

# INTERNAL BULLETIN

VOL. 15, No. 3

February, 1953

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Excerpts from the Presentation by D. Stevens in Debate with M. Bartell	1
2. Rebuttal by D. Stevens in Debate with M. Bartell	6
3. Reply to Stevens by Mike Bartell	18
4. Statement by Gold	23

Issued by:

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY  
116 University Place  
New York 3, N.Y.

25¢

EXCERPTS FROM THE PRESENTATION BY D. STEVENS  
IN HIS DEBATE WITH M. BARTELL  
NEW YORK CITY, SUNDAY, JAN. 11, 1953

(Where the presentation overlaps with material in "Perspectives For the Period Ahead" by D. Stevens and H. Ring, it has been omitted here. D.S.)

It may be that you are as surprised as I am at the development of such an intensive discussion before our City Convention.

Last year, you will recall, we did not have much pre-convention discussion. We did not even have a discussion bulletin. This year our City Organizer is so intent on discussion that he even insisted on a formal debate before the ink was hardly dry on the pages of our first article in the bulletin and before our second was even written, as if we had deep going programmatic differences. Perhaps he is right.

The intensive discussion is all the more surprising in view of the fact that we had, as all of you know, a convention of the party only six months ago.

It might be contended that we need such a discussion in order to implement the decisions of that convention. But if that were true, then it is difficult to understand why any heat should be generated -- and as many of you are aware, there has been some heat. Such a discussion would take place simply around concrete proposals applying the major decisions of the convention to local needs and possibilities.

But this discussion does not take place around that axis. In fact the City Organizer's report does not even consider some of the most important policy decisions of that convention calling for action on our part.

We must therefore look for other reasons for our present intensive pre-convention discussion. It flows from what was injected by Comrade Bartell, some proposals that appear in a strange light when viewed in connection with the resolutions of our recent convention.

My opinion is that these proposals are of such far-reaching character that they must be fully and leisurely considered and in the most objective, calm and comradely manner, because they are of vital importance to our party tasks and perspectives.

To start out with, I'd like to tell you why Comrade Ring and I felt it necessary to enter this discussion, to write our two articles (rather, they were written in two parts because we didn't have the time to write it all at once), to state our disagreement on certain issues with Comrade Bartell, our criticisms and proposals.

It's true that for some months now there have been differences in the City Committee and in the City Bureau. But in the main

these differences were expressed on the nature of the work to be done, on concrete tasks and activities. None of these assumed programmatic importance if you consider them individually and in isolation. We resolved our differences on the details of work. We compromised. We made concessions.

But Comrade Bartell's report which opened the pre-convention discussion goes beyond an examination of our Local's activities. Actually, as a report of our past year's work, it is entirely too vague and general, and is also too much given to self-satisfaction. That alone would have been no big problem, however, What is important is that Comrade Bartell's report outlines a basic orientation for the most important local, the main political base of the party, which we consider to be an incorrect one in its stress and emphasis.

When it was first submitted, orally, to the City Committee -- all of us tried to be objective in considering it. Some tried to give it every benefit of doubt. Certainly, no one leaped to attack it. I personally declared that I couldn't vote on it or speak on it until I could read it and give it serious consideration. (There were no copies available at this time.)

When we were able to read and study the report it became clear to Comrade Ring and myself that the report was proposing a direction to our work that represented a departure from our basic proletarian orientation. Thus, we felt compelled to speak out, to ask some questions, to put forth some positive criticisms and proposals, and to attempt to correct what we considered to be a tendency to go off course.

This discussion takes place at a time when the working class movement and our party are confronted with many difficulties and obstacles. The question of a correct orientation assumes at such times a special importance, and requires the most serious attention of the entire party. We must achieve the highest degree of clarity in order to know how to act in these days, to prepare ourselves, to prepare the advanced workers, the awakening workers and the vanguard of the oppressed masses for the great impending class battles.

In analyzing Comrade Bartell's report our own views have developed and have become more clarified. We were compelled to think things through. We expect that in the further course of this discussion we will benefit and learn from the experiences and contributions of all the comrades participating in the discussion.

In our discussion articles, "Perspectives for the Period Ahead," we dealt with several questions which bear directly on the problem of our orientation. The main questions are trade union work, Negro work and opponents work.

As the basis for considering these questions in our Local, we turned first of all to the work done by the international movement of Trotskyism and by our party especially at its last national convention. The work of our co-thinkers relating to

our tasks in this country is summed up by M. Pablo in the section of his report to the Tenth Plenum of the IEC entitled "Essentially Independent Work." There he states that "for a whole category of very important countries where the obstacle of a strong reformist or Stalinist movement does not exist, the immediate central task of the Trotskyists is to act from now on as the revolutionary leadership of the masses." The U.S. is placed in this category with one reservation: our work for the formation of a labor party. I think it is necessary to stress this point that has long been one of the fundamental concepts of our party because of the danger of mechanically applying wholly or partly in America what is necessary for France and Italy or Germany and England.

Stalinism and official social-democracy do not lead or influence the mass movement of workers in this country as they do in some other countries. Our case is clearly closer to that of England -- without a labor party. In the present absence of a mass political organization of the workers in America we should not seek to find substitutes for it in the meager caricatures that American Stalinism and reformism represents of its European counterparts. Our main task is to be in the real mass movement of the workers as it is in this country. That is in the unions. Our main job there is to organize the workers into a mass political party of their own.

That is how to act as the revolutionary leadership of the masses today in America, putting it in a general manner.

If this is correct then the problem for us should be how "to act . . . as the revolutionary leadership of the masses" under the conditions and limitations of this period, taking it as our "immediate central task."

Nowhere, however, is this concept reflected in Comrade Bartell's report. Nowhere is this problem even posed. It sees little if any active role for our party in the mass movement of the workers today and turns its major attention to propaganda work directed towards the groups in and around the Stalinist movement as the main axis of our work in this period.

\* \* \*

We have found it necessary to call attention to the statements of our fundamental position made at the last convention, even though the convention is barely six months behind us, because Comrade Bartell seems to have overlooked them, or forgotten them or set them aside in drawing up his report.

\* \* \*

Beneath Comrade Bartell's exaggerations and illusions concerning the Stalinists there is a drop of reality. The Stalinists are isolated and under heavy attack. The liberals they can still muster are few. Some of these liberals admire our valiant and principled struggle on the civil rights front. Some don't want to be stuck with supporting Stalinist cases alone and want to

avoid the smear of "Stalinist fellow traveller," by supporting so popular a case as that of the legless veteran. Faced with such facts, the Stalinists are sometimes forced to make a concession to the liberals. The moment is not opportune for them to engage in open struggle against our civil rights. This may give us some opportunities to press the advantage and where possible we should use such opportunity vigorously. But we should have no illusions that Stalinism is now ready to genuinely defend our rights.

Their retreat on the question of our civil rights dictates that we bring the Kutcher case, the Trucks Law case and our principled defense of Stalinist defendants sharply to the fore wherever we confront them in the various organizations. Such are the propositions that the Report should treat with. Instead the Report says only that: "We should take the fullest advantage of this opportunity to penetrate deeply into this movement."

If the Report has any policy at all in relation to the Stalinist movement it is one of immersion, to penetrate, to get in, to "become integrated," to find "a political milieu in which to operate." At most it speaks of making "personal acquaintances" and "party contacts." To penetrate, become integrated, make contacts and acquaintances cannot constitute a policy towards the Stalinist movement. Such an approach is understandable as an initial stage for comrades who enter the trade union movement where they will develop their work over a period of many years. It could constitute a policy for the first phase of an entrust maneuver such as we carried out in the Socialist Party here in America in 1936, or as is being done by the Trotskyists in the Stalinist movement in France, for example, today. But what does it mean now, following the period of "exploration and selection" we have already gone through in the New York Stalinist movement?

The Report sees the ALP as "the most important of these organizations by far, since it is the heart of the movement and its active core are the politically conscious cadres." It proposes, despite the fact that the "ALP is the most difficult to work in since it is primarily an electoral machine although it does carry on other activities," that "we should send a number of comrades into the ALP who are prepared to participate in its activities and remain in for a considerable period of time."

Now why should we do this? What's going on in there? What's going to come of it? With what perspective? With what policy? With what plan? How many comrades should we send in? What type of comrades? Do you have in mind young and inexperienced comrades or politically seasoned comrades? How will the comrades function in the ALP? Will it be necessary for them to establish themselves simply as good ALP builders over a period of time? How long a perspective is this?

What is the policy and perspective for the party from which this "entry" proposal stems? The only logical answer is that

Comrade Bartell sees the Stalinist movement and the petty-bourgeois circles surrounding it as our major sphere for political activity for the whole next period.

\* \* \*

Coupled with the failure to present any thought-out policy and perspectives in our opponents work and with a gross over-estimation of the possibilities in this field, the Report fails to emphasize our need to clearly and sharply differentiate our program and methods from that of the Stalinist, semi-Stalinist, petty-bourgeois, liberal and pacifistic elements that befuddle, betray and derail the workers whenever they have influence enough to do so. Our comrades who are active in these circles must be armed with a thorough understanding of the need for uncompromising struggle against such theories and policies. Whatever we can win from the Stalinist circles can be only on the basis, not that we have a better program for the realization of common aims, but that ours is the sole correct program and leadership and that the Stalinist program and leadership is counter-revolutionary through and through.

\* \* \*

Comrades, we have a great wealth of experience on the question of trade union work right here in New York. We had a big proletarian base in maritime. Before that we had a base in the paper-box union. In both of these unions we suffered serious setbacks. But look at what we gained in spite of the setbacks. We have here in this hall today not a few young workers as a result of our work in these two fields. For us it is an important number.

But we have suffered defeats in these unions, some will say. What can we do now? Well, what do we do when we suffer defeats? In this vast trade union field in New York City we must imbed ourselves in new fields. That is what we should be discussing here if we are serious. What is decisive is not whether New York is a commercial city or whether industry is small and scattered, light instead of heavy, transport instead of production, but that there are millions of organized and unorganized workers in this city.

To speak of the difficulties confronting us in the work does not answer the problem. It only poses it. It points the need to more effort, greater consciousness and perseverance.

Who would have thought of paper box workers as a fruitful field for us? It really wasn't if you think of fruitful fields coming to us simply by waiting for them passively. Comrades created it for us. Similarly in maritime, where the difficulties were many and of a special kind, we managed to build our forces, make an impact, recruit precious cadres and prepare for all of this under the conditions of World War II and the ruthless gangster Stalinist leadership of the NMU. Our gains did not fall as manna from heaven. We went after it. We can do it again.

True, the objective situation is bad. True, it may get worse. But the main thing for us -- no matter what the situation is, is to be with our class in its mass movement as it is, actively carrying out positive revolutionary work. Let us recall what Comrade Dobbs

told us at our trade union conference on the question of the reaction and its blows: "We will be more fortified", he said, "against attacks of the reaction, the deeper we penetrate into the union ranks and the larger the vanguard we mobilize."

\* \* \*

REBUTTAL BY D. STEVENS  
IN DEBATE WITH M. BARTELL  
NEW YORK CITY, SUNDAY, JAN. 18, 1953

Everything in our discussion so far points to one key issue -- our main orientation. If we are all in substantial agreement on this question, if our differences are merely artificial, manufactured or illusory -- then there's nothing to argue about.

In such an event we would be, all of us together, working out the concrete application of our major course in New York City. Through our common efforts, basing ourselves upon the living experience of various comrades, and guided by our mutually agreed upon orientation, our proletarian orientation, we would elaborate a concrete, specific plan of action, policies and tactics for work in the unions and shops, in the Negro movement, etc., as well as some secondary activity in the opponents work field. We would do this in a general manner, leaving the particular details and elaboration to be worked out in life, by our experiences in the work. There would certainly be no need whatsoever for this intense and heated dispute. There would be no need for this debate.

Now that seems to be the contention of Comrade Bartell, and a number of other comrades in this debate. In his oral statements Comrade Bartell claims that there is no difference on orientation. He too, you see, quotes Cannon, and Dobbs, and Pablo. Ostensibly there is complete agreement all around, except that Stevens and Ring, for all kinds of unworthy reasons and purposes, are engaging in sniping attacks and carping criticism. They have no concrete, specific, detailed plans and proposals on what to do in the coming period and on what should have been done in the past period. All Stevens and Ring do is string together quotations from the party's basic documents. But without concrete proposals, their references to documents are completely beside the point, because Comrade Bartell, so he says in this debate with me, agrees with all these references.

If that were his real position and not merely his ostensible position, it is hard to understand why he would demand this debate.

If for example, he really believed that the position of Stevens and Ring was nothing but carping criticism, why didn't he meet it on that level? Why didn't he just write a brief reply to us and publish it in the Internal Bulletin? This is the usual way carping criticism is met when, as occasionally happens, a comrade makes such a mistake and offers criticism that can be characterized as nothing but "carping".

But Comrade Bartell did not handle our criticism in that way. He responded as if there were fundamental programmatic differences involved. He insisted on a debate. He even went further; he insisted on "amendments" or a counter-resolution to his report. And he even put the heat on us to agree to election of separate slates of delegates to the City Convention.

When in the history of our party has "carping" criticism ever been handled like that?

It seems to me beyond reasonable dispute that Comrade Bartell's actions prove that he does not consider our criticism as "carping".

I think every comrade who considers this point carefully must come to the conclusion that Comrade Bartell himself sees two different orientations involved here -- the one he projects and the one we are defending.

If this conclusion is correct, and I think it is unassailable, then Comrade Bartell's charge that our criticism is "carping" is nothing but a smoke screen.

Now let's go a step further. Besides the proof of Comrade Bartell's actions, we have something just as convincing.

And that is what he put down in black and white; namely, his report.

If it is true, as I pointed out, that Comrade Bartell says there are no basic differences in orientation. But this contention is destroyed by what he wrote.

Now I am interested in what Comrade Bartell says all right. I'm even interested in what he thinks, and sometimes try to figure it out. But I don't base myself on that. I base myself on what he wrote -- in his report. That's what I am discussing -- the report.

If in the light of what Comrade Bartell has said here you re-read his report, it will be clear that there is a decided contradiction between his ostensible position as stated on the floor, and his real position, as written in the report.

First let us examine the report from the standpoint of what it is not. No one can claim that the report is an expression, or an application, in any way or to any degree whatsoever, of the party's basic trade union orientation.

As I have pointed out before, Comrade Bartell is not at all unaware of this. He poses the question in his report quite explicitly -- in these words, "Since ... our opportunities for work in the union movement have become extremely limited, and since our activities are to be directed primarily toward more politically conscious circles, the question naturally arises: what about the proletarian, or trade union, orientation?". (my emphasis)



Does this manner of raising the question express a basic proletarian orientation? Doesn't it state that "our activities are to be directed primarily toward more politically conscious circles"? Isn't this favoring our activity in the "more politically conscious circles" and counterposing it to our work in the union movement?

This is not an unfortunate formulation that slipped in by mistake or carelessness, and which we are pouncing upon in our perverse zeal to manufacture a difference and mislead the membership, as Comrade Gold charged us here last week. Comrade Bartell's report doesn't appear out of the blue. It is written after months of discussion of differences in the City Bureau and the City Committee. It is carefully, consciously and I would say, even guardedly constructed with as much talk in favor of union work as he could include consistent, of course, with his real orientation.

Comrades should reread the report. This negation of our basic trade union orientation, and the substitution for it of opponents work as our main job appears in the very opening sentence that introduces the section called "Trade Union Work". It is one of the more conscious and deliberate statements in that report. Comrade Bartell shows his complete awareness of this when, as a conclusion of his reversal of major orientation, he poses the problem by stating, "the question naturally arises: What about the proletarian or trade union orientation?". Yes the question does "naturally" arise. There is nothing accidental about it. It is not a blunder.

Well what does happen to the proletarian or trade union orientation? That is the most important problem before us in this discussion. That is recognized, I am glad to say, by Comrade Bartell too, (in his report, that is). For there he states very pointedly that, "The answer we give to this question (not only verbally -- but in action) is of the greatest importance.....," etc. Here we agree. It is of the greatest importance. But what answer do we give? Well, he has already given the answer essentially, in the very posing of the question, as I pointed out. And we believe it is the wrong answer. That's all. Everything else that follows in his report on trade union work, insofar as it states things clearly, for much of it is obscure, only bears out the wrongness of this answer. This is true even where he attempts to emphasize the need for being in the unions and factories, or where it might appear to some comrades that he is really for a trade union orientation.

We are not saying that Comrade Bartell says that we shouldn't have comrades in the factories and unions. Or that he says that you can't do anything at all there, or that one shouldn't do contact work there. No. But even this is said negatively and pessimistically as if he were simply making the record.

For example, he states that "it is ... not true that nothing whatever can be done even today in the shops and unions", or that we should "not become isolated from the workers physically as well

as politically", or that "opportunities to speak at union meetings for a labor party and on other issues are not entirely (!) absent ..." Is this the way we state our proletarian, or trade union orientation?

One of his more obscure statements deserves closer attention. "We must not so adapt ourselves (!)," he declares with a tone of intransigence, "to the exigencies of the moment, as to be completely unprepared for the stormy movements which will arise in the factories and flow through the channels of the trade union movement." What does this mean? Restating it clearly it says -- that we should "adapt ourselves to the exigencies of the moment," but "not so," that is not in such a way or not so much, "as to be completely unprepared for the stormy movements which will arise in the factories ..."

What should be said? We should say -- that we must not base our policy upon an adaptation to the "exigencies of the moment" but rather increase our efforts and our attention to the carrying out of Socialist work in the mass movement, among the workers, the oppressed minorities, etc., today so as to be completely prepared tomorrow, "for the stormy movements," etc.

This is not the way Comrade Bartell answers the question of proletarian orientation which he poses.

His is an abandonment of the proletarian orientation in favor of an orientation towards the Stalinists and their petty bourgeois peripheral circles.

What the report should have stressed, and emphasized, and insisted upon, and projected, is our proletarian orientation. That has been the position, and continues to be the position of our party. The reaction places obstacles in our way. Well, we do not change our orientation. We do not permit the reaction to disorient us. We redouble our efforts. Not to vainly pound our heads against a stone wall, but to find ways and means of getting around the obstacles, the impediments, the stumbling blocks that are placed in our way.

Even while Comrade Bartell was disclaiming his departure from the proletarian orientation at last Sunday's debate, he was explaining the reasons for abandoning the proletarian orientation. He told us that what determines our main course is not any molecular process, etc., but what he termed, "the raging of an extreme terror" which, moreover, is "growing worse" and which constitutes an "overwhelming" reaction. We will not go into the question at this time of what, (in the face of this panicky description of the reaction today), actual Fascism or even a finished garrison state could possibly look like. What is necessary to reject in this discussion is the idea that our course is determined by the reaction.

No, all that the reaction determines are the tactics that we must employ in order to remain on our road, to hew to the line of our proletarian orientation despite the difficulties created by

the reaction. Comrade Pablo in his 10th Plenum Report, says that "essentially independent activity means ... to act from now on as the revolutionary leadership of the masses," and he goes on to explain that, "This character of the activity flows from the evaluation of the situation and the perspectives of its evolution. The situation is pre-revolutionary all over in various degrees ..." The evaluation of the situation is not exhausted by talking of the reaction in the most dire terms. There is the perspective of the evolution of the situation and this includes the "molecular processes" about which there has been a little sneering here.

I was very pleased to see some new and some young comrades turn their attention to the teachings of Lenin and Trotsky on this question. The sections that they read to us last week were extremely apt and to the point even though I must admit that Lenin and Trotsky did not write them in direct reference to the 1953 New York City Convention. They nevertheless apply. The best time to go back and read or re-read Lenin, Trotsky, etc., is precisely during such periods of internal party discussion of differences such as we have now. For example, I would like to recommend the re-reading of the section on trade union work in Lenin's "'Left-wing' Communism and Infantile Disorder" with special attention to pages 36,37,38 and 76. (Little Lenin Library.)

Now all this is elementary and it wouldn't be necessary to refresh ourselves on it if it weren't for the fact that Comrade Bartell's report is guilty - not as the ultra-leftist, dual-unionists of Lenin's day were - but in its own way, of the misconceptions that Lenin fought against. Comrade Bartell determines our course by the "raging terror" in such a way as to shift our main axis from work among the masses to work in the more "politically developed" circles.

Even if there were no differences at all between us on practical tasks either for yesterday and today or for tomorrow, and there have been for many months now many such differences, even if there was nothing specific and concrete to separate us, this introduction, by Comrade Bartell of a basic change in our orientation, this alone, would necessitate the discussion and the correction that we seek.

Under the present conditions, socialist work in the trade union movement is difficult, full of hardship and even danger. There isn't a ready audience on a mass scale. There is the persecution, the hounding, etc. Under such conditions there is an inclination to get away from it. It is understandable. All of us feel this. It is an enormous pressure. That is why we feel it. It isn't necessary to din this into our ears. We know this. It requires no analysis, no thought to know this. The problem is how to overcome this pressure. How to counter the natural inclinations to get away from it. How to overcome the difficulties, the hardships and the dangers in this work, and to persist in it, to carry out active, positive, socialist activity in the mass movement under these very conditions. That is what the report should have stressed.

"Some," says Comrade Bartell in his report, "choose jobs which are most convenient" instead of "helping the party penetrate the mass movement." Then all the more reason to stress the extreme need, value, fruitfulness of this work today, and make it our major preoccupation. It is this which requires consciousness and determination.

"This problem of 'proletarianization'", says Comrade Bartell further in his report, "is a peculiarly New York problem, and it has always been with us." That's true. But then it requires for New York a particular, an exceptional consciousness of the need for this work. We must place an extraordinary stress upon it to overcome both the difficulties in this field and the inclination that exist to avoid this work.

Comrade Bartell's report lacks a trade union orientation, underestimates trade union work and takes an unrealistically pessimistic view of it. But he more than makes up for this negative attitude when he turns to opponent's work. Here we are given a picture of meadows and flowers and soft summer breezes, brilliantly touched up with summer sunlight -- no chill winter winds or admonitions to button up your overcoat or warnings about "Baby, it's cold outside" such as he delivered here last week in reference to trade union work. First of all he explicitly states that "our activities are to be directed primarily" in this field. He makes this our main orientation, overestimates what actually can be gained in it and, as I said, paints it up fantastically. Let me read you again how he views these circles. "Indeed," he says, "their movement could be said to be rife with 'Trotskyist conciliationism.' Unity sentiments are widespread even among some leaders and spokesmen of the PP movement. Our victory over the Stalinists in the civil liberties struggle is virtually complete. The Daily Worker editorial on the Kutcher case was the formal announcement of the change in line. Leading Stalinist spokesmen are declaring both publicly and privately that they were wrong both in the case of the 18 and the Kutcher case, and proclaim the need for unity in the struggle. Trotskyism has become legitimized among many Stalinist members and sympathizers." Now what accounts for this calendar art work that is bright enough to make the coldest days of January seem snug and comfortable? Why this blowing up of the situation in the Stalinist movement out of all proportion to the reality? Perhaps Comrade Gold would like to say that here too we have an "unfortunate" formulation. That the report is a little inflated at this point. A literary slip. That it is accidental.

Not at all. It all fits in. A deflation of mass work, an inflation of Stalinist work. This meshes with Comrade Bartell's change of basic orientation from mass work to work in "the rest of the left-wing world." The reason for his hopped-up version of a Stalinist movement "rife with Trotskyist conciliationism," etc., is his false orientation. His orientation towards the Stalinist movement doesn't possess any real substance of its own. It isn't France or Italy with its millions of proletarians and poor urban masses under Stalinist leadership. Huberman's little

magazine and his discussion circle aren't Tito's partisan army and proletarian revolution. Marcantonio and the ALP are not Mao Tse Tung and the Chinese Red Army. The Stalinist movement here isn't even Muste's party of 1934 or the Socialist party of 1936 with their left wing ferment. A major orientation in the direction of the Stalinists and their petty-bourgeois periphery must rest on something. That something consists of the kind of wishful thinking, dreamy-eyed self-deception that I read to you from Comrade Bartell's report. That is the explanation. It's a disenchantment with the mass movement of the workers today - a romantic enchantment with the Stalinists and their 'petty bourgeois intellectual fringe."

Comrade Bartell declares in his report that "We should take the fullest advantage of this exceptional opportunity to penetrate deeply into this (the Stalinist) movement." Where else in his entire report does Comrade Bartell see an "exceptional opportunity" or even a promising one? Where else does he call for taking "fullest advantage" of a situation? No Comrade Gold, you will not make us believe that all of this is merely an unfortunate expression, a fault of style, instead of a basic change in orientation. And it doesn't serve for clarification of the comrades and a healthy thrashing out of the issues, to obscure this change in orientation, or to pin the label of "carping critics" on the two comrades who voicing the opinion of the majority of the City Committee, call attention to the deviation.

And that is what Comrade Bartell has done in this debate. Here he claims that he agrees with the Tenth Plenum, with Cannon and Dobbs, etc. That there is no difference in orientation between us. That we are barking up the wrong tree. That we are inventing things. But in his report, and you must all read it again, he clearly and unmistakably projects a new orientation in place of our proletarian orientation. Don't base yourself merely on what he says or on what you think he thinks. Read the report and you will see the glaring contradiction between his presentation last week and what he wrote in the report.

One of the worst features of the Report is its flagrant painting up of the situation in the Stalinist movement. What this can do in disorienting our local is shown by the remarks of Comrade Lou S. here last week. Now I want to assure you that I am not picking on Lou. I have known him for a very, very long time. He is a good comrade and does the best he can in our work. I choose Lou because he demonstrates what can happen if you take Comrade Bartell's projected orientation seriously. Lou's views are all the more important because he happens to be in charge of our opponents work and in view of the major stress Comrade Bartell places upon this field, undoubtedly reflects Comrade Bartell's real views.

The first thing necessary for this work, if it is to succeed, is to have a clear and correct idea of what we are dealing with. Of what Stalinism is. And it is this that makes what he said last week stand out with such embarrassing prominence.

Comrade Lou in his discussion from the floor last week took sharp exception to what I said about Stalinism in my presentation. Here are my exact words in their context: "Whatever we can win from the Stalinist circles can be only on the basis, not that we have a better program for the realization of common aims, but that ours is the sole correct program and leadership, and that the Stalinist program and leadership is counter-revolutionary through and through." Lou did not in the least temper his extreme opposition to this concept of Stalinism which has been the Trotskyist appraisal of Stalinism for many years now and which has not been altered one iota by our international co-thinkers.

Where I said "Stalinist program and leadership," he used the term "Stalinist parties" as though he were quoting me. And then proceeded to lambast the idea that the Stalinist parties are counter-revolutionary. This switch from "Stalinist program" and "leadership" to Stalinist parties hardly alters the matter, however, for what makes a party "Stalinist" is its program and leadership. Lou declared that this idea has been outlawed in the international. He branded it as a sectarian concept. He went so far as to say that he wonders if this isn't a buckling under to the pressure of imperialism, a response to its attack on the Stalinist movement.

This is the first time that I have heard a comrade in our movement get up at a party discussion and deny the counter-revolutionary nature of Stalinism, its program, leadership and parties. And with such vehemence! It is the first time in our movement that I have found myself attacked for asserting the counter-revolutionary character of Stalinism. Where are we? Is it in our party that I am called a narrow sectarian for this? Is it in the party of American Trotskyism that one is charged with buckling under the pressure of American imperialism for describing Stalinism as counter-revolutionary, yes, "through and through"?

I know that Comrade Bartell did not say these things. Lou S., the director of opponents work said them. But these ideas of Comrade S's are natural enough in view of Comrade Bartell's false orientation. They are the logical extension of Comrade Bartell's conceptions. They cast a most illuminating light on what Comrade Bartell's report is really all about.

Look, we are not dealing with immature remarks of some new comrade. Comrade S. is at the head of our opponents work. He guides this work and he guides our comrades, many of whom are young comrades, in this field. What he says is important and the City Organizer must bear responsibility for it, because the director of opponents work is only carrying out Bartell's line.

Where do these ideas come from about the non-counter-revolutionary nature of Stalinism? Comrade S. would have us believe that Stalinism is anti-imperialist and that with the approach of war, it must lose its pacifist character. Comrades, what is an anti-imperialist party that loses its pacifist character? Revolutionary, we must presume. Is this what comes from seeing the Stalinist movement "rife with 'Trotskyist conciliationism'"?

Comrades, this shocking example is not an isolated one. About the same time that the director of our opponents work begins to

make these fundamental revisions of our analysis of Stalinism, other comrades are giving expression to such views also. I believe that this is only incipient, but nevertheless, a serious danger to our movement and requires a clear and unambiguous rejoinder.

This too should be the task of the City Organizer. His report should have armed the comrades against these views. But it is precisely his report that encourages and gives comfort to such false and dangerous evaluations of Stalinism.

These are not the views of our international co-thinkers. The theses of the Third World Congress of the Fourth International on "Orientation and Perspectives" under the Caption XVIII - The Struggle Against Stalinism declares:

"XVIII. By its very nature, the Soviet bureaucracy is fundamentally opposed to the development of the revolutionary forces in the world, and it is excluded, even in the case of a general war against the USSR, that the bureaucracy can impel the CPs to take power in areas of the world that it will not be able to control, among others, for example, the USA, which, however, is the citadel of imperialism.

"While the counter-revolutionary role of the Soviet bureaucracy remains unchanged, either as concerns the betrayal of a workers revolution or the stifling of an independent proletarian movement, its possibility of successfully performing this role is determined not by its subjective desires and intentions but by an objectively revolutionary situation, which because of its vast scope and intensity becomes increasingly difficult to destroy or to maintain within rigid bureaucratic channels and police controls."

A few comrades, following Lou's example, have been talking of the dual nature of Stalinism, as if its duality consists of one side being counter-revolutionary and the other -- revolutionary. No comrades, The dialectic of Stalinism, not of the masses under its leadership, but of Stalinism itself, of Stalinism in its totality, combining all of its aspects, is its fundamentally counter-revolutionary character.

Comrade S. is artfificially projecting for America a possible conjunctural and exceptional situation that may occur as it has in Yugoslavia and in China for a mass Communist Party in a situation which impels such a party to cease, or to begin to cease, to be Stalinist as it is pushed on to the road of revolutionary struggle by explosive and uncontrollable situations.

Such a C.P. may, only under exceptional circumstances of advanced decay and degeneration of the bourgeois rule and a mighty revolutionary upsurge of the masses, project a revolutionary orientation. But to the extent that it does this it ceases to be Stalinist.

How absurd, how utterly fantastic it is to apply this to that miserable, impotent, isolated, discredited Communist Party of America!

Even in those countries where Trotskyists find it necessary to enter the Stalinist movement because it embraces millions in a pre-revolutionary period, they do so without the slightest illusion concerning the nature of Stalinism itself, of the Stalinist program, of the Stalinist leadership. It is only by a combination of a firm, uncompromising Trotskyist understanding of the thoroughly counter-revolutionary nature of Stalinism together with an active and energetic intervention in the mass movement headed by Stalinism, an intervention unfettered by either Stalinophobia or Stalinophilia that we can become the leadership in the revolutionary process in which must be destroyed both dying capitalism and perfidious Stalinism.

You don't think that that's in the thesis and resolutions of the Third World Congress? Re-read them too, and then re-read Bartell's Report. It's a fine education.

It is amazing how little of the Third Congress Comrade S. has understood, how much of it is distorted in his mind, and with what arrogance he accuses us of buckling under the pressure of American imperialism because we characterize Stalinism as counter-revolutionary.

Now Comrade Ring and myself would be willing to take the blame for this characterization of Stalinism, only we don't deserve it. Doesn't Comrade S. know that this is the view of our party? Isn't this the position of the National Committee? Isn't this the line of the Militant? Why, you have only to take this week's issue of the Militant, and read M. Stein's excellent article on the purge cases of Marty and Tillon in France for a really rich description of Stalinist counter-revolutionism; Or take any issue of The Militant which deals with Stalinism, the anti-Semitic and counter-revolutionary purges in Czechoslovakia and East Germany, in the Soviet Union, etc. Or take Comrade Cannon's pamphlet on the Road to Peace and you will read it there, clearly, explicitly and without water in the mouth.

Comrade S. has spoken clearly. But not quite clearly enough. Whom are you taking issue with Comrade S.? Whom do you accuse? The comrades of the City Committee who are in agreement with Comrade Ring and myself? Or do you extend your accusation to cover the National Committee, the party press and the party leadership? If you don't want to speak diplomatically, as you assured me, then tell us that.

Comrade S. is the head of our opponents work. That's a responsible position. Last week in his talk he let fall the remark that he heard some say that the government will take care of the Stalinists. Now that's not so diplomatic, Comrade S. But take it a step further. Make yourself clear. What do you mean? Is it that some comrades welcome the government witch-hunt against the Stalinists? Is that what you are hinting at? Who are these "some comrades"? Do you mean Comrade Ring and myself? Then why didn't you say so openly and frankly.

Comrade S. accuses us of "sectarianism," and of buckling under the pressure of imperialism. But he ends up by saying the debate was really not necessary.



What kind of double talk is this? And why did Comrade Bartell whose report you uphold and who in turn takes responsibility for your line and your work as opponents work director -- why did Comrade Bartell demand this debate?

Let's consider another link between Comrade Bartell's Report and Comrade S.'s views. Where Comrade Bartell states in his report that "Trotskyism has become legitimized among many Stalinist members and sympathizers. . ." Comrade S. went him one better when he said last week that "the Daily Worker half way legitimized us." That was in reference to their Kutcher editorial. The Daily Worker itself, he declared, legitimitizes or half way legitimitizes us (whatever that means; second class citizenship perhaps)? And Lou went on to point out that this means that they are saying that the Trotskyists are part of the working class. Now who can say that if Bartell is right, S. is wrong? What measuring rod do we have to determine which of these two assess the truer degree of "Trotskyist conciliationism" in the Stalinist movement?

Now we did not have to wait for the French CP to expel Andre Marty to understand that these notions about Stalinism legitimatizing us, that are held by Bartell and S, are the sheerest soft-headedness. Andre Marty was charged by the Stalinist prosecutor as follows (and let me read it to you as it is quoted in Comrade M. Stein's article in this week's Militant):

"The conception of the Party held by Andre Marty is such that in his last document addressed to the Political Bureau, when he mentioned the Trotskyists he did not speak of 'Trotskyist riffraff' or the 'bunch of Trotskyist gangsters' which is our customary and natural language in talking of these individuals, but on the contrary spoke of the Trotskyist International and even of a party (Trotskyist) in so-called opposition to our French Communist Party. . . . When we learned what Marty had written, we belived he had done this with the view to later publication and the idea that some day, in his struggle against the party, he could rally this mad and unprincipled gang of saboteurs and agents of diversion and division."

Now in view of this attitude of the leadership of the mass French Communist Party of millions, a party that may be impelled upon the road of revolution -- how can any comrade soberly believe that the Daily Worker in America, amidst general reaction and without any impulsion from any masses will legitimitize us, even "half way," and recognize us as part of the working class movement?

Another instance which demonstrates the close link between S.'s ideas and Bartell's is seen in the following: Where Comrade Bartell sees the Stalinists and their periphery as the main "political milieu in which to operate" and finds in those circles "people who are equipped to understand (our ideas) and are willing to listen," Comrade S. again ups the ante and finds that "now the Stalinists are moving to the left." Where is this indicated? How did you find this out Comrade S.? The reports written by our comrades who went into the Compass clubs and into the ALP don't indicate this. Neither does the draft report by Foster on the situation after Eisenhower's victory, a report which opens the door for their dissolving the Progressive Party into the Democratic Party in forming

a so-called left-wing, indicate any such thing. Where do you find these things out? Perhaps as director of opponents work you have some special information which you have not yet divulged to anybody.

If what both Comrade S. and Bartell say are added together and if that would constitute anywhere near a realistic picture of the Stalinist movement in America, then -- I repeat what I said last week -- this would compel us to consider the question at least of some form of a semi-entry.

Last week Comrade Bartell claimed that the 12th Plenum of the IEC bore out his analysis of the reaction and its further growth in America and the tasks that flow from it. Since Comrade Bartell raises the question of the 12th Plenum's position in reference to our dispute, I will point out what it says that really has bearing on the question before us.

The report of the Plenum declares that there are some members who "have the tendency to schematize our present position and to accord to the CP's and to our relations with them an importance that the latter do not have.

"The best way of expressing our interest for the category of workers who follow the CP, where they are only minority parties with a restricted base of influence, is to draw them behind us either by the dynamism of our independent action (for example, Ceylon, Bolivia) or by the dynamism and success of our work toward the principal mass of the organized proletariat within the big reformist organizations (for example England, Germany, Austria)."

For America this means, in the main, the CIO where the movement for a mass political organization of American labor will take place.

If beginning with the city organizer's report we have arrived so quickly at the opponent work director's declaration that Stalinism is not counter-revolutionary and that to say so is to be sectarian and to buckle under the pressure of American imperialism -- then it is necessary to understand that the criticisms which Comrade Ring and myself have raised are not back-biting and petty and carping, but are aimed against a fundamental shift in the party's orientation.

What Comrade Ring and myself are doing in our two articles and in this debate, in criticism of what Comrade Bartell wrote in his Report -- is simply to reaffirm, to re-state our movement's position, nationally and internationally, on the question of orientation. We put forth these criticisms in a positive manner and we hope the comrades will give them their serious consideration.

# # #

REPLY TO STEVENS

By Mike Bartell

1. ON THE NATURE OF THE DISCUSSION

Comrade Stevens is "surprised. . . at the development of such an intense discussion." What is he surprised about? He and Ring throw a "discussion article" at us charging that the City Organizer's report has dumped the proletarian orientation overboard in favor of an orientation (maybe even an entry) toward the petty-bourgeois Stalinist circles, has abandoned Negro work altogether, and in general is leading the Local down the road to ruin. This obviously would indicate the organization of an opposition to repudiate the report and the local leadership with it -- an effort in which they have been feverishly engaged ever since.

Why then is he so surprised at the heat? What did he expect? We are reminded of a similar situation with the Johnsonites, who presented us with a "discussion article" attacking us up and down the line, and then complained that we were precipitating a fight when we proposed to debate them.

Comrade Stevens says that by my reaction to their "discussion article" I have revealed that I recognize that we really do have fundamentally different orientations, and that therefore their criticisms are not of merely a carping and sniping variety. He is mistaken. I did not say that their opposition was merely a matter of carping and sniping. I said that these comrades had decided to launch an opposition in the Local in anticipation of a national controversy, and that since they had absolutely no case against the local activities or leadership, they proceeded to fabricate a synthetic platform woven around selected quotations and filled in the holes with irresponsible carping criticism (for example, with regard to our Negro work).

It is true that some comrades are revealing real differences on the nature of Stalinism, and they come as no surprise to many of us. They have been evident for a long time, at least since the opening of the discussion on the Third World Congress. It is apparent now that this discussion was never really completed in our party, that we will have to re-discuss these questions and probe these differences to the very bottom, for otherwise, they will continue to plague us.

The trouble is that these and related questions cannot be settled by a New York City Convention. To introduce them into our local pre-convention discussion, and to insist on making these questions its main axis, as Stevens and Ring have done (after their makeshift local platform collapsed under them) and then to propose a six-week extension of the discussion (a four-month local pre-convention discussion!), which could not possibly resolve these differences in any case, is a thoroughly irresponsible procedure -- especially since these comrades know very well that a national discussion on these very questions is now in preparation. In effect, they are insisting that people take a stand and line up in a national controversy before the documents clarifying the respective views are forthcoming.

I did not introduce any special views in my report on the nature of Stalinism in America or the world. The only point they can find to take issue with is my estimate of the degree of increased receptivity to our ideas in the Stalinist movement, and of the possibilities of fruitful work there. This is not a fundamental difference and does not necessitate an all-out struggle. The only "far reaching proposal" I made was to do fraction work in this movement -- a proposal made in the Political Resolution and one which we are told is not opposed by Stevens and Ring. I was content to leave the broader and more general questions for the proper time and place. But not so Stevens and Ring -- and their supporters.

At this point I will limit myself to a few questions on the subject of Stalinism. Why is it that Stevens and Ring who see two sides to every question, see only one side when they look at Stalinism? How do parties which are counter-revolutionary "through and through" become transformed into parties which lead revolutions? Is it not the logical conclusion of this conception that all revolutions or transformations carried through by Stalinist parties or by the Kremlin, or by a combination of both, are in reality counter-revolutions (China, Yugoslavia, Korea, Eastern Europe)? What has such a view in common with basic Trotskyist conceptions, or with the real facts of the class struggle?

## 2. TRADE UNION WORK

Comrade Stevens describes our setbacks in maritime and the paper union and asks, "Well, what do we do when we suffer defeats? In this vast trade union field in New York City we must imbed ourselves in new fields. That is what we should be discussing here if we are serious." Correct, that is one of the things we should be discussing -- if we are serious. Then why aren't we? Because Comrades Stevens and Ring disdain to discuss such "concrete" questions with us.

Now everybody knows that the New York Local is not strongly rooted in the trade unions. This has always been its weakness. That is why Stevens-Ring have selected this as the principal plank in their "platform." They want to blame the local leadership and its "orientation" for this weakness, and thus make factional capital out of it.

Yet Stevens knows very well that in spite of the obstacles, we have to some extent "imbedded ourselves in new fields." They know that since the defeats he refers to, in these past few years, we have built a strong influential fraction in one of the biggest and most important CIO locals in the area; we have consolidated a significant fraction in District 65; we have placed small fractions in each of two big UAW plants in the metropolitan area. We have maintained our fractions in the painters union, a UE local, and a reduced fraction in another union. We have individual comrades who are well established and respected in a number of other important unions, including the chief steward and a recognized leader of a CIO shop.

If Comrade Stevens is really "serious," why indeed isn't he discussing this problem with us? We had a trade union conference where all this was reported by the City Trade Union Director, but we heard not a word from Comrade Stevens or Ring on which "new fields" we

should "imbed ourselves in." Why don't they give us the benefit of their wisdom and their "superior orientation?" Are we really so far apart that they cannot discuss such questions with us?

Comrade Stevens says, referring to my report: "This negation of our basic trade union orientation, and the substitution for it of opponents work as our main job appears in the very opening sentence that introduces the section called 'trade union' work." This theme is repeated over and over. Here we have a typical example of the Stevensian distortion whose special characteristic is its incredible brazenness.

### 3. WHAT PROPOSALS?

In searching for the cause of the heat, Comrade Stevens finds that "It flows from what was injected by Comrade Bartell, some proposals that appear in a strange light when viewed in connection with the resolutions of the recent convention. My opinion is that these proposals are of such a far reaching character. . . ." (Stevens' emphasis.)

Later on he says: "Thus we were compelled to speak out, to ask some questions, to put forward some positive criticisms and proposals. . . ."

I defy anyone to point to a single proposal in my report, far reaching or otherwise, that Stevens has directly opposed, or a single important proposal which Stevens and Ring offered in their documents (aside from the proposal that we act right now like the revolutionary leadership of the masses in New York, and that we should build a Trotskyist Negro cadre today.)

### 4. OPPONENTS WORK

Now there is one proposal I made which Stevens and Ring have questioned -- but not directly opposed, and the point is extremely illuminating. I refer to the proposal to send a number of comrades into the ALP to do fraction work. Comrade Stevens takes issue with the proposal with a series of twelve questions: "Now why should we do this? What's going on there? What's going to come of it? . . .," etc., etc.

The first thing to observe is that Comrade Stevens does not venture any answers to his own questions.

Second, the answers to his main questions were explicitly given in the Political Resolution adopted by the last national convention -- the very resolution which Stevens-Ring claim they are defending against the heretics:

"Our attitude toward the Progressive Party must be determined by the following considerations: That it is the sole electoral organization of importance in the anti-imperialist camp besides ourselves; that it still groups around itself a considerable number of radical workers and students; that the coalition policy of the leadership is in contradiction with the desires and aspirations of a part of its membership and following."

There follows a discussion of the indicated propaganda tactics and a prescription of fraction work and united front proposals.

My report also answered the questions: "Now why should we do this?" and "What's going on there?" I explained that "its very decline has brought it to a crisis of perspective," and described some of the tendencies which were developing as the crisis approached.

Third, since Comrade Stevens asked his questions, he has been answered by events themselves. The conflicts predicted in both the Political Resolution and Report and Tasks has broken out in the ALP, in an even sharper and clearer form than we had anticipated. The Communist Party has put forth its policy of dissolution into the Democratic Party, and this is meeting with strong resistance in the ranks.

Since the development, we have heard no more questions about "Why should we do this?" or "What's going on there?" The answers are now apparent even to Stevens and Ring. They are now indignantly protesting that they are and always have been for fraction work in the ALP. Indeed as much, if not more so than we. They deny ever having resisted or dragged their feet. Comrade Stevens' "questions" which now appear in print should settle this point once and for all.

This entire experience is a costly lesson in the consequences of sectarian politics. It is a lesson in how this sectarian approach to Stalinism prevents an effective struggle against Stalinism.

I have never exaggerated the possibilities for immediate recruitment from the Stalinist movement. I have always cautioned against any illusions that we could make big or sensational gains from this work. It is true there were some who went overboard, and the most extreme case was that of Comrade Stevens. A year ago, I reported to the Downtown Branch on the results of our 1951 election campaign, and emphasized the powerful impact we had made on the ALP ranks. Comrade Stevens followed me with a hopped-up harangue which reached a climax with the contention that out of 100,000 ALP voters, we should be able to recruit at least 100 members. That was before he spun around 180 degrees on his axis and discovered that we had a trade union orientation.

He has even discovered that "Huberman's little magazine and his discussion circle aren't Tito's army and proletarian revolution. Marcantonio and the ALP are not Mao Tse Tung and the Chinese Red Army." So? So why bother with a mere 52,000 registered ALP'ers or 4,600 miserable readers of "Huberman's little magazine?" After all, Stevens has the many-millioned mass movement all to himself.

Concerning the dispute on the nature of our victory over the Stalinists in the civil liberties struggle and their changed attitude toward us, we have just received a new verification. Last week the "Mayor's Committee on Group Relations" in Newark, N.J. held an open meeting on the question of the eviction of "subversives" from public housing projects. Jimmy Kutcher spoke, and in the course of his remarks mentioned that the only tendency in the labor movement which had failed to support his fight for reinstatement to his job, was the Communist Party. He added that he was glad to see that the Daily Worker finally had carried a favorable editorial about the court de-

cision. The State Secretary of the Communist Party then took the floor and said in essence "although my party has political differences with the last speaker, I want it known that we support his fight against eviction."

Is this a change in line, or not? Is this merely not engaging in an open struggle against our civil rights? Is this a "virtually complete victory" on this issue or not? Does this tend to "legitimize" us "among many of their members and sympathizers," or not?

If all Stevens is trying to prove is that the GPU has not really had a change of heart about Trotskyists, then he is carrying on a private debate with himself.

#### 5. 12TH PLENUM

Stevens quotes from the 12th Plenum report what he thinks "really has bearing on this discussion." It is a typical and most transparent case of his method of selective quotations. Here is the sentence just preceding the one he quotes: "Some of our members still have the tendency to reason along the lines of old, out-dated schema (because conditions have changed) and do not sufficiently keep in mind the new international situation in which all, including the Soviet bureaucracy and the leadership of the Communist parties, are placed." In my opinion this is what "really has bearing on this discussion."

As for the second quotation, I leave it to Comrade Stevens to explain to us how we can "draw them (the CP) behind us" today either by independent action other than the extremely limited actions we have been able to conduct. Let him explain how the type of independent action in Ceylon and Bolivia or the dynamism and success of our work in big reformist organizations (for example, England, Germany, Austria) can be related to the present situation here to our problems with the Stalinists.

#### 6. ON THE CITY COMMITTEE

Comrade Stevens boasts in passing of representing a majority of the City Committee. This is a quarter-truth which would better have been left unsaid (for him). But, characteristically, Stevens could not resist the temptation. Of the 15 members of the City Committee (11 regulars and 4 alternates), 6 support Stevens and Ring and 9 oppose them. Since Stevens and Ring and their four supporters on the committee are all regular members, they do have a 6 to 5 majority of the votes. This committee was elected a year ago when there were no differences, when no one was concerned about votes, and, therefore, the regular members were unanimously chosen on a functional basis -- that is, primarily on the basis of posts. The four alternates, all of whom support my Report, are seasoned comrades with years of experience in the unions. To round out the picture, I repeat that 7 of the 9 trade unionists on the committee reject the Stevens-Ring criticism of Report and Tasks. This would have no special significance were it not for the fact their main criticism against me is that I have abandoned our "basic trade union orientation."

7. I never said there was a "raging terror" in America.

# # #

STATEMENT BY GOLD

Comrade Stevens, in his speech at the New York membership meeting on January 11, which now appears in this bulletin No. 3, made the following references to me (Page 11): "Why this blowing up of the situation in the Stalinist movement out of all proportion to the reality? Perhaps Comrade Gold would like to say that here too we have an 'unfortunate' formulation, that the report is a little inflated at this point, a literary slip, that it is accidental" and further on Page 12: "No, Comrade Gold, you will not make us believe that all of this is merely an unfortunate expression, a fault of style instead of a basic change in orientation."

Now, this rhetorical dialogue Comrade Stevens conducted with me from the platform, which is now being printed in this bulletin (over my protest), is false from beginning to end. I didn't apologize for Comrade Bartell's report when I spoke the previous Sunday before the same New York membership. On the contrary, I began with these words: "I completely solidarize myself with Mike's report for the City Convention and I consider it the soberest report we have had in years." I then went on contrasting the sobriety of this report with quotations from the Stevens-Ring discussion article, from the last National Convention, and from a report by Mike to the 1950 City Convention, which, in my opinion, were decidedly over-optimistic and a good deal inflated.

How could anyone mistake my remarks to mean the very opposite? The answer is that Stevens' factional ears are attuned to hear what he wishes to hear.

I therefore strongly protest the practice of making references in a national internal bulletin to remarks made at a local meeting in a heated discussion where no stenogram or recordings were taken.

# # #