

Bolshevism," raised by the Communist Labor Party and by some "persistent voices" within the Communist Party. His only regret is that these protests were "confused"—so far as the Communist Labor Party was concerned, and that they were "officially stifled" within the Communist Party. . . . He longs for the Left Wing, dreams of that blissful time when he will be "back again in the Left Wing. . . ." His whole article, in fact, is a continuous moaning for the Left Wing.

The language federations of the Party,—particularly the Russian Federation,—were instrumental in the organization of the Communist Party in the United States. This is a well-known and established fact by this time. Comrade Zinoviev, the Chairman of the Communist International, in one of his official communications, calls the Russian Communist Federations—"promulgators of the Communist movement in the United States."

Y. F. undoubtedly also knows and recognizes this fact. But just because of this—he, a sentimental bard of the Left Wing,—bitterly hates and attacks the Russian Federations: "The net result of the Federation leadership has been an absolute pushing backward of the revolutionary Socialist movement in the United States," he indignantly exclaims.

O, of course, since the Communist Party has already been organized in this country—"it is assuredly not the desire at this date to quarrel with the fact of the starting of the Communist Party," he tries to reassure us. He is so magnanimous, that he does not even mention—"at this date"—that the Convention, at which the Communist Party was started, had been "packed. . . ."

But he "accepted" the Communist Party simply and only because it seemed to him a good "forum in which to fight against domination of an aggressive, active, hopeful membership by a small clique of vain politicians. . . ."

By the way, Comrade Reader, does this not have a familiar ring to you—this charge of "a small clique of vain politicians"? Isn't this the very same charge flung against Lenin and his gang" by the reptile press in "dominating and suppressing the good, kind and generous but simple Russian people"?

he accusation that "an aggressive membership" could be or has been dominated by a "small clique of politicians," certainly sounds just as absurd as the most ridiculous and lying accusations invented against the Bolsheviks by the capitalist press.

While virulently attacking the Federations for their "fight to conquer the Left Wing"—in order to transform it into the Communist Party,—our virtuous Left-Winger confesses, however, his aim as well as his adherents in the Communist convention and subsequently in the Communist Party was "a Left Wing conquest of the Communist Party"—in other words,—re-transformation of the Communist Party back into the Left Wing:

"Once in Communist Convention (in other words, —once such a "catastrophe" had happened), there appeared no escape from the dilemma except a Left Wing conquest of the Communist Party! . . ."

The Federations, and especially the more experienced Russian Federations understood very well, and saw through the tricky plans of the "perpetual-Left-Wingers"; they realized the danger of a "Left Wing conquest (or absorption) of the Communist Party" and acted accordingly. . . . But Y. F. and his adherents did not understand and did not know that they and their plans were discovered and warded against,—and this is precisely why he so "sarcastically" accuses (in his naivety not suspecting even how comically it really sounds) the Federations of applying an "arbitrary calendar test" in the process of the formation of the Communist Party.

No, dear Y. F.—though you are a "learned statesman" and "political scientist"—you did not understand them, and still do not understand, that it was not a "calendar test." The question was not of a date, but of the method of formation of the Communist Party. Substantially, there was no difference whether to start it officially on June 22nd or on September 1st,—and as matter of fact the Federations shifted the date from the former to the latter,—but it was important, and it made a great difference as to how to start the Party. It is one thing to start with a clearly defined, real, Communist Party from, and with a membership, already consciously Communist,—who in fact were already Communists,—and it is quite a different thing to invite to participation in its formation, and in the formulation of its program and tactics, elements—large numerically but poor in "Communist quality. . . ."

But, we realize, of course, that such considerations are beyond the understanding of our learned statesman and author. . . .

Having failed in an attempt of a "Left Wing conquest of the Communist Party" at its first Convention, and in several similar attempts (in fact,—it was one continuous attempt) during the subsequent seven months of the Party existence, our "Lord Varney" and his followers were not discouraged; they found their consolation in the sentence: "defeats are only disastrous when we fail to acquire a new wisdom and a new determination out of them."

And so they decided to arm themselves with "a new wisdom and a new determination," in order to save the Party, and incidentally "liberate" it from the "exotic (read: foreign) domination" by Federations.

"A new wisdom" soon prompted them a proper course of action, while a "new determination" made them ready and willing to accomplish "something really big, something extraordinary."

The Communist movement in the United States has gone backward since June 1919, "having been dramatically declared by the Don Quixote "theoretician" of the "minority group,"—his administrative Sancho Panza—Damon—decided to interpret this statement into action. . . . And, since "the Communist movement has gone backward,"—it was only natural that he decided to push it "forward," to—June of last year. . . ."

His recent "coup d'etat" in the C. E. C. and the C. P. was clearly an attempt to carry out that plan and that decision. It was a deliberate attempt to accomplish the longed-for desire of the "minority" and to return the Party to that delightful primitive stage of "Left-Wingism." Had their plan succeeded, there would be—just as in June of last

* Not being a "theoretician" and sneeringly branding as "great theorists" all those who "constantly talk about principles," Damon, as is well known, is a "man of action" and a "great administrator and organizer." His administrative and organizing genius found its expression in the following profound sentences in his "Statement to the Majority members of the E. C." (Ex. Council): "The Chicago District Organizer . . . is the most capable man in such a position. . . . He has turned over to the National organization . . . more funds . . . than all the other districts combined. . . . The officialdom of the S. P. are called "vote-catchers."—Damon may well be called a good "money catcher." And he certainly knows how to catch money. He "appropriated" more than seven thousand dollars of party money and "got away with it. . . ."

APPEAL TO THE MEMBERSHIP, ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

(Editor's Note: A part of this call was omitted by some error in the last issue of The Communist. Since it is impossible to reprint the omitted part by itself we are reprinting the entire call as this is an important official document.)

The Coming Convention of the Communist Party, APPEAL TO THE MEMBERSHIP, ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE C. P. COMRADES:

The Central Executive Committee recognizes the necessity for a party convention in order to settle finally the differences that have been seething within the party for a long time and which came to a climax at last in the form of the present "secession movement" led by the former Executive Secretary and two members of the C. E. C.

The C. E. C. recognizes that the membership also demands a convention for the same reasons. Therefore, this being the earnest and general desire of the party, THE PARTY CONVENTION MUST AND WILL BE CALLED.

However, in order to make the convention a success—in order that the convention shall accomplish the necessary task of clarifying the fundamental issues at stake—IN ORDER THAT THE COMMUNIST PARTY SHALL FUNCTION FOR THE PROPAGATION OF COMMUNISM IN HARMONY WITH THE PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES LAID DOWN BY THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL, without internal dissension paralyzing its activities—and—what is most important—in order TO GIVE THE MEMBERSHIP—THE RANK AND FILE—the opportunity to express their opinion on the issues before the party, this convention

year—no organized Communist Party, but only an "unimaginative," diffused Left Wing divided into two groups,—majority and minority. . . .

CONCLUSION

At the end of the first installment of his article—of which this is an analysis,—Y. F. promises a "continuation." We do not know, whether or not he will fulfill this promise. But even if he should, we doubt whether he will say anything new, whether it will be of any particular interest to us.

As we stated before, his "political identity" is now definitely clear to us. Whatever "new" and "interesting" he could have said, is already contained in the first part of his article. His further "written exercises" can only have an "archeological" or "psychological" interest. They may contain interesting material for a treatise on the "Psychology of a Political Has-Been," but no more than that.

He revealed himself politically, as a "Communist Has-Been." Together with Harold Lord Varney Walling, Spargo and others, he has the dubious honor to belong to a "class" of political "has-beens."

It may be argued that to identify him with Walling and Spargo is a "little too strong. . . ." To which we reply, that we do not imply that his apostasy is of the same degree as that of Walling or Spargo, but, what we do intend to imply, may be better expressed in a "mathematical formula": The relation of Y. F. to the Communist Party is identical to the relation of Walling and Spargo to the Socialist Party, or of Lord Varney to the I. W. W. . . .

All of them belong to the same political species, all of them should be carefully shelved and listed in a museum of "political has-beens. . . ."

Regrettable, however, is it that so many comrades,—many of them good and sincere Communists, perhaps,—still do not understand this "has-been" character of Y. F. and of the "minority group" whom he represents.

Some of these earnest comrades, are still due to misunderstanding, misinformation, or misinterpretation, on the side of the "minority," serving the latter as a sort of "gunfodder" in its fight against the Communist Party. But even among the comrades who are on the side of the "majority," or rather—of the Communist Party,—good Communists though they be—we hear from time to time (but more and more seldom though, it is true) voices in favor of "requesting Damon and the other members of the C. E. C. to return immediately to their respective posts" and continue to work under the control and supervision of the C. E. C.

The comrades voicing these "requests" and "demands," in their honesty and sincere devotion to the Communist Party do not realize that neither Damon nor Y. F. and other leading figures of the "minority" group do belong any longer to the Communist Party, and for that matter—to the Communist movement in general,—that to "invite" them back into the Communist ranks sounds just as naive and sentimental,—if not to say ridiculous,—as for instance, to "invite" Hillquit or Onal into the Communist ranks! . . .

We want, in this country, as everywhere,—a real, definite, revolutionary Communist Party, without any "Centrist" taint about it. It was for such a Communist Party that we split away from the Socialist Party, that we (or overwhelming majority of us) bolted from the National Left Wing Conference and separated ourselves from the Centrist "Communist Labor" elements. Are we now going to destroy the results of this long and painful process of building the Communist Party? Are we now going to "invite" back to our ranks those "Centrists," who—just because of their "Centrism"—have themselves voluntarily left us? . . .

No, comrades! It is high time to understand, that,—whatever might be said of the split in the C. E. C., its reasons and of its desirability or practicability at that particular moment, two months before the convention,—now, since the split has already occurred, we have no reasons to regret its occurrence.

"Prematurely," perhaps, having occurred earlier than it would have otherwise, this split liberated us from the "Centrist" elements who handicapped our Communist work, and, if anything,—we must rejoice about it.

It is high time to understand that the return of all these "Centrist" elements into the Communist Party (granting, for the sake of argument, that such an absolutely impossible thing could have occurred) would be a decided step backward,—it would really push our Party and the Communist movement backward in this country by at least one year. . . .

All these considerations and the desire to bring them to the attention of the comrades prompted us to write this article. Though devoted to "one individual" only,—as it might appear on the surface,—this "one individual" being the leading "theoretician" of the "minority group,"—it was important to prove conclusively to the comrades his and his followers' "centrist" character. . . .

* Not speaking even of the utter inconsistency of inviting "back to his post" former Executive Secretary Damon, a man who so shamelessly betrayed his trust and the confidence placed in him! . . .

must be well-prepared and carefully arranged. The time, the place, the method of electing the delegates, and, above all, instructions to the delegates are essential prerequisites in order to make this convention accomplish its purpose.

This means, first of all, that before the convention is called, the membership must be given the opportunity to discuss all the issues so that, when the time comes for the election of delegates, they will not elect them blindly, BUT INTELLIGENTLY—AND ELECT ONLY THOSE DELEGATES WHO ACTUALLY REPRESENT THEIR OPINION ON THE ISSUES IN THE CONVENTION.

All this requires time for preparation—preparation for the process of elections in the various stages and the technical arrangements connected with these and the convention itself, both by the membership and the Central Executive Committee. If called too soon, without the proper time for preparation as stated above, the convention would only result in failure and necessitate the calling of another convention a few months after this convention to settle the issues, which a hurried convention will inevitably fail to accomplish.

Moreover, this convention should be called only by the Central Executive Committee of the party, as the only legally elected body which, between conventions, can speak with authority in the name of the Communist Party and its membership as a whole. This is the only meaning of revolutionary centralism and discipline upon which a real, strong Communist Party can be built.

Therefore, we call upon the membership to repudiate the so-called convention called by the former Executive Secretary Damon, which, as we will show, is nothing but a trap set for the rank and file. The date itself, as fixed in the call issued by the former Executive Secretary implies no real desire to have any convention at all.

In the first place, the former Executive Secretary had no right or mandate to call this convention. The duty of the Executive Secretary, as defined by the convention, is to work only under the supervision and control of, and in conjunction with, the Central Executive Committee. He is only the executor of the decisions of that body, or where a division exists, of the majority of that body, and is responsible only to the Central Executive Committee, which is, in turn, responsible to the convention.

Secondly, the date set in the call issued by the former Executive Secretary, May . . . for elections of intermediary units and May . . . for national convention, even were it technically possible, would give no chance to the membership to discuss the issues involved.

Thus, while pretending that they represent the membership and that they want to give them the opportunity to express themselves at the convention, the "minority" in fact, is deliberately arranging the convention so as to prevent the membership from any possibility of expressing themselves. The date fixed by them implies that they are deliberately arranging their convention so as to force the membership to elect their delegates blindly. In other words, they are simply deceiving the membership.

But it is obvious that it is physically impossible to have the elections and the convention on the date set in the call of the "minority." Conventions are not called at a week's notice! This is so self evident, that even the "minority," however ignorant on party questions they may be, cannot pretend to be unfamiliar with. Most assuredly they knew it, but still they purposely fixed their impossible date as a sort of "bribe" to the membership in an attempt to swing them away from the Communist Party and its Central Executive Committee, over to their side by offering them an "earlier" date. The very fact that in their letter to the C. E. C. requesting joint action on the question of a party convention, the "minority" express a willingness to change the date and other details already fixed by them, indicates clearly that they themselves did not take their own call and its fixed date for the convention seriously.

In the meantime, the "minority" do not hesitate to use the party funds in the possession of the former Executive Secretary, entrusted to him by the C. E. C., to appoint paid District Organizers in every District, even where District Organizers appointed by the C. E. C. are still functioning, in order to build up rival organizations in all the party units—TO CAPTURE THE DELEGATES FOR THEIR SIDE. In other words, to break the very foundations of the Communist Party—ITS REVOLUTIONARY DISCIPLINE.

But we know that the membership will answer the "minority" and in no uncertain terms. They will not be led into the trap set for them. They will refuse to go into a "convention" called by these "secessionists" and disrupters. They will dismiss as irrelevant and hypocritical the cry of "factional control" raised by the "minority" against the C. E. C.

The rank and file will, first of all, carefully discuss the issues involved—WLL TAKE SIDES and elect their delegates accordingly in order to settle the issues at the convention called by the Central Executive Committee. At present, the "next order of business" before the membership is to take up those issues, discuss them and understand them. And the C. E. C. urges every party unit to this "order of business."

It is necessary that every group should have this discussion, before the sub-district and district conventions are held (not after them). For it is exactly these preliminary conventions that will determine the CHARACTER AND COMPOSITION OF THE NATIONAL PARTY CONVENTION! DO NOT ELECT SUB-DISTRICT AND DISTRICT DELEGATES NOW.

The call for the party convention will be issued by the Central Executive Committee; setting the time for sub-district and district conventions, details and methods of elections.

The C. E. C. will set a date for the convention after inquiries from, and consultations with, the District Organizers and the Executive Committees of the language federations, so that the date finally fixed will be physically possible and convenient for all party units to participate.

THIS CALL WILL BE ISSUED SOON. SIGNIFY THAT YOU STAND BEHIND THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY BY REPUDIATING THE CALL ISSUED BY THE FORMER EXECUTIVE SECRETARY.

SIGNIFY THIS CONCRETELY, BY ALIGNING YOURSELVES WITH THE DISTRICT ORGANIZATIONS UNDER THE CONTROL AND DIRECTION OF THE C. E. C. . . . WAIT FOR THE CALL TO BE ISSUED BY THE C. E. C. . . .

IN THE MEANTIME DISCUSS THE ISSUES. TRY TO UNDERSTAND THEM SO THAT YOU WILL BE ABLE TO ELECT THE DELEGATES WHO REPRESENT YOUR POINT OF VIEW. ONLY

(Continued on page 8.)