

# THE COMMUNIST

Official organ of  
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA  
published by the  
CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Vol. II September 15th, 1929 No. 18.

## The U. C. P. and Communist International

The group of Centrist leaders who dominate and control the U. C. P. are in a decidedly unenviable position from which they are unable to extricate themselves except by shutting their eyes to facts and deliberate fortitious circumstances they would merely excite ally—but since they have brought this upon themselves by their rascality and double-dealing they only merit contempt.

That these men are deliberate liars as well as Centrists is evidenced anew by the recent answer of the U. C. P. to the Executive Committee of the Communist International in reply to their appeal for unity between the Communist Party and the former Communist Labor Party.

From beginning to end this answer of theirs is a tissue of lies, misrepresentations and evasions of the issue. It is merely an apologetic whining where it does not lie or misrepresent.

The U. C. P. answer did not even attempt to state why unity was not achieved between the C. P. and the C. L. P. For a very good reason. They would have been compelled to tell the truth and that would have exposed their dirty under-handed trickery to "split" the Communist Party and unite only with the splitting off faction. No word as to the unity negotiations that were pending and why they were broken off. Similarly with regard to the recent "split" in the Communist Party.

Indeed to judge by their answer, it would seem as if there never were any unity negotiations. Of course, it wouldn't do to admit that the C. E. C. of the C. P. (the same against which Damon, Y. F. & Co. formulated so much) actually formulated the very method of unity as now promulgated by the Executive Committee of the Communist International. Nor would it do to admit that they were the very ones who were opposed to it.

How could they be expected to reprint the following agreement as printed in the "Communist Labor", official organ of the former C. L. P. of May 15th?

"Several meetings were held between representatives of the C. L. P. and representatives of the 'minority' group as represented by..... At these conference AGREEMENT WAS REACHED NOT TO NEGOTIATE WITH THE 'MAJORITY' GROUP OF THE C. E. C. OF THE C. P., those who attempted to continue their control in opposition to rank and file desires...."

Such facts would be rather awkward to say the least.

This answer of the U. C. P. is very much on a par with John Reed's hysterical version of the two conventions of Sept. 1st of last year after he reached the other side.

In those days the C. L. P. had no other reason for separate existence than the false statement that the C. L. P. was composed mostly of Americans while the C. P. was made up mainly of "foreigners" who wanted to dominate the Communist movement.

Today the U. C. P. can give no better reasons for separate existence than that "The United Communist Party is a re-organization of the majority elements of the former two parties. But, as we have already reported to your committee, a minority faction of the unity. This faction is composed of part of the membership of the Lettish, Ukrainian, Russian and Lithuanian Federations of the Communist Party. Practically all the members of the Communist Labor Party have come into the united party."

The inference which the U. C. P. wishes to be drawn from this outrageous lie is that there is no Communist Party in existence just a few splintered federations. While the U. C. P. has lost all the members of the C. P. and "practically all" the members of the C. L. P....

These Centrists measure Communism quantitatively. What is to be expected coming from them—but why did they fail to submit figures to the Third International to substantiate their claim?

We are not surprised at such a lapse coming from the U. C. P. leaders—they have never been overfond of figures when it had to do with O. L. P. membership—but Damon and Y. F. have more business sense than that! (We remember how proudly Damon once challenged Meyers to submit membership figures of the C. L. P. during the unity negotiations and how shamefacedly Meyers replied that he had no books or dues-stamps to go by). Surely Damon, the best business man in the Communist movement and Y. F., with his legal training, would not neglect such a wonderful opportunity without good cause!

The answer to this riddle is that the U. C. P. are lying and dare not present figures. They dare not present figures as to the membership of the C. L. P., which was represented

in the unity convention mostly by proxies some of whose constituencies have since repudiated of those proxies—like the State of Washington and left their new party. They dare not present figures as to what they lost through the Deba nomination—but the repudiation of their C. E. C. at that time gave us more than a hint of what was going on behind the scenes. Surely the Clifford gang of Ohio, who stated openly as members of the C. L. P. that they were opposed to force and a violent revolution, or even the use of force, are not members of the U. C. P. What became of Lore's German Federation which publishes the Volkzeitung? Surely the U. C. P. did not take over that paper and abolish the German Federation? How about the Scandinavian Federation of the C. L. P. which published "Truth" is now out of the party. All these facts are conveniently omitted, they give no figures but they have the effrontery to say that "practically all" of the C. L. P. has joined the U. C. P.

With reference to the "minority" faction which followed Damon, Y. F. & Co. into the U. C. P. the same stilted silence as regards figures but blustering phrases about the depleted federations of the C. P. which no longer exist.

Fortunately, our former Acting Secretary after Damon, Comrade Bunte, prepared and submitted authentic figures to our recent convention which disposes of all their pretensions and lies. The Communist Party did not lose more than 28 per cent of its membership after the split. Of which we know for a fact, that if the U. C. P. got half of this figure they were doing well. All in all, the total membership of the U. C. P. does not total more than five thousand and is probably nearer four thousand. While the depleted federations of the former Communist Party that negligible faction has more than nine thousand members. Close to eight thousand members participated in the convention while some 1500 or 2000 members had no opportunity to participate because three federation conventions were held at about the same time as the national convention.

So much for membership figures. We shall now analyze their "general views upon particular questions" as expressed in their statement.

For instance: "The United Communist Party is opposed to a narrow sectarian policy which fails to take into account and to strive for close contact with the mass of the workers in their constant economic struggles. Indeed, IT WAS EXACTLY THIS CONTENTION UPON WHICH THE FORMER COMMUNIST PARTY MEMBERSHIP BROKE WITH THE MAJORITY OF THEIR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE." (Italics ours, editor).

The kind of "close contact" the former Centrist "minority" wanted was close contact at the sacrifice of Communist principles and tactics. They stated they were opposed to our interpretation of mass action, which included armed insurrection against the capitalist state, and refused to propagate this idea to the masses. They stated they wanted to abolish the political unit of organization and wished to substitute industrial branches instead. They were for support, the I. W. W. and wanted to make their organ a recruiting ground for the I. W. W., a industrial unionism, "Communist theory they would and the "Big Bluff of Bolshevism" and would have none of it. Their position on these questions is open for any one who cares to go through the files of their paper and their statements and needs very little comment here. The controversy between the C. E. C. and the Centrist "minority" was not sectarianism or close contact with the masses but what kind and condition of contact were to be achieved and how!

In view of these well-known facts it is the sheerest humbug and hypocrisy to ascribe sectarianism as the cause of the disagreement.

In trying to explain the reasons for the Communist movement not having been a vital factor in the recent "collisions between capital and labor", they resort to stupidities and banalities instead of telling the truth. We quote:

"We are keenly conscious of the force of what is said about agitation outside the circle of our party, agitation which expresses Communist leadership in the immediate struggles of the American workers. OUR OWN IMMATURITY AS A PARTY, DIVERSION OF ENERGIES INTO FACTIONAL CONTROVERSIES ON INESSENTIAL MATTERS, (THE PERSECUTIONS WHICH HAVE AGAIN DISORGANIZED OUR WORK, HAVE LIMITED THE EXTERNAL AGITATION AND INFLUENCE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES IN THIS COUNTRY." (Italics ours, editor).

To judge by this answer one would be led to believe that the American working class was and is ready to accept Communist leadership in their economic and political struggles! That they are waiting with open minds and outstretched hands to welcome the Communist leaders but they have been too busy with a "diversion of their energies into factional controversies on INESSENTIAL MATTERS" to respond. (It is characteristic of Centrists that they regard all questions as "inessential"—even those questions upon which they dare take responsibility to split a Communist organization).

Instead of stating the truth about the great masses of the workers—their provincialism, their repulsion toward Communism, their lack of class-consciousness, etc., they prefer to give the impression that the American workers are sufficiently awakened politically and economically that the proletarian revolution is not far away. They whine about the persecutions (totally oblivious that it was due to their criminal negligence to put the plan of the C. E. C. of November 15th into action that resulted in our

being completely taken by surprise and almost destroyed.

On the subject of labor unions they attempt to prove that their position agrees with the Communist International—which is patently absurd if they only compare their program with the Thesis of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on the role of the Communist Party in the proletarian revolution. Their policy is a rank compromise with the syndicalist position of the I. W. W. They make the I. W. W. the "obvious medium" for propaganda and agitation on the economic field. Their form of shop committees is such that party and non-party members can be members, so that they will have no possibility of controlling them as soon they are put in operation.

Their policy toward the A. F. of L. is the same as the policy of the I. W. W., which is condemned by the thesis, by Zimoviev, as the following quotation will prove:

"The Communists do not avoid the mass non-party working class organizations even when they bear an openly reactionary, 'Black Hindoo', character (the 'Yellow' Unions, the 'Christian' Unions, and so on). But the Communist Party ceaselessly carries on its own work within these organizations, and untiringly demonstrates to the workers that the non-party idea, as a principle, is consciously fostered amongst the workers by the capitalist class and its lackeys. In order to divert the proletariat from the organized struggle for socialism."

Probably the gem of the document is the chapter dealing with language federations. Their despicable and fraudulent attempt to disparage the role and influence of the language federations both within the S. P. and afterwards proves to what depths these "chauvinists" will descend in their hatred and opposition to federations. (The recent decision of their C. E. C. in reference to the Russian language branches conference which elected a National Propaganda Committee which elected a National Propaganda Committee which elected a National Propaganda Committee in this issue—in eloquent testimony as well). It is small wonder that they abolished language federations in their party they haven't the slightest conception of real organization. A mechanical, bureaucratic centralization, with a docile membership that does not understand English and therefore cannot control its leaders, is their conception of an ideal form of organization. They have in the U. C. P. .... It remains to be seen how long their membership will stand for it.

This chapter dealing with federations wastes several hundred words in an obvious attempt to evade stating that they have abolished federations. Their only conception of foreign language propaganda is "paying more attention to certain matters of new." They do not understand that the federation form of organization for the non-English-speaking elements in the S. P. was the most important factor by crystallizing and coordinating the wave of revolt in the membership that resulted in the Left Wing movement and the subsequent creation of the Communist Parties. Even today, in the Communist Party, the federation form of organization plays a twofold purpose. One—an efficient co-ordinated propaganda in the foreign languages, which the federation form is capable of—and second, coordinating the activities of the foreign-speaking comrades and disseminating information and knowledge of the party and its leaders, so that no set of leaders will be able to lead the party into a Centrist path without effective opposition. (It is the latter reason which has scared our former Centrist "minority" as well as the C. L. P. leaders, into abolishing the language federations "at one stroke").

The U. C. P. is composed of the same relative component parts of English-speaking and non-English-speaking elements as the Communist Party. But whereas the federations in the C. P. hold annual conventions and elect their C. E. C. (including editors) directly responsible to their membership and to the C. E. C. of the party—within the U. C. P. the language branches have no connection with each other but only with the party committees. The editors of the language organs are the paid employees of the C. E. C. and responsible to no one else. They act merely as translators—who translate the articles of the English organ into their own language. They have no policy of their own within the limit of their language problems. These men being chosen by the C. E. C. are usually the willing tools of the C. E. C. or they would not be selected. This makes it impossible in general for effective counter-expression in the foreign language papers which could acquaint the non-English speaking elements with the real policies of the leaders. Secondly, even if some such articulation should develop from time to time, there is no effective medium of crystallizing this sentiment in the party so as to effect a change in the personnel of its leadership. Of course this is a distinct advantage to these Centrist leaders, but it is equally disadvantageous for the vast majority of the foreign membership who cannot read or write or speak English. The regular party units are useless for such a purpose. The fact that members speaking a number of different languages have to elect representatives to party committees, makes it imperative that only those able to speak and understand English shall be elected. The basis of representation therefore automatically becomes the ability to understand and speak English rather than their knowledge and usefulness as Communists. From which it follows that the possibility of humbugging the entire membership (and the Centrist leaders of the U. C. P. are past masters at the art of humbugging the membership) is tremendously increased without any effective retaliatory weapons in the hands