

# 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fact that there must be something seriously wrong with the present structure of the Party, and that its policy must be out of date on many vital questions.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 innuendoes 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, India 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. could 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 why 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 80% 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 "petti 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 profits 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 payments, 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 bawled 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.

-----