

What Kind of Party?

An Answer to the Majority Group of the C. E. C.

THE present crisis in the Communist Party organization presents the opportunity through membership action to make the party really a party of understanding and a party of action.

During the seven months that the party has been in existence the work of developing its organization strength and carrying its message to the masses has been hampered by a group in the Central Executive Committee which was more interested in the personal "revolutionary fortunes" of its members than in building up the party.

This group has shown itself to be incompetent to develop constructive organization work and as a matter of policy has sought to keep the party organization within very narrow limits. This latter policy was not based upon any question of principle, but upon the realization by this group — the majority group of the C. E. C. — that it could maintain its position of leadership in the organization only so long as the movement was prevented from attracting to its ranks men of greater capability.

The policy of the majority group toward the Communist Labor Party, both during the Chicago conventions 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 programs of the two parties, but never has done so. The aim was to prevent this group from being ousted from its position of prominence and leadership in the Communist Party — a position which it could not hold in an organization which included all the Communist elements, because it has neither the capability of applying Communist principles in action nor the organization ability to entitle it to such leadership.

This use of power in order to safeguard its position has not only been made against the C. L. P. but has been used in the party itself, notably in New York City, where comrades of considerable ability, whose services would have been of great advantage to the party, have been shunted aside because they were not enthusiastic enough in their support of this factional group.

Whenever this majority group of the Central Executive Committee was under attack because of its factional policy it has taken refuge in loudly shouting about "differences in principle". It realizes that the members of the Communist Party are really in earnest in their desire to maintain the party as a clear expression of Communist fundamentals, and that by assuming the part of "defenders of principles" it could always shout down those who attacked it because of its intrigues.

Now that its use of power for selfish ends has brought about a split in the Central Executive Committee, it is again raising the issue of "differences in principles" as a smoke cloud behind which to hide the fact that it was the intrigues and use of power to maintain its group leadership, even to the extent of disrupting the organization, that has brought about the present situation.

Analysis of these "differences in principles" is all that is necessary to show the hypocrisy and demagogic character of this "majority" group.

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

Through some twisting of the facts the attempt is made in the manifesto of the "majority" group to create out of the controversy over European representation one of the "issues of principle". The fact is that no such issue exists.

The controversy over this question developed on the point whether matters of party policy should be decided by the governing body of the party or by underhanded intrigue of a group within the Central Executive Committee. It was this underhanded intrigue of individuals, who, immediately after the adjournment of the Chicago convention, took no further interest in the upbuilding of the Communist Party of America, but devoted practically all their time to the intrigue to become the party representative in Europe, which created this controversy.

The "minority" did not at anytime oppose the establishment of relations with the Third International. Steps were taken by the Executive Secretary, before the question of sending a representative developed, to acquaint the Third International with the facts about the organization and principles of the Communist Party, and only a few weeks ago the comrade who took this information to Europe returned with the report that it had been successfully transmitted to Moscow.

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 the argument was only over the question of time and party resources.

The matter was first broached three weeks after the party convention. At that time the party was in the midst of organization work and a bitter controversy with the C. L. P. It did not have five speakers who could present its cause in English, and the same was true in regard to writers and editors. Yet it was proposed to immediately take out of the party work the man who had up to that time held the position of leadership in the editorial work of the movement. When the question finally came to a decision in November, there

was not a single vote against sending the International Secretary to Europe. It has since developed that the trip could have been delayed another two months and had exactly the same results for the movement. Yet it is sought to magnify this question into an issue of "principle". This is itself the best example of the kind of bluff the "majority" group uses in order to deceive the party membership.

The facts about the matter of relations with the Third International are that the "minority" group has fought for a policy in harmony with the ideas expressed by the Third International, while the "majority" has disagreed and has taken the attitude of "super-Bolsheviks" who look with contempt upon the policies of the Third International. This is illustrated in the "majority" group issue of the "Communist". In an editorial on "The Party Crisis" this statement appears:

"The "secessionists" believe that subscribing to the three fundamental and basic policies of the Third International, namely — Proletarian Dictatorship, Mass Action and Soviet Power, is sufficient in itself upon which to build a Communist movement in this country".

The inference in this statement is that the "majority" group do not believe this to be the case and the policy it has pursued is further proof. And from whom did this statement of policy with which the "minority" group is charged with agreeing, come? From the Third International!

There have been three or four communications on the subject of unity of Communist elements from the Third International. Two of these at least were directly concerned with the question of unity of Communist forces in the United States. One such communication was brought by a representative of the Third International sent to this country to organize a Communist Party before the time of the convention. Another was published in the New York World, having been taken from a courier who was captured and shot in Lettvia. And each of these documents urged the unity of all those elements in a Communist Party which accepted the three fundamentals, Mass Action as the means of achieving power, the Dictatorship of the proletariat, Soviet government.

Yes, comrades of the "majority", the "minority" group accepts this basis of Communist unity and is working to build a real Communist organization of action on this basis, while you reject the position of the Third International, fearing the loss of personal prestige and power, and attempt to create some superfine