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A certain element in the Socialist Party is determined that the documentary evidence, upon which the National Executive Committee suspended 7 language federations and revoked the charter of the state of Michigan, shall not reach the special national convention in time to be of any service to the membership. This convention will meet on Aug. 30. This element has plenty of money to send expensive telegrams all over the country. It is keeping the wires hot asking locals to endorse the latest proposal that comes from Cleveland.

Local Cleveland initiated a referendum within 24 hours after the National Committee acted. It had received word by wire from its “trusties” in Chicago and it responded by wire. Now on second consideration Local Cleveland withdraws its first proposal and submits another. The second one proposed a referendum that the National Executive Committee’s decisions regarding Michigan and the federations, the election frauds, and the election of the Board of Directors to hold the party property, shall be reversed by referendum. Local Cleveland reports <illeg>, 821 members back of this proposal.

The question immediately arises, have any of these members seen the evidence upon which alone the suspensions were made? Have they seen the mass of evidence regarding election frauds?

Not at all. Here are questions that involve the violation of the party constitution and party principles. A general vote of the members cannot decide whether the evidence was sufficient to warrant our actions. The “Left Wing” knows this. Any sane man knows it. Yet the “Left Wing” wants a referendum vote on these questions before the national convention can meet where the evidence can be consulted by delegates of the members coming from all parts of the country!

No matter what the result of such a referendum vote would be, it would not be decisive. The members would not know whether the evidence was genuine, whether it was sufficient to warrant the penalty assessed, or whether the constitution was violated or not. Of this violation the “Left Wing” cares nothing, so long as the members do not find it out. They can only find it out in the convention. Therefore the “Left Wing” would have it removed from the convention by a referendum.

At an earlier session this year the “Left Wing” members of the National Executive Committee were interested in preventing a violation of the constitution. They joined with the rest of the members in issuing a statement to the membership warning the latter that the state and national constitutions prohibit party members from joining any other political organization. They joined us in warning the membership that the constitu-
tion prohibited party members from even endors-
ing “any other political organization.”

These warnings had reference to joining or
endorsing the Labor Party. Now the “Left Wing-
ers” turn a somersault and insist that party mem-
ers can join or endorse another political organi-
zation without violating the party constitution.

In order to justify this complete shift of posi-
tion, the “Left Wingers” try to involve a mass of party
members into endorsing a violation of this anti-fu-
sion clause of the party.

•     •     •     •     •

It does not make any difference whether it
be the Labor Party organization or the “Left Wing”
organization. In either case the warning the Na-
tional Committee sent out last January holds good.
There is only one reason why the “Left Wing”
could hold that joining it or endorsing it would
not be a violation of the constitution. That is the
assumption that the “Left Wing” is not a political
organization. In that case the “Left Winger” con-
cedes what many of us have charged: That it is
fundamentally opposed to political action. If so,
then why should any party members join an organi-
zation that is opposed to political action, yet claim-
ning to be in harmony with the Socialist Party?

Whichever position the “Left Wing” takes
on this matter it is seen to be in conflict with the
Socialist Party. Because it is in conflict, it is spar-
ing no expense in telegrams to locals in all parts
of the country, in a frantic effort to force a refer-
endum on the question. The “Left Wing” is
doomed before an impartial convention where all
the evidence is presented to the delegates.

•     •     •     •     •

Locals that do not want to deliver the party to
a self-constituted “dictatorship of the proletariat,” a
dictatorship that has not been chosen by the party,
that outlaws the red card of the party, that says you
must have a card of the dictators before you can even
[serve?] a branch or local in any capacity — such
locals should throw the request for a referendum in
the waste basket.

Then take part in choosing delegates to the
special convention. Insist on their consulting the
evidence in these cases and then report back to
your [halls?]. Only in this way can the matter be
satisfactorily and intelligently handled, and it is
just this procedure that the frantic “Left Wing”
does not want.