

2723

bulletin no. 1



REPORT ON
ORGANIZATION

October 1959

2723

ORGANIZATION REPORT

(Transcript of Chairman's Report to Expanded REB Meeting, Aug. 22, 1959)

I New Stage of Development

In Hollywood they call it, "making a big production out of something." And in TV they call it "a spectacular." But we do the work, and understate it -- especially if it's a worker who does the work.

The reason I had asked Inez not to show the Afro-Asian pamphlet before her report on Finances, and then to show it at that point, was that it is indeed a very big achievement for us -- both in the speed with which it was executed, and in that she alone was responsible for the technical work (and, as we all know, technical is impossible to separate from the political). She did the design of the cover -- the actual artistic work -- and the design of the pamphlet in general.

We all know that we have very few things, except "Indignant Heart" and The Constitution, which we can give to people so they can see our ideas without having to wade through the 400 pages of MARKISM AND FREEDOM, which is not the easiest work to read. The pamphlet gives our major ideas on Marxist Humanism, and gives them not as an abstract lecture but through the application to what everyone is talking about, the new elements in the world, the newly arisen Afro-Asian nation. I believe that Inez's modesty is symptomatic of the modesty with which a worker does such a job.

You have just heard a Finance Report which revealed the special responsibility -- and a heavy one it was -- that the REB and NEB have undertaken in financing the translation, the trip, and the regular petty cash fund for the chairman without any campaign on the part of the membership. Not only does that display the seriousness with which the leadership considers its obligations, but it was a very hard blow to take because we weren't supposed to pay for the translation.

The pull of the Communist Party, and the Socialist Party -- any of the mass parties -- is so great that the one who had broken with the Communists and looked as if he were coming toward us, and who happened to have money and was going to pay for the translation, has since decided to go over to the Henni socialists. Yet, that surprise element, instead of being a blow to the organization, was just taken in stride. I think there are certain things like this that the membership has to realize the leadership does just as a matter of course.

Coincidentally, as you heard, Barb and Morgan were also able to raise \$100 for the translation, which is not why we include their move as part of the REB-NEB activities. The "why" of the inclusions deals with more basic fundamentals than money. It is that their move to virgin territory (insofar as Marxist Humanist ideas are concerned) will demand work of a leadership, a founder nature. It is a happy coincidence, there-

fore, that the activity of the REB is concentrated on the organizational plane at the present moment and sets an example for them, and a task for itself.

Only if the REB proceeds and expands its work can we move from just gaining wings to being able to really stay up there. It's the staying power and not the initial gaining of the wings which is the test. That is particularly important now because since the founding of the organization this will be the first time that the Chairman and the REB will have had a physical separation. I've always taken tours, but I could always be reachable. Now I'm not only not going to be reachable, but will not wish to be reachable. I must be a European for at least 3 months.

The fact that this activity was begun ahead of departure shows that just as each stage in the development of theory arises out of the actual stage of development of the objective world -- in a word, the class struggle -- so each stage in organizational development proves the (I hope you forgive me the phrase, but I have to use it) vanguard's comprehension of their own theory. WITHOUT ORGANIZATIONAL GROWTH, COMPREHENSION OF THEORY WOULD BE BUT AN ABSTRACTION. And Abstractions always aid the enemy, not the working class.

Organizational growth, it must be stressed again and again, in this meeting of the expanded REB, at this period from now to Thanksgiving, is not a question only of breaking out of our isolation. Rather it is a test of leadership realizing, not just seeing or comprehending, but REALIZING; -- that is, putting into practice -- its own comprehension of Marxist Humanism.

It is true that in one sense, the REB suffers from non-recognition of its leadership by the membership, which is the fate of all generals who are generals without an army. But in another sense, it is thrust forward by this compulsion to prove theoretical comprehension in an organizational form.

I think if we go into the how of individual responsibility and collective growth achieving a synthesis, or a merger, or a theoretic understanding, or whatever you want to call it (even a party, it wouldn't be bad if we ended up with one) it is necessary to begin from where the worker stands and what it is he thinks, and how it is he approaches this merger with the intellectual. They don't want the intellectual who's an enemy. But they certainly want the intellectual who considers thought for what it is -- an activity of the human being -- which they do not want to separate from the wholeness of the human being that capitalism depersonalizes into a cog in the machine. It is important to begin with the worker not only because he is the essence of theory, but because at this stage, he will either get us to the new audiences that are working class, or we will fail to have the proletarian stamp on our activity, whether we have aimed our activity at worker or at intellectual.

(1) As editor of the paper and man on the production line, Charles Donby should certainly be able to concretize MARKISM AND FREEDOM by producing a pamphlet addressed to union and non-union strata of Negro workers. If this were an intellectual job, whether it were

27.2.6

-3-

done by an intellectual or by a worker, you could do it merely by reading MARXISM AND FREEDOM, and writing what the old radicals used to call a popularization -- putting it into easier words. But it is not an intellectual job. We could put it into easier words easily enough.

Finding new audiences for it means first of all that you have to find them ahead of writing the popularization, and therefore it can be done only after some concentrated activity on membership growth that has resulted in actual members and a periphery. In other words, it's not you who are going to teach them what MARXISM AND FREEDOM means. It is they who will demand a new point of departure for theory and practice from their experience, not from ours. And not even from yours, Donby, even though you're a worker. It is they who will make you realize the need to bring MARXISM AND FREEDOM out of its high atmospheric level and onto the groundwork, or "footing", of the workers' own experiences and aspirations, which must be answered in the form of a concrete pamphlet, not because you're searching for easier words than the ones I had, but because you're searching for entirely different thoughts.

It's a new relationship you find with the workers when you begin to learn from them, even though you yourself are a worker. In that process and not before that process is completed, can you write that pamphlet which is so needed by the organization. We could give you an assignment and I'm sure you would do a very good job. But that is not the job that needs to be done if we're going to reach wider audiences. It has to be done on this entirely new level of getting to know them first and getting used to listen to workers who do not have your experience, who have not been convinced to Marxist Humanism, and who ask questions that may sound very silly to you -- even though you're a worker, too. You suddenly find out they're not silly at all. They have started from an entirely new level of experience and aspiration, and therefore your answer is an answer to their problems in which you show that Marxist Humanism has an application. You can't show it has an application if it hasn't yet been applied.

The acquiring of new members produces not just a "new audience" -- as a passive recipient of the learnedness of our editor, or anyone of us -- but a new dimension in the editor himself, because it is this new flesh and blood and gray matter that made him grow. He may have thought he understood MARXISM AND FREEDOM from 2 sources: first, his own life which brought him to us; and second, from lectures. But he will see, after he gains this new periphery, that all he understood before was mere background, while his own activity produces a new point of departure, not only to a wider audience, but to a new theory. Because every creative interpretation of an old theory is a new theory. That's what Marxist Humanism is -- an interpretation of an old theory, Marxism. But it couldn't have been done or had that form of Marxist Humanism before the 1950's; otherwise it would have. Marx was greater than we -- he didn't give it that form. And if he didn't, neither could anyone else.

And (2) John, the intellectual, need no longer worry that we have not entered into the lives of the community, or participated in the class struggle with a language all its own. In turn he must recognize (more than in passing -- for in passing, I'm sure he recognizes it) that the 10% experience that the Trotskyists have on us in running an organization, producing a magazine and a newspaper, etc., is easily gotten -- while the 90% theoretical jump that we have on them, not only in MARXISM AND FREEDOM, but

7 2 7

4

in NEWS AND LETTERS, in its editor, cannot be gotten by them without such a thorough reorganization that in fact they would no longer be themselves. They would no longer be Trotskyists, and Trotskyism would enter as what it deserves to be -- a mere footnote in history.

Or (5) to return to a worker again, Inez would have made a "production" out of this pamphlet -- and, after this neighborhood work gains a momentum of its own, she will no doubt become a top rate organizational secretary. That's what she has to become at the end of these three months. Because that's the one thing that will make it possible to expand our theory into the life and thought of the workers, battling Automation and the daily hardships of a worker's life, when the working day is done. It isn't only in the shop, but the housework when you come home, and what-
ever else piles up on you, and these questions, too, must be answered.

If it was impossible to get to a higher stage, or more concrete stage, than she has gotten before on the question of the opposite to Automation -- that is, that the opposite to alienated labor is a type of work that is like life itself, a matter of the self-development of the human being -- in the manner in which she expressed it in her article quoted in MARXISM AND FREEDOM, then she would be able to realize it in this new era.

For example, she has certainly enjoyed meeting Esther. Now all she has to do is convince her to be a member. Then she will prove her organizational work -- because it isn't just an organizational question. Otherwise, anybody could -- in fact, we all did -- ask her to join without too much success. It is a question of breaking through on a new point in theory which will not sound abstract or separated from her life.

With all due respect to all of us, and I think I appreciate as much as anyone in this room the great theoretic contributions we have made -- and I certainly do not separate the great theoretic contributions we have made from the practice of the class struggle, because, small as we are, we have certainly made our mark wherever we were in contact with the class struggle, whether it was the rank and file struggle in 212, or whether it was the unemployed movement, or whether it was a great big miners' strike --

Nevertheless, I say with all due respect to all these great contributions we made, it is high time we approached the routines of our own organization as the one, the only and the total -- the one, the only and the total -- proof of theory and practice. This proof depends on the activity of each and all, especially each.

This doesn't mean we haven't been active. Everyone knows that if there is one thing we regret it's that a day somehow only has 24 hours. Before you turn around that day is done, and by the time you have put in 8 hours of labor for the capitalists, just to earn a living, and 2 more hours on the miserable transportation back and forth, and perhaps half an hour trying to get the noise of the factory out of your head, and become a human being -- that's when our work first starts.

I'm talking about activity that is organized in your mind, as much as the fact that you go out today to knock on someone's door. In other words, it has a purpose that

2727

is defined concretely and that you never vary from until you're ready to have an intellectual discussion with yourself and say, "After three months on this block, it's no good, and I'm going somewhere else."

Decide whatever you want to decide, but it cannot be made as a decision unless you have gone through, in your mind, the activity that you had actually participated in, made generalizations for both theory and the organization, and then made a conclusion which leads you to something else. In other words, we are the greatest empiricists in one sense, because everything comes out of the class struggle and our work; and on the other hand, we refuse to be empiricists in the sense of being eclectic. We refuse to be eclectic because, at the point of the conclusion of a certain activity, whether it's in thought or in the work of the hands, it should lead to some generalization. In other words, out of all the empiric studies, whether they are of science or of labor, or of anything else -- even music -- you draw certain generalizations.

You don't go around like an animal just doing the same thing you did before. You say, "Now I've done this and this for so many years of my life, and this and this is what it has produced. I am, or I am not, satisfied with this result, and I will therefore draw this and this conclusion." Even though you never judge outside of experience, it is always based on the concrete. It doesn't continue endlessly without your drawing a generalization and saying that the particular experience you have had, difficulties, or results, or non-results, has led to this and this, a conclusion. In other words, there is a dialectical interrelationship when your thought, your activity, your desire, your aspirations, come together in what you're doing in order to reconstruct society.

This ability to generalize on the basis of both the empiric and the theoretic level, has given birth to parties, and particularly so, working class parties. Why do we have such a phenomenon as a party? I'll limit myself for now to the working class parties. I am talking about groups of workers and intellectuals, whether they called themselves abolitionists in this country, or Marxists in Germany, or Anarchists somewhere else.

What gives birth to a sudden grouping where human beings say that because the movement of history up to this point has resulted in the misery of slavery on this earth, they will give their lives to the abolition of slavery? What gives birth to the fact that instead of you saying it as an individual, suddenly there are 12 people who say it and a party arises? It is the realization that this idea of being not just one individual but several -- whether it's six or six thousand doesn't make any difference because it's both six and six thousand depending on your stage of development -- represents the element of the movement forward of history itself. Capitalism, or any class society, having divided the human being into mental and manual labor, the necessity to reconstitute the human being with a heart and a soul as a whole human being has fallen on the few who have listened, consciously or unconsciously, to the movement of history and wanted to be part of that movement. It hasn't been invented by anybody. It came just as naturally as the class struggle comes, whether it's a wild-cat strike or an official strike. When it comes it immediately reaches another point -- how to reach the big mass that isn't in this room but that you say you represent. It may take a decade, a month, a year, or 50 years. How do you prove this movement you thought you heard?

-6-

II ORGANIZATION, ORGANIZATION, ORGANIZATION

On this question of organization I know that the way I'm using the term will sound very "unkosher" to all of us who have been raised on the fact that we are opposed to the vanguard to lead — and we still are opposed to the vanguard to lead. But I think if we go a little further into the concretization it will be seen why I am now insisting on using this "unkosher" term. To gain members you need not only theory, of which we have plenty, and practice, of which we have some. We need something simpler in one respect, and much more difficult in another. We need that which is the will in each of us. We need the plain work of Jimmy Higgins — er Tom, Dick and Harry, if you prefer — that goes to make up what is known as a cadre. That is the spinal chord or spirit and sweat called organization. It begins with you taking yourself seriously first of all. No one will take you seriously unless you take yourself seriously, and you take yourself seriously because you have a cause.

The organizational form which comes so naturally to workers when they want immediate things — they go out on a wildcat and say "I want those conditions in the shop changed, and I'm not going back until they are" — and is our second nature insofar as so-called ultimate results are concerned, must somehow merge on all levels so that, just as theory and practice are one, so are ultimate and immediate.

If we feel that there is no division between ultimate and immediate, if we see the dialectic whereby each struggle for a different condition in the factory, or for an end to the alienated intellectual, is fused, then everyone who talks to us — whether it is on what car we are going to buy or not buy because we have no money for it, or whether it's at home or at a meeting — they will feel it. In other words, if we live breathe, think, act organizationally, so will they. If we don't, then they will make the separation. And you will not achieve the membership growth that you must prove yourself for. I don't care how great anybody's theory is, if you don't grow you're sure to deteriorate because theory isn't forever either. You always have to restate it, not only for your age in general, but for your everyday activity in particular.

* * * * *

Now, I want to take another look, if I may, at Lenin. In the talk on Western Europe and us, I stressed the period, 1903-1923, as something that didn't stand still. It evolved into something different each time. I want to take it up now, both as to what it meant at each big period, and what it meant by different levels. I keep stressing here that we must merge on all different levels. of relationship to the worker on the outside, relationship to the intellectual on the outside — relations within, without, until there is a merger where people say "I have to join this organization if I mean anything, or if I say human beings are not there just to be made into cannon fodder."

Let's begin with 1903. Lenin was confronted, in the Tsarist Russia of that day, with a Marxist grouping. He didn't found it you know. It was founded before his time by Plekhanov. It was quite loose. They all said they believed in Marxism — that means we believe in the proletariat being the

motive force of history, that means we are for a socialist society, etc., -- but in view of the fact that we live in this miserable society that doesn't even have a republic, that doesn't even have bourgeois democracy, that is still a totalitarian Tsarist regime, and we are so tiny (less than the people in this room) we should really want to have a lot of people with us. The way Plekhanov tried to get a lot of people with him is to say to intellectuals, like Dave and Joe who are here today, "You believe in Marxist Humanism? Don't bother to attend any meetings. Just write stories. We'll accept anything that says there is such a thing." In other words, they defined a member of the organization as one who believed in the ideas, and tried to spread them in which ever way he as an individual could.

Lenin said: Absolutely not. A member is a person who believes in the ideas, of course. But that is only the beginning. He is made different, whether he is an intellectual or not, by the organizational form -- he must attend a meeting, he must make a distribution, and so on. Besides which, just because it's a Tsarist regime and we have such a big task, it doesn't mean that we don't have a special task. It is true that Lenin also said that in addition to discipline in what is a member, the organization must also bring socialist consciousness to the proletariat who, on his own, can only gain trade union consciousness. That was said for the benefit of the trade unionists who said that all you must do is have the workers join the union and that's good enough.

When 1905 came, it showed him that this backward Russian proletariat and peasantry were a good deal more advanced than a lot of people talking Marxism. They made a Revolution. THEY went out and did it. He changed his position on only one thing -- that you don't have to bring socialist consciousness to the workers, that they can and do evolve to it as instinctively as to the trade unions. He did not change his position that it must take an organizational form. That relation to the worker did not change by the fact that the 1905 Revolution proved the maturity of the Russian proletariat. Not only that, at each stage of the development of theory he did not separate it from organization.

For example, you've heard me speak a lot against the theory of the "permanent revolution" and its abstractions. What exactly happened? Why does it sound so beautiful, the "permanent revolution," but did not answer the questions, and Lenin refused to pay any attention to it at all?

When the 1905 Revolution was defeated, and you were confronted with a Tsarist autocracy even more bloody than the one before the Revolution because they had to achieve the counter-revolution -- the question became, in theory, and I'm talking now only of theory, "Who are to be the allies of this proletariat that is so isolated?" There was a vast sea of peasants. Since it was supposed to be a bourgeois revolution, a lot of people said, "We have to go with the liberals, at least to the overthrow of Tsarism."

Lenin said: Absolutely not. We go to the peasantry, they're our genuine ally. In other words, the theoretic point, of allies in a revolution that was proletarian but in a peasant country, defined a relationship to the classes which in turn meant that Lenin then called for the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. In other words, he said these

will run the government if we overthrow Tzarism. The others said the parliament. He said: No. I don't know the form, but something between the workers and the peasants."

When Trotsky said that because the proletariat is so advanced, so concentrated, so powerful, therefore they can jump directly into the socialist revolution, he refused to answer Lenin's question about who is going to rule. In fact, he did a lot of flirting around with the liberals himself. And he certainly rejected the peasantry as not mature enough or even capable of thinking. The result was that from his theory of "permanent revolution" nothing flowed in any organizational form -- nothing. Today he was a Menshevik; tomorrow he was a Bolshevik; the third day he was all by himself -- nothing. When 1917 came there were 12 other generals just as great as he, and they all came -- it was a great big revolution -- with millions and millions of people already there. Whom was he compelled to turn to when he was still resisting the pull of Bolshevism? Gorki! In other words, an individual writer who had his own paper and didn't even know where he was going except that he certainly wasn't going with the Bolsheviks.

On the other hand, there were the Bolsheviks, who had always translated their theory into an organizational form, growing by leaps and bounds. Lenin was nowhere in sight. Absolutely nowhere. Because the theory had always taken the organizational form, despite Lenin's absence from Russia for the period of 1908 to 1917 -- that's nine years, most of which were spent deep underground (for breathing they sent you to Siberia) -- they not only had an organization that had a mass base, but a paper, and a cadre. All this in the few short months between February, 1917, when they first became a legal organization, and April -- mind you how short a period that is -- when Lenin came with his April theses. "Pravda" became a mass paper overnight. There was the cadre, that hard working daily core, including Stalin, who knew that on Monday the paper had to come out, and on Tuesday it had to be distributed, and on Wednesday something else had to be done.

Because they had not separated theory from practice or from organization, when Lenin came and said: You people are all wrong; I don't know what society you live in, and I'm the one who has been away for 9 years. Where were you? Look at all these people already discussing Kerensky and you still talk about defending Kerensky.

Then he said: If you, my party, my political committee, are not going to put the question of power on the agenda, I will go to the sailors. They understand me better. The sailors are 1000 times more revolutionary than you are. The party membership is 100 times more revolutionary than the party leadership, and the people on the outside are 1000 times more, and the sailors the most of all.

That's what Trotsky is always emphasizing -- that without Lenin there would have been no revolution because they hadn't had the right policy, and he supposedly had the right policy. He certainly was for a revolution at that time. The truth of the matter is that whereas Lenin threatened to go to the sailors, he never had to. You can say that the committee accepted his policy because he was forceful, or he rammed it down their

throats, or whatever you want to say. The truth is that because he was always checking his theory with an organizational form, it had two ways that it could always prove itself: 1) to the masses who will follow you on the basis of what they want; and 2) they were in daily contact with those revolutionary masses who were daily dissatisfied with the sort of democracy they had.

Tsarism was overthrown, but... Thereupon you must begin also to listen to your leader. You heard him because you also heard the masses, or you heard the masses because you also heard him. I don't care who you put first, the cart or the horse. The point is that they merged because of the fact that there was always an organizational form. That proved or disproved whether you really answered and were moving along with the masses who were trying to establish a new society. Or you didn't have an organizational form. If you didn't have an organizational form, as Trotsky didn't, you had to join the Bolsheviks finally. He had to do that or just stay there and be a great orator, and move great millions of masses of people -- to what? What would compel them when he told them to make the revolution?

Lenin had something to say when he said, "All power to the Soviets," and "We are the party that represents the knowing of the proletariat. We'll help you get this power, and we'll function alongside."

You see, if Trotsky had spent one-tenth of the time in learning the lessons between 1908 and 1917, instead of teaching the lessons of October, we wouldn't have had a Fourth International that turned out to be merely the left front of Communism. Now, I want you to get the organizational form, not as an abstraction, but as concretely what it meant: 1) editing a paper in Russia, by yourselves, without the leader; 2) distributing it, just as well illegally as legally, whether it had to be stolen in or distributed openly among the masses; 3) daily contact with the masses.

It's easy to have daily contact when it's not underground: when you have a revolution you always have thousands of masses. But because you had an organizational form to your theory he never allowed the Bolshevik party not to have a relation to the masses. Even if it was one single worker they got hold of him somewhere. I'm sure some of you have heard me tell the story many times: one of the favorite forms necessitated by the underground condition in Russia of organizing the Bolshevik party was the toilet in the factories. They were just out-houses. They didn't have such nice toilets as you have in your factories. It was so stinking that the foreman never went near it. So, that's where the Bolsheviks hung up their leaflets.

III THESE THREE MONTHS

Now then, to go from the historic height to our daily routines is not either a routine job, or a descent from the sublime to the prosaic -- for it is the prosaic, as I showed, which sent them on to sublime; and we will not need decades, but mere years to reach the sublime, so mature is our age. Even on the tiny scale which we are, we could prove that this organizational form does lead to an expansion of the paper.

You went around to a neighborhood, distributed the paper, went back the next week to ask what they thought and ask for a sub.

In these few weeks we gained ten new subs, here and in Los Angeles. And, why do you suppose Andy was so great — he met some steelworkers — not only the one from Pittsburgh, but some right here in Detroit. The result is that already in the next issue of the paper we will have for the first time the expression of what the steelworkers in this city think. We have it from a steelworker who said so. If you immediately judge, and it's altogether too soon to judge because the work will have to continue, then it isn't routine to knock on the door and ask. It has meant both a sub for the paper, so the steelworker can hear your story, and a story for the paper so that you will be able to hear the new impulses from other strata.

Secondly and aboveall — and that's why I'm sorry you didn't leave this for the big climax — this pamphlet. It is to be sold, not given away. Everyone who got one here has to deposit 25¢. That's going to be one of the most wonderful experiences for you. What's so wrong about asking money for something that has your ideas in it? It has already changed some of the concepts that Johnny will present, I know. He wants to begin at each factory gate, while two people distribute the paper another sells the pamphlet.

Just as the neighborhood has already brought different stories, the pamphlet and the sale, rather than the distribution, will give a different kind of contact, both in the neighborhood as well as in the factories. All the pamphlets are to be sold except a few free copies for review only. Saul is making up a list which will be very limited because I don't think they will review, but it's worth sending out to the main newspapers and magazines, and a few gift copies for the libraries. There are only about three or four books in English libraries: one in Liverpool, one in Glasgow, and one in London and somewhere else. But there are already some 12 meetings scheduled for me. So the person who doesn't have the quarter can read it in the library.

Because we are few I think we do need some ads, and one in Dissent we'll vote on today. Now, the people who actually send in a \$5 bill for the book and the paper, I suggest we start them off with this issue and not the next. Thus, they will get the supplement, but still not the pamphlet.

I know that when Johnny begins to concretize for the local here what it means for the activity in Detroit, it will not be as activity for someone else because we're all members of Detroit, but as a matter of everyone's own self-development. The mailings that will go out with it, or on the special meeting later, all should also have a banner head on the question of "just off the press."

Denby will, along with the HEB, have many more responsibilities while I'm gone, to keep the paper on as high a level as heretofore. He is to make sure that it always, every single issue, carries new stories from people who are not members. We are not a sectarian group interested only in what we think. "Indignant Heart" must be followed up by resolute builders of a Marxist Humanist organization. Even as the indignant hearts of 1789 — the enragees — are not the same ones we have today, they need more than just

indignant hearts, they need an organization, a theory, and this resolute life.

Now, the lucky accident that B & M happen to be leaving will give us yet a new experience to found a Marxist Humanist organization in a new area by two people who are not workers. In other words, they'll have all the elements; they'll begin with young intellectuals like Dave and Joe here, so this is a very good experience for them. I hope, in the course of the discussion, that they raise problems for us to discuss.

I think that if we keep up these three months of work to the grindstone, we will find not only that we have grown in organizational strength but that we have grown in theoretic depth — and all these pamphlets, and many more, that I mentioned will automatically flow off the press. If there is anything that we haven't followed through, it is what used to be called the "penny press." We'll have to charge 25¢ now instead of a penny, but we should have at least a dozen pamphlets on every conceivable subject from the youth, to the Negro, to the women. You see McShane, the 60-year old man with all that tremendous experience in the class struggle. He wants to see individual chapters of Marxism and Freedom reprinted as pamphlets. That is because he has a cadre in him. He knows what it is. And at the age of over 60 he's not the least bit discouraged that Communism has become this horrible monster because he's absolutely sure the workers will build something better — and maybe he will live ten more years, and by that time we'll see the new society ushered in.

I believe that if, in this next period, we have gotten our 500 pamphlets, as a minimum, sold, perhaps 1,000; 50 new subs; half a dozen new members — then the REB-NEB will have met its test. And when they produce a bulletin I will be the first one to read it avidly, every comma and period, so that I reorient myself to bring in the American movement upon my return.
