

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 Republic

"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, colored, mixed, 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 wages 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 docile 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 opportunist 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 Losovsky pub

7
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 this 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 lie, 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 Babbitts 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.

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 Heinholz 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

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 speakers 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 sightseeing 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.