

The „Minority“ Has Been Smoked Out

The "minority" has been smoked out of their hole, and forced to come out in the open. Their first statement, confined mainly to personalities and devoted to abuse and slander, having fallen flat—the landslide of the membership, which they had so confidently counted upon, having proved to be a landslide in the opposite direction—they have now issued a second "statement" in a vain attempt to retrieve their waning fortunes.

In this second statement, the "minority group" attempts to answer some of the fundamental questions of principles and policies which lie at the bottom of the whole "secession" movement and upon which the vital disagreement exists. The second statement proves, what we have all along contended, that the "minority group" are casting about like typical Centrists, to evade the real issues. If fundamental differences exist—AND THEY DO EXIST—then the question of personalities and personal slanders and abuse are of no importance in the issue.

The only justification for a split before a convention is on the question of principles and policies—not on the question whether one or more members of the "majority" of the C. E. C. are capable or incapable of carrying on the work allotted to them, or, are charged (but no means have those charges been proved) with certain acts of commission or omission. Differences on the latter question do not justify a split before a convention. Such delinquent comrades can be very well taken care of at a convention.

It is the recognition by the rank and file of this fact which has forced the "minority" to issue another statement, in which, much against their will, they expose their position on the fundamental issues.

We shall take up the issues in the order in which the "minority group" presents them in their second statement and PROVE how deep the cleavage on fundamentals really is.

Introduction.

The charge of the "minority" that the "majority" "has neither the capability of applying Communist principles in action nor the organization ability to entitle it to such leadership" is obviously another attempt at mud-slinging to lend credibility to their own course of action, but which can easily be recognized as a part of their campaign of slander and has nothing to do either with the "secession" itself, or the reasons for such "secession." The only answer to this charge is the present activities of the C. E. C., which, though deprived of all funds withheld from it by the former Executive Secretary (who does not intend to make restitution but spending this money in building up rival organizations within the party) is able to function better than before the "split."

Unity with the C. L. P.

The "minority" say, "the policy of the majority group toward the Communist Labor Party, both during the Chicago convention and since, was not determined by the widely heralded difference in principles. The "majority" group has been frequently challenged to show these differences by analysis of the program of the two parties, but never has done so."

Of course, the members will recognize that this charge is one of the two main reasons why the "minority group" accused us of "packing" the convention, seven months after that convention. We have smoked the "minority" out already. Let us analyse the charge, and see if they are not evading the real issue of unity with the C. L. P., upon which a fundamental disagreement exists.

The reasons of the "majority" for not effecting immediate amalgamation with the C. L. P. Executive Committee has been dealt with in our statement. Not daring to refute the position expounded there, the "minority" attempts to bring in the issue on another and altogether inconsequential and hypocritical plane.

The present "minority" not only acquiesced in the decision of the convention at that time and later, but applauded the stand taken by the convention on unity. We quote from an article in the September 27th issue of the Communist written by one of the "minority" (Comrade Isaacs); we may also add that the former Executive Secretary was one of the committee elected to draft the reply of which the following quotation is a part:

"It is apparent that this Communist Labor Party adventure has no significance beyond the per-

sonal ability of a few dozens to give their membership representation in either of the two real conventions, that of the old party or that of the new Communist Party. IT WILL STAND AS A GRAPHIC PORTRAYAL OF THE VICIOUSNESS OF CENTRISM, WITH ITS PLAY ON REVOLUTIONARY PHRASES AND ITS NEGATION OF DECISIVE ACTION..."

Mark you, the "minority," who now have the unmitigated effrontery to talk about what the convention did or failed to do to unite both conventions, subscribed and endorsed the above statement!

Now as to the two programs.

Was there any doubt in anybody's mind as to what the C. L. P. program really represented? Up to the January raids, the "minority" fully recognized the heterogeneous mixture of Syndicalism, Centrism and confused Communism which that program contained. In the "minority" motion for unity sometime in October or November (expressed at that time, in an attempt to liquidate financially the C. L. P.), they so characterized it themselves. To-day they charge that we, the "majority," did not discuss both programs! What monumental hypocrisy!

During, and immediately after the convention, the present "minority" sang hymns of praise to the convention and to the Communist lessons they learnt. We quote again from an article which appeared in the September 27th issue of the Communist as an example of the inconsistency of this Centrist aggregation. We need not add that we entirely disapprove of the eulogies and praise, nor the manner of its expression (characteristically Centrist) in which it is written. We quote it merely to point out their hypocrisy and inconsistency:

"There are many other respects in which this convention stands out from all other Socialist gatherings in America. For one thing, the fact that the Federation delegates were largely Slavic emphasized the close union between the organization of the Communist Party here and the parent organization which came into being at Moscow in March of this year—The Communist International. It was the Russian expression of Marxism which predominated this convention, the Marxism of Lenine, and the party traditions of the Bolsheviks.

"One delegate after another expressed amazement at the lessons thus brought before him. Many years of most valuable experience were compacted into one week; and there is no question but that the students ran the teachers a merry pace."

To-day, this convention was "packed" and the "majority" did not discuss programs! The writer of this article Comrade Isaacs (which expressed the "minority" point of view at that time) who thought he had learnt so much then, has now renounced Communism altogether like a Harold Lord Varney. Compare the above with the treacherous article from his pen printed elsewhere in this issue.

It seems that the United States Department of Labor is better able to judge of the differences between the two programs than our own "minority group"!

Why don't the "minority" come out with the truth and state squarely that they agree more with the C. L. P. than they do with the Communist Party, instead of hiding behind seven months' old excuses which they themselves suddenly resurrect when it helps them to hide the real issue?

* * *

In introducing their discussion of principles the "minority" say: "analysis of 'these differences in principles' is only necessary to show the hypocritical and demagogic character of this majority group."

The inference made is, of course, that there is no difference of principles worth mentioning (Centrists always try to prove that they do not disagree in principles with the Extreme Left) but, no sooner do they open their mouth than they put their foot in it, to use a colloquism.

The Third International.

The "minority" claim that through some twisting of facts an issue has been created where no real issue exists. And then naively expose that difference themselves. They say: "the 'minority' did not at any time oppose on principle the establishment of relations with the Third International." (Italics ours.)

This is a typical way of confusing the issue. The issue is not the establishment of relations but—THE KIND OF RELATIONS TO BE ESTABLISHED, which is an entirely different matter.

As to the kind of relations to be established the "minority" boast that the former Executive Secretary took steps to fully acquaint the Third International with the facts about the organization and the principles of the Communist Party. What were those steps? MERE CORRESPONDENCE.

Certain documents, such as the Manifesto, Program, Constitution and the International Secretary's report were enclosed in a packet and smuggled to Europe from where it was transmitted to Moscow.

This is the extent and kind of international relations the "minority" believes is sufficient. We need not repeat the C. E. C. position on this question. It was dealt with fully and reveals unquestionably an entirely different conception of establishment of relations with the Third International. At this time we merely wish to bring additional proof that the "minority" at all times opposed the sending of any delegates to establish connections and attend meetings of The Third International, of which sufficient knowledge was in our possession.

The "minority statement" says that "the controversy over sending the International Secretary to Europe was not over the question whether we should be represented in The Third International. It was because underhanded methods were resorted to and over the question of time and party resources."

What tommyrot! What sheer hypocrisy!

The "minority" refused to obey the decisions of the convention, refused to send the International Secretary upon presentation of a letter from Comrade Rutgers urging that delegates be sent, and attempted to postpone his going until it would be too late for the meeting Rutgers mentioned.

The Chicago Executive Council (controlled by the "minority") made a motion to postpone the next regular meeting of the C. E. C. from November 1st to December 20th, BECAUSE THEY FEARED THAT THE C. E. C. WOULD OVERRULE THEIR DECISION. One of the arguments made by the "minority" in postponing that meeting was the following: "This work (building up the party) is SECRETARIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PURELY. Comrade Fraina appears to be in the mood of throwing the whole question of sensible party administration into the issue of his immediate departure for Europe."

And to prove that the "minority" used the same arguments then as they do now, we shall quote Comrade Fraina's answer on this point raised by the "minority": "The international relations of the party, our contact with the Communist International, is not something that can be postponed for six months or one year, or decided by correspondence; but requires immediate discussion and action by the full Central Committee."

So it is quite evident that the "minority" LIE when they say that they were not opposed to the sending of Fraina to Europe. They tried by every trick (and the former Executive Secretary, having been a secretary of a Socialist local for ten or twelve years, is a past master at such tricks) to delay and postpone his going until it would be too late for him to go in time to attend the Conference.

Later on, when by the initiative of the "majority" Fraina did go, and he had borrowed \$200.00 more on the eve of his departure, the "minority" refused to pay the money so borrowed, even though the conditions of his going had changed and the borrowed money was necessary for him to accomplish his mission.

Still later, (February 7th) at a Council meeting in New York, when a communication from Fraina was received that the conference at Amsterdam was over and asking whether he should proceed to Moscow and if so, to cable him \$300.00 more for this purpose (and a letter from Comrade Rutgers corroborating this was also read) the "minority" introduced a motion, not that he should not proceed (Centrists never act straightforwardly but in a roundabout way) but "that no money should be advanced to the International Secretary until an accounting is made." Do the