

went to Chicago to use all my influence to prevent a break in the unity of the party and succeeded.

I reported this settlement to the Executive Council last Tuesday, but in place of accepting it and thus expressing its co-operation in endeavoring to prevent a split in our organization, four members of the Council, representing the majority group of the Central Executive Committee, took action to maintain their factional control of the party — action which is bound to bring about a split — by voting to send a representative of this majority of four to Chicago with authority TO REMOVE THE DISTRICT ORGANIZER. This action was preceded by a proposal to remove the entire District Committee and to reorganize the District, which was only abandoned when it was shown by the minority that it would be impossible to carry out such a proposal because the membership of the Chicago District would not permit it. The four members of this majority (Andrew, Bernstein, Raphael and Sascha) also voted down my motion to refer the whole matter to the full C. E. C. (motion supported by Damon, Bunte and Braun.)

The sending of a representative of the majority group to Chicago with authority to remove the District Organizer can only have one purpose, and that is, to use the temporary authority of the present majority group to perpetuate its control by arbitrarily ousting those who oppose it. The removal of the Chicago District Organizer on this issue would be resisted by the District Committee and the membership of the Chicago District and would bring about a break in the party unity which I succeeded in preventing.

There is no other ground than an effort to perpetuate factional control to warrant the removal of the Chicago District Organizer. He is the most captable man in such a position in the party at the present time. The Chicago District reorganization has progressed farther than any other district. The Chicago District has turned over to the National Organization for the party work more funds during the last three months than all the other districts combined. Yet this majority of four members of the Executive Council in its desperate attempt to maintain its control of the organization is ready to summarily dismiss this District Organizer because he represents a different party viewpoint than they do, at a time when the party has been unable to secure competent men to fill similar positions elsewhere.

The proposed action of the majority members of the Executive Council (a bare majority of one, for the motion was adopted by a vote of four to three) is exactly parallel with the action of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party last year, when it expelled all those members of the party who opposed it, in order to make certain its control of the convention in August, with the

exception that in the Socialist Party there was the justification of a great difference of principle, while the action of the majority of the Executive Council is based solely upon motives of personal politics and control, even though it attempts to camouflage its motives by talk about "discipline" — discipline which it only invokes against those who oppose it.

In my activity in the party I have consistently stood against disruption and fought to maintain the unity of our organization. I do not believe there is any issue in the party at this moment which cannot be decided by the coming convention and leave the party united.

But I am faced with the necessity of choosing a course of action in a situation in which a temporary majority, a few weeks before a convention, threatens to bring disruption and disunity into the party in an effort to further, not the interests of the party, but its own group control. I have determined that it is my duty to the membership of the party to fight such disruptionist activity when it comes from a majority of the Executive Council, just as I fought it when it came from the Chicago District Committee.

I therefore make the following statement to the majority of the majority of the Executive Council:

Should it persist in the course of action determined upon at the last meeting and this result in the removal of the Chicago District Organizer and refusal of the Chicago District to further recognize the authority of the Executive Council and the Central Executive Committee until the convention, it will be impossible for me to continue to work with the present majority of the Executive Council. I will continue to conduct the work of the office of Executive Secretary and Acting Party Editor and will carry on the work of the party through the District Organizations, including the Chicago District Organization as now constituted, holding all funds and report of my work for submission to and disposal of by the convention.

DAVID DAMON,
Executive Secretary.

The submission of this statement compelled the Executive Council majority to change its position and to call a meeting of the Central Executive Committee, the District Organizers and the Executive Secretaries of the Federations. At this meeting an effort was made by the Executive Secretary and those supporting his position to effect an agreement to maintain the situation as it stood before the Council action, until a convention could be held. The agreement this group proposed is contained in the following statement which they submitted to be majority of the C. E. C.:

STATEMENT BY THE MINORITY GROUP.

The undersigned earnestly desire to prevent the development of a sit-

uation in the party which will result in disorganization and chaos at a time when all the energy of the movement should be directed toward building up a stronger organization and propaganda among the masses of the workers.

They believe that they represent the majority of the membership of the party and that it can be proven beyond doubt that their position in regard to organization tactics is supported by the membership, and that those who support the opposite viewpoint, although they may be in the majority in the C. E. C., do not represent the membership of the party. If the wishes of the membership should prevail, their plan of organization would be immediately adopted.

They cannot, therefore, accept the decision of a committee, which by every standard of judgment and experience, has been repudiated by the membership, but in order to preserve the party unity, propose an agreement on the following statement and conduct of the organization in accordance with same, until a convention can be held and the future of the party authoritatively decided:

That until the convention the existing facts in the party at the time before the meeting of the Council at which the controversy developed shall remain the status quo and neither the Executive Council nor the C. E. C. shall take any action to change the situation so far as the matters of controversy are concerned.

The status quo to mean:

That there shall be no change in District Organizers except to fill vacancies, until the convention.

That the Executive Secretary shall continue as Acting Editor.

On the last point we are willing to agree that two pages of each issue of the paper shall be set aside for each group for the publication of controversial articles. These two pages to be under the complete control of the respective groups.

In regard to the matter of expressing the party policies in harmony with the party program we agree that when the acting editor and associate editor disagree, the article shall be referred to the Council for final disposition.

We further agree, that the majority may send a representative to present its viewpoint to various party units.

Signed: David Damon, Executive Sec., Ed. Fisher, District No. 5, W. A. Davey, District 4-C, Polish Federation Representative, J. E. Wood, District 4-A, Esthonian Federation Representative, A. Smith, District No. 1, South Slavic Federation Representative, German Federation Representative, Ukrainian Federation Representative, J. Kasbeck, member of C. E. C.

The majority group of the C. E. C., however, refused to agree not to remove any District Organizer until the convention and insisted on appointing another editor with equal power with the party editor.

The majority refused to discuss the call for the Convention.