
Draft of a CPA Appeal and Protest to the CI on the Ultimatum of the American Agency as Presented by “Scott” [Janson] [April 11, 1921]

Document in the Comintern Archive, RGASPI f. 515, op. 1, d. 46, ll. 29-29a.

1) This ultimatum (copy attached) was originally drawn up by the Am Ag [American Agency] on March 5th [1921] to be presented to the EC of CI for their approval. Upon receiving notification of full powers both K. [Katayama] and F. [Fraina] were out of the country and Scott [Janson] (Apr. 5) proceeded to enforce the plan. We were informed by Scott [Janson] that no amendment ~~or addition~~ to this plan would be considered — that the CPA must agree to it in full without reservation.

2) Point one declares for a convention on the basis of 30 delegates for each party. We cannot understand what new or special conditions have arisen under which a change from the previous decision of the EC of the CI for proportional representation is made necessary. We protest against this change ~~which the CP of A stands ready to obey the CI~~. We recognize that the Am Ag should have full power to enforce unity, but object to the AA using its power to enforce conditions which are contrary to the express conditions and decisions of the EC of the CI.

3) As to the special conditions set forth in the plan of the AA, we emphatically protest against binding the delegates to the convention in advance to any particular formulation of program, constitution, or manifesto. The CI has already stipulated that the programs and constitutions of all parties affiliated to the CI must be in full accord with all the Theses of the 2nd Congress [July 19-Aug. 7, 1921] and the decisions of its EC and subject to their approval. If the AA assumes the responsibility of preparing in advance of the convention its own formulation of the Constitution and Program of the United Party and

makes these provisions a condition for unity, what need is there for a convention at all? We cannot and should not be required to bind our delegates to any special provisions which are not directly essential for the immediate purpose of achieving the unity of both parties. Organizational questions must be left the convention at which unity will be perfected.

4) Especially do we call the attention of the EC to the clause providing for the appointment of the chairman of the future CEC of the united party. In no other country has the EC provided for such drastic action. What emergency makes it necessary in the United States? In principle this policy would be wrong. The members of the CEC of the United party must be directly responsible to the party membership, subject to their discipline and control, especially when the fact that neither the AA nor the EC of the CI has ever set up the claim that the CPA has violated any of the principles or decisions of the CI. ~~We cannot believe that the EC will endorse this humiliating condition, placing the control of the entire American movement in the hands of one individual.~~

The charge that the Federations in the CP of A are autonomous is absolutely false. A copy of the Constitution is attached and the following sections (name them) will show that the present CEC of the CP of A is the supreme body between conventions and that the Federations have no powers which are autonomous in character.

We request that the EC of the CI reject the plan of the AA and enforce proportional representation to be based upon the number of convention assessments by both parties to the proposed unity convention and the right of this convention to elect its own CEC and to draw up its own Constitution, Manifesto, and Program.

Whatever your final decision will be we pledge our party to carry them out implicitly.

We request a speedy reply.

Edited by Tim Davenport

1000 Flowers Publishing, Corvallis, OR · May 2012 · Non-commercial reproduction permitted.