party cannot condone such anti-Marxian propaganda and it should not be put in the Pro News as it is a reflection on the theoretical level of the Party.

ON THE NEGRO QUESTION:

In the June Bulletin Comrade O'Brien states; "I have refrained from speaking publicly on the Negro question and I have advised other Comrades to do likewise until our Party has made a decision." Here is an example of how one of our oldest comrades not only refuses to take the stand of the Party, but also by his own statement advises other comrades to ignore the Party stand the same as himself."

Comrade O'Brien's stand is the same as in 1931; he was present at the 1931 convention and knows very well that the Party took a definite stand against the C.I.'s nationalistic interpretation of the Negro question, he knows very well that the Party's stand was against his personal stand. But Comrade O'Brien's personal stand seems to be the most important. The Party's stand is not to be carried out evidently and so Comrade O'Brien "advise" other comrades not to do so.

Comrade O'Brien may say the Party's position has not been published; if the thesis has not been published, "Thesis on International Relations", it is the fault of the N.E.C. Comrade O'Brien is a member of the N.E.C. Why doesn't he place the blame where it belongs instead of hedging around and trying to make it appear that we have no stand on this question? Comrade O'Brien tells us to read Stalin, and also the C.I.'s thesis on the Negro question but to pay no attention to the C.P. of A's distortion of the C.I.'s position. He doesn't state how or where the C.P. of A, distorts the C.I.'s stand on the Negro question. The facts are that the C.I.'s position on the Negro question is the most silly and fantastic romance ever to be forced on the revolutionary movement.

We don't have to go to Browder, Hathaway or Stalin, we can just take the C.I.'s thesis; this is the official stand of the C.I. and it doesn't have to be interpreted by any of the little generals of the C.P. Does Comrade O'Brien agree with the C.I.'s "oppressed nation" is a part of the South (so-called Black Belt) containing 25% of the negroes of America, an oppressed nation just because the C.I. draws a pretty little shaped map and says so?

And this extraction of "super profits" , where did the C.I. discover this nonsense? If Comrade O'Brien would get his head out of Moscow and look up some American statistics he will find his "super profit" from the Black Belt is just another fairy tale that that should have stayed behind the walls of the Kremlin. He will also find out that the Cotton and Tobacco farmers, land owners or share croppers, white, red or white, are figuratively speaking "on the bum" and like the rest of the petty bourgeoisie in America are begging the government for help.

"The political and social equality" for the Negroes? What does this mean? Do they mean to give them the same social and political equality that the whites have? If they do, does that do away with the class struggle?

Their demand"to remove all the imperialistic armed forces from the Black Belt"--that's good; we would like to see all the armed forces in America done away with, but any Marxist knows this can be done only when capitalism has been abolished. The C.I.'s "vast majority" of negroes in the Black Belt turns out to be a majority in one state, and there less than 51%, and then the whites must submit to the majority; 49% whites must submit to 51% negroes for a Black Bourgeois Republic. These are the figures from the American census of 1931. Perhaps the boys in Moscow can count better than the census takers in America. When faced with this the C.P. lawyers and priests, chopped the Black Belt up into counties to fit the occasion and now their pretty little map has several little black republics.

Comrade O'Brien tells us to study the history of the negro-- I advise Comrade O'Brien to read something else besides the confused drivel in the IMPRECOR. The C.I.'s considering the Negro question as a national one and calling for a Black republic out-Garveys the Garveyites, But no! when the C.P. puts forth national bourgeois demands it is revolutionary, when Marcus Garvey or the N.A.A.C.P. does so, it is reactionary. When the C.P. said repeal the 18th Amendment it was revolutionary, when the Democrats advocated repeal--it was reactionary.

Besides Comrade O'Brien, we note Comrade Novak wonder whether the negroes are suffering from a pre-capitalist form of oppression. The C.I. claims the system of "share cropping" is a feudal system. Is this what Comrade Novak means? Does he or Comrade O'Brien think share cropping is feudalistic? If they do, then there is lots of feudalism in all farm sections of America regardless of what color the share croppers are.

Can Comrade Novak or Comrade O'Brien show us where the share croppers do not produce for sale? Are those that share-crop any different than those who pay a money rent? I know in California, at least, a considerable number of former rent payers who are now share croppers. But they are still capitalist farmers as long as they produce for sale. And if the negroes do suffer from a pre-capitalist form of oppression; what about it--does Comrades Novak and O'Brien maintain that a capitalist revolution is necessary in capitalist America?

I maintain that the position taken by our Party at the 1951 Convention is correct and altho we could take many pages in writing a thesis on this so called "Negro Question" by extending and widening the explanations; yet the fundamental stand, to-wit;--

That the "Negro" like all other workers is exploited because of being a worker and not because of racial or national divisions, should by no means be tampered with. This practice of trying to foment a separate national feeling, which does not at present exist among the negroes, will tend to widen the gap between the negro and white workers rather than promote unity.

And finally, the individual persecution of negroes or even their persecution as a minority in America, is the result of racial prejudice, in turn a historical development from the previous position of the negro under chattel slavery, which was in some respects, superior to that of the poor whites.

Coupled with this there is the further competitive threat --as a huge industrial reserve army--that they presented to the white industrial workers since the Civil War. All southern workers, whether white or black, present the same threat, but the white workers in the north only see the black threat.

This racial prejudice fostered by the master class as well as competition among all of the working class, results from the nature of the capitalist system of production itself and must be fought tooth and nail by the revolutionary movement.

The revolutionary party must bend every effort to show not only the negro workers but the workers of all races and nationalities, that their interest is not the temporary competitive struggle for the job, but the necessary unity of action among the great mass of wage workers for the complete abolition of the wage system.

THE FARM QUESTION.

Comrade Novak says, "What Revolutionary possibility does the farmer possess?" and further he says, "We must connect up the struggle for the revolution with the immediate and concrete demands of the farmer." If Comrade Novak knows what revolutionary possibilities the farmer possesses, and he must know, because he wants us to connect up the farmers' concrete demands with the revolution; then why doesn't he tell us what these possibilities are? Is Comrade Novak speaking in behalf of the farmers league or a revolutionary political party? What are these immediate and concrete demands that are revolutionary?

We know what the immediate and concrete demands of the farmers are; but, we lack the profundity to discern how or where they are revolutionary. The demands of the farmers are; less taxes, moratoriums on mortgages, no more mortgage sales, farm loans at low rates of interest, and mainly "higher prices for their commodities."

Does Comrade Novak contend that these demands are revolutionary or even that they are conducive to a revolution in America? We see these demands of the farmer working in behalf of maintaining the farmers in their present position as capitalists and consequently they will continue to be diametrically opposed to the working class revolution. But perhaps Comrade Novak knows of some "new revolutionary demands" of the farmers, if so we are eagerly awaiting to hear about them.

For our part we are in agreement with the past stand of the Party on this question. We are not opposed to working in farmers leagues or even to the extent of helping to organize them, but we work in them only for the purpose of working on them, to point out that many are doomed farmers and that "they should defend not their present but their future interests", They should not vainly try to roll back the wheels of history, but to aid in rolling it forward to the Proletarian Dictatorship, and the co-operative commonwealth.

THE C. I. QUESTION:

In our criticism of the C.I.'s statement in the Pro News we dealt extensively enough with this question, to warrant in our opinion the following stand on the C.I.:

That due to their continual nationalistic and petty bourgeois, opportunistic policy over a period of at least nine years, the Communist International should be condemned by the Proletarian Party as non-Marxian, and placed in the same category that Lenin placed the Second International before the Great War. The Party stands at the cross roads; either we take a firm unwavering Marxian stand, or continue our cringing attitude, servile in many respects, in trying to cater to the C.I.'s position as in the past.

We are sick of this eternal criticism of the C.I. at Conventions and the writing of elaborate thesis that are never published, what advantage lies in this attitude we cannot find, but the disadvantages are numerous. If we maintain, as some do, "that the C.I. is correct but the C.P. does not carry it out"; then from time to time our new members trained on this basis will swing over to the C.P., as New York did in 1931, and as did part of Cleveland. We can no longer say that the American section is bad, because late international developments have proved that all

sections in capitalist countries are as bad as the American section.

Germany, England, Austria, Spain, New Zealand and Greece are all based on petty bourgeois nationalism. In our present position we are not only training people for the C.P., but if we take the "Holy of Holies" (C.I) for example as the last word in Marxism we will be training nationalistic fascists instead of Marxians.

We should stand above the C.P as an organization, and not trail behind barking at their heels like the Lovestoneite and Trotskyite camp followers.

The time has come to take a clear Marxian stand for revolution and fighting hostile attitude towards all organizations that claim to speak for the working class, yet who in reality represent the interests of the petty bourgeois shop keepers and farmers of America.

 More About The C.I.

(by C.M.O'Brien, Local Los Angeles)

Comrade Mary Wright of local Boston, in the 2nd section of the June Bulletin, says we should alter our position and instead of saying the C.I. "is the best international working class organization" we should criticise the C.I. My reply is that we could fill every issue of the paper with criticism of the C.I, and still maintain that it is the best working class international. She says ; "Many of the policies for which we criticise the C.P., are the directions of the C.I." I think we criticise the C.P., for distorting the directions of the C.I. Comrade Wright gives the following examples:

1st, The C.I. is in perfect harmony with the C.P of A, on the Negro question. Evidently she has not read the criticism of the C.P by the C.I for distorting their resolution on the Negro question.

2nd, The United Front from below. The united front from below does not necessarily exclude the bureaucrats on top, but a united front with the bureaucrats may easily exclude the membership from below.

3rd, If the C.P is rotten the C.I is no more sound and that our differences with the C.P, should be put in our program. As I said in reply to Comrade Wass, to condemn a part is not a condemnation of the whole and our condemnation of the part is in all of our literature, only not enough of it because we cannot afford the space.

4th, That our Marxian education ought to enable us, especially the Editorial Board, to make a decision about the German C.P without so much delay. Our Editorial Board are chosen because they live close to our headquarters and they are not paid for editing. Every member has access to the same information as they have about the German situation. Thanks to our Marxian education they did not jump at hasty conclusions such as Mary Wright has.

5th, That we should not back up the C.I, attitude of regarding the Social Democrats as greater enemies than the Fascists and the refusal of the C.I., to unite with other labor organizations in the face of the menace of Fascism. Yes we do and we should continue to regard the leaders of Social Democracy as our closest enemies, the closest enemies of Marxism. I have no information of the C.P of Germany refusing a united front with other labor organizations against Fascism.

The C.P of G., made the mistake of trying to win the masses from the S.D.P., by trying to be more opportunistic than the S.D.P. It is worthy of note that the leader of the C.P of G.,

was, before the Fascists took power, discharged by the C.I., and severely reprimanded by the C.I. True he has since then placed at the head of the C.P. of G., Perhaps there was not another member of the party as capable as he, incompetent though he may be.

The Trotskyites are feasting on the crisis in Germany and in this country. They are making a special effort to supply our members with their literature. Our members should refrain from being influenced until they know the whole history of Trotsky and the group in this country that support him. Then, with a proper understanding of Marxism, we can read their literature as we do the Daily Worker, knowing what to accept and what to reject.

 The remarks I sent in last week regarding Comrade Mary Wright's article in the 2nd addition of the June Bulletin, did not mention her charge that the C.I., organizes dual unions. I did not then have the time to look up the data that I thought I had and since then I find that I left that information in San Francisco. However, so far as I know the C.I., or the RILU have never instructed their sections to organize dual unions. Their instructions were to organize the unorganized and those workers expelled from the old unions. This contention is, I think, supported by the following quotations:

The "Communist International" No 7, Vol VII., says in part "Lenin's incomparable work; Left Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder, was written in the struggle against 'heroes' Nevertheless in our practical trade union and mass work, relapses often unconscious, are frequently made... and delay the development and ripening of the proletarian revolution.***** How, for example, in the Ruhr district, can such slogans as; "Whoever is not with the Communists is an ally of the class enemy and must be treated as such", or "Fight the adherents of the Fascists, so that they can be driven out of the factories", or "The social democratic members are as bad as if not worse than their social-fascist leaders, who have already been exposed to the masses"---how can such slogans win us anything but isolation from the masses?*** The Fifth Congress must entirely repudiate that arrogance... Revolutionary trade unionists in particular must exercise a great deal of patience in winning, by intensive ideological work, those masses of workers who are still adherents or followers of the class enemy or of its social-fascist allies.....

"The old idea of labor aristocracy, as the name given to that section of the highly skilled workers... is no longer valid... because in the rationalized factory of today the old differences between the highly skilled manual worker has been abolished. Wherever we meet these workers, whether in the street or in the factory, at home, at meetings or at the pub, whether in sports or cultural organizations or wherever else, we must work among them.

***** ** : ** *****

"A large number of the members of the Communist Party have in the last few years left the unions, not only in the sense of ceasing active union work, but completely, as members. They left voluntarily, not because they were expelled.

**** **** ***

"We must not draw away from the masses, and form new unions prematurely, because revolutionary impatience or an insufficient understanding of the real will of the masses may mislead us. As things are at present, they would be organizations with only officials, lacking a rank and file..." An article by Zosovsky pub

lished in the Daily Worker, Aug 15, 1930, criticizing deviations that must be fought. He says in part: "Lumping together the social-fascist leaders and the workers who follow them; in not knowing how to work--often not wishing to work-- in the reformist trade unions...."

The January 15th, 1932, issue of the Communist International (official organ of the C.I) has a report of the Eighth Session of the Central Council of the Red International Labor Union, a part of which reads as follows:

"The session paid considerable attention to the question of work inside the reform trade union movement. The Fifth Profintern Congress raised the question of work in reformist and other reactionary trade unions as one of the central tasks of all sections of the Profintern-----At the same time work inside the reformist trade unions during the period under review was not only not increased, but almost universally slackened off. The session established that this state of affairs is absolutely intolerable and demands that all sections bring about in practice an immediate change in this work....." Regarding the unemployed, this report also says: "The main thing is to develop this movement wider and wider, to guarantee that the Red Trade Union and the trade union opposition give concrete, day to day, leadership to the unemployed movement, in this lies the guarantee that the struggle of the unemployed will be linked up with the struggle of those engaged in industry, which is the main problem. The leadership must not take the form of a sort of guardianship over the unemployed movement, or of organizationally including this movement as part of the Red Trade unions and trade union opposition. This leadership must consist in safeguarding the creation of committees and councils of unemployed on the basis of a true, broad, united front from below.,...."

This report further states: "In several places the correct Bolshevik relationship, which should exist between the Party and the vanguard and the trade unions as the transmission belt has not been properly understood. Party organizations too frequently still order the trade unions about and act in their place, instead of leading them through their fractions. The flagrant opportunist view that it is the Party's business to deal with politics, and that the economic struggle can be left to the trade unions, is still not entirely overcome in certain sections of the Communist Parties."...

 Criticism Of A Critic

(by Stanley Novak, Local Detroit.)

Comrade Babbitt in an article in the July Bulletin came out with a brand new definition of the class struggle and a severe criticism of local Detroit for its supposed low theoretical level. We agree that practical activity without theoretical clarity is practically useless. Clear understanding of class lines, the class struggle, and the economic and political forces that shape the position and the struggle of the classes in society is extremely important to the revolutionary leadership. The every day struggle of the masses of workers to improve their condition for a struggle against the lowering of their standard of living--for higher wages, shorter hours, better working conditions, against reduction of wages, against speed-up, against war,--- all this is not a form of the class struggle, according to Comrade Babbitt.

He defines the class struggle as follows: "The class-struggle is a wider and more conscious struggle of the working class against the capitalist class. The workers who recognize

the irreconcilable antagonism between these two classes, struggle for political supremacy in order to abolish capitalism." Will Comrade Babbitt contend that the struggle against reduction of wages is not a class struggle? Since the majority of the working masses do not realize the irreconcilable antagonism between the workers and the capitalists and since they are not yet ready to fight for the overthrow of the capitalist system and working class political supremacy until the country reaches the revolutionary crisis, would that mean that there is no class struggle until that period arrives?

How does the working class gain the knowledge about the irreconcilable antagonism between the classes? How do the working masses realize that in order to live they must overthrow capitalism and establish working class supremacy? Do they get these ideas purely out of their brain, or from experience in the every-day class struggle?

Marxism as a theory plays an extremely important part in the political development of the masses. It supplies them with a very sharp intellectual tool--a guide to action. But the working masses must first have a great deal of direct experience in the class struggle before they are ready to understand and accept Marxism.

The Communist Manifesto outlines the growth of the working class as follows: "The various interests and conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat are more and more equalized, in proportion as machinery obliterates all distinctions of labor, and nearly everywhere reduces wages to the same low level. The growing competition among the bourgeoisie, and the resulting commercial crises, make the wages of the workers ever more fluctuating. The improvement of machinery, ever more rapidly developing, makes their livelihood more and more precarious; the collisions between individual workmen and individual bourgeois takes more and more the character of collisions between two classes. Thereupon the workers begin to form combinations (Trades Unions) against the bourgeois; they club together in order to keep up the rate of wages; they found permanent associations for these occasional revolts. Here and there the contest breaks out into riots..."

"Now and then the workers are victorious, but only for a time. The real fruits of their battles lies, not in the immediate results, but in the ever expanding union of the workers..."

"This organization of the proletariat into a class, and consequently into a political party, is continually being upset again by the competition between the workers themselves. But it ever rises up again, stronger, firmer, mightier. It compels legislative recognition of particular interests of the workers, by taking advantage of the divisions among the bourgeoisie itself. Thus the ten-hour bill in England was carried."

Comrade Babbitt's position that the every-day struggle is not a class struggle is a complete negation of the Marxian theory of the class struggle.

"As the every-day struggle develops and the discontent of the workers becomes more and more manifest", writes Comrade Babbitt, "the workers in their helplessness due to the fact that they do not understand the social structure, are always looking for somebody to do something for them... What should be our attitude toward this struggle? Should we become absorbed in it?" asks Comrade Babbitt.

It is a well-known fact that at times a revolutionary Party is in danger of absorbing its activities in the every-day struggle of the masses to the injury of the revolutionary cause. And

our Party too may in time deviate in that direction. But the question that in my opinion we must ask is what is the immediate and most pressing deviation with which the Party is endangered? Is our Party at the present time in danger of becoming absorbed in the immediate struggles of the workers to the detriment of its revolutionary principles, aims, and activity? It is the opinion of the present writer that the Party is greatly in danger of the very opposite deviation, namely, isolation from the every-day struggle of the working masses and therefore from the masses. Comrade Babbitt does not even know how to formulate a question, how to approach a problem. We must stop talking generalities, which get us nowhere, but, instead, clearly formulate the concrete and immediate problems confronting the Party. Comrade Babbitt's talk about the danger of the Party absorbing itself in the every-day struggle is a thoroughly false alarm-- at least, at the present time.

We must give another example of Comrade Babbitt's peculiar understanding of communism. He writes: "The every-day struggle can be best developed consciously into the class struggle through the introduction of Marxism into the conflict. The theory of Communism does not develop out of the struggle of the working class under capitalism, but is applied to that struggle by the revolutionist who has some understanding of Marxism." To prove the correctness of his position, Comrade Babbitt tells us that Engels thus teaches in his Socialism, Utopian and Scientific

In the opening statement of the book mentioned, Engels says: "Modern Socialism is, in its essence, the direct product of the recognition, on the one hand, of the class antagonisms existing in the society of today, between proprietors and non-proprietors, between capitalists and wage workers; on the other hand, of the anarchy existing in production. But, in its theoretical form, modern socialism originally appears ostensibly as a more logical extension of the principles laid down by the great French philosophers of the eighteenth century. Like every new theory, modern Socialism had, at first, to connect itself with the intellectual stock-in-trade, however deeply its roots lay in material economic facts. (Emphasis mine)."

One can clearly see that ~~what~~ Comrade Babbitt puts forth is very different from what Engels taught. Comrade Babbitt has not freed himself from the idealist point of view. To Comrade Babbitt, the theory of class struggle is not an outcome of the experience of the struggle itself, but to the very contrary the theory is introduced into the struggle and the introduction of the theory--Marxism--converts the every-day struggle between the workers and the capitalists into a class struggle. I will realize that Comrade Babbitt will protest against the conclusion I make from his article, but I cannot make any other deduction; in fact, I cannot see how any reasonable person can make any other.

It may appear to many comrades as a waste of time and valuable space in the Bulletin to explain such elementary questions; but it must be done. Comrade Babbitt expresses the views of many comrades. He often speaks on the Party platform, teaches classes, and, in fact, has of late been much employed by the National Office as the official Party Organizer. We cannot tolerate such anti-Marxian theory, such absurd principles, especially in a man upon whom is conferred such duties and such responsibilities.

Immediate Demands
(by Jack Gardner, Local Boston)

It appears from the criticism of immediate demands in the Bulletin that if a comrade proposes such demands, he immediately becomes the object of a thorough analysis and investigation. His experience in the labor movement, and the fact that "he has looked at the covers of Vol. II and III of Capital" are immediately brought forward as evidence that this particular comrade is incapable of presenting a thesis that would be theoretically sound.

It happens that the comrade with such a long standing in the labor movement makes the statement that "recently I am convinced that the position of the Communist International on the Negro question is a real Marxian one." He also points out "since its inception the Proletarian Party has endorsed the theory and policy of the C.I." I am sure that upon closer study Comrade O'Brien will find the Communist Party in accord with the resolution of the C.I.

It is not likely that the Proletarian Party will endorse the "self determination for the Black belt policy. It is quite obvious then that the P.P does not endorse the C.I policy. To be logical we must point out the error of the C.I on this question, as well as others in which we may be in disagreement.

Experience is indispensable for formulation of correct tactics. Without an understanding of fundamental principles and the experience of the labor movement it is impossible to evaluate objective conditions correctly. But this does not prevent those comrades with a great deal of ability and experience from making errors and even acquiring a metaphysical outlook on the labor movement, while conditions change and corresponding changes must be adopted by the revolutionary party.

Comrade Bielskas in April Bulletin states: "They still have to make big splashes and spectacular stunts, also looking for blue prints of action, with social democratic proposals to be placed on the hook to catch the fish. The Party is not making enough noise, so they want to be like an empty wagon, which rattles the most when drawn over the road." This reference to those who advocate immediate demands is voiced by other comrades in the Party. They say it is the impatience of the comrades over the backwardness of the labor movement, and in particular the slow growth of the Party, that is the cause of their desiring the Party to adopt immediate demands.

In "Left-Wing Communism" by Lenin, this question is seen: "We are communists wrote the Communist Blanquists in their manifesto, because we wish to attain our aim directly without stopping at intermediary stations; without compromise which only postpones the day of victory and prolongs the period of slavery."

Carl Babbitt in July Bulletin writes "As the every-day struggle develops and the discontent of the workers in their helplessness, due to the fact that they do not understand the social structure, are always looking for somebody to do something for them". He asks the question, "What should our attitude toward this struggle be? Should we become absorbed in it? I say No."

"Engels in 1874 writing on program of Communist Blanquists chastises them for their desire to leap over "intermediary stations without compromises" and for refusing to participate in such activities for the reason that "they clearly see and perpetually follow the one final aim, the abolition of classes and creation of a social system in which there will no longer be any place for private property in land or in the means of production." Engels further adds "What childish naivete to put forward one's own impatience as a theoretical argument."

On the basis of what Engels has written are we not correct in charging those comrades who are in opposition to immediate demands with the fact that it is they who are impatient over the daily struggles of the workers and are desirous of avoiding them, with the object in view of hastening the building of the Proletarian Party.

Carl Babbitt as well as many other comrades seem to think that because a revolutionary party fights (as an organization) for certain immediate interests of the working class, that the Party must necessarily become swamped in social democratic reformism. These comrades must remember that with the social democrats immediate aims are an end in themselves. Marx in the Communist Manifesto has stated, "The Communists fight for the attainment of the immediate aims, for the momentary interests of the working class, but in the movement of the present, they represent and take care of the future of the movement." It is therefore possible, according to Marx, not to be swamped in reformism, but on the contrary raise the ideological level of the working class by active participation in the struggle for their immediate aims.

Working within mass organizations communists advance demands which reflect the every day needs of the workers, whether these organizations be trade unions, unemployed groups, etc. We must win the sympathy and confidence of these workers by our loyalty and perseverance, as well as our ability to understand their needs and fight for them. In pointing out the shortcomings of struggling merely for their immediate needs we try to instill into the minds of the workers the understanding that struggle only for "a fair day's pay for a fair day's work" will leave them enslaved, that only the abolition of the capitalist system will be the solution to their problems.

The C.P. attempts to do just this though failure results because of their tactics which not only isolates them from the workers but many times creates a hostility on the part of the workers toward them.

Comrade Keracher in writing about striking auto workers in Detroit states, "We are working with them in the friendliest way. These are the facts and Detroit comrades will use them to the utmost against the C.P. who in the early part of the strike advertised us as lined up with Republicans and Democrats against the strikers." I am quite sure that by supporting the strike, as an organization, the Party has made some valuable contacts with a great many workers, and gained the friendship of workers who have never been in contact with the Party.

Comrade Babbitt points out that theoretical work is neglected by local Detroit. If this is true then this condition should be corrected by all means. But this does not mean that the practical work of the Party should be pushed in the background. Theory is the basis for the development of a revolutionary movement. If it is lost sight of the movement stumbles along and disintegrates. Marxian theory becomes a vital force in the labor movement only when it is coordinated with practice. Otherwise all the theory that may be obtained, if it is not linked up with practice remains absolutely useless.

Comrade Heinhuis expresses what he believes the viewpoint of the workers to be regarding the Party: "Today our movement is decidedly unpopular. It may remain so until the eve of the revolution. But this possibility should not deter us." A revolutionary party should not, to my mind, remain "unpopular" to the working class. For sometime before the revolutionary crisis considerable sections of the oppressed toilers must regard the vanguard as an organization fighting for their interests.

For the Proletarian Party to follow a policy of [education]

PARTY SPEAKERS

(by A. Bielskas, Local Grand Rapids)

Comrade Babbitt touches on something that should be given further consideration. That is, the wise guy type of speakers, and also the kind that do not understand the Party's position on the Farmer question and many other questions that our Party speakers are called upon to explain.

The Party should work out ways and means of eliminating those speakers from the Party platform who do not understand the position of the Party. The wise guy type antagonizes and confuses, while the one who is ignorant of the position of the Party misinforms. Both kind do more harm than good to the Party. We should see to it that these Comrades be routed that understand the position of the Party. If we allow every member to speak for the Party just for speaking sake then that talk only amounts to "blaa blaa". There is already too much of that in the Party.

We review all articles before they are published in the Pro News to see that they are theoretically sound before we publish them. Why do we do this? Only for this reason, we know that we must explain things as they ~~were~~ are. Our aim is to convey the facts about our work, whether they are liked or not. Nevertheless we at all times try to explain the truth about just what kind of a Party ours is, and also our position relative to the class struggle.

Some comrades seem to think that we should yield to the wishes of the masses in order to win them over to our views. They don't seem to understand that when you have yielded to their wishes you have been won over by their views, and that they are leading you instead of you leading them. Just how a group of farmers could get a "revolutionist" to go in their direction is easily explained. They were leading someone who claimed to understand but did not. This leader should go back into the study class and find out something about the status of the farmer before he goes out again to speak to them.

We will deal more about the wise guy type. Workers cannot be won over by this type of speaker. Workers who hear the wise guy type come to the general conclusion that he is trying to convey to them how "wise" he is. Smart cracks and empty phrases do not put over ideas. This type of speaker does not belong on a working class platform. He would be better in a vaudeville. If a speaker cannot mix with the workers he cannot win them over. The wise guy type usually finds himself isolated from the workers. His influence is nil. If we examine articles for our Party press to make certain of their soundness, then it follows of necessity that we should select only the best informed for our platform so that our position be presented correctly to the workers. Above all comrades, let us eliminate from our platform those who do more harm than good to the Party. If we don't, then we will be doing more to confuse than to enlighten the workers.

The speaker's views should harmonize with the views presented in our program and Party press. If they do not, then they are in contradiction to the Party's position. This dualism must be eliminated, and it only can be done by keeping those off the platform who do not understand the Party's position. A study class should be held in all locals for speakers, and they should be thoroughly enlightened before being allowed to speak in the name of the Party. No speaker should be allowed to speak in the name of the Party unless he is willing to learn to express the ideas of the Party program. Districts should not route a speaker who does not know how to get acquainted. He must be a mixer to form effective contact. Money and time are wasted if the wrong kind of speakers are sent out. The Party is not organized to give joy-rides or sight-seeing trips to anyone. Let us use only those in our Party who are sound and can get results. This must be done if we are to grow as a Revolutionary Party.