
Wants a Conference:

A Letter to the Editor of *The New York Call*, March 18, 1919.

by J. Codkind

Published in *The New York Call*, March 18, 1919, pg. 6.

Editor of *The Call*:

It was with some indignation that I read Comrade Gollomb's long letter in Wednesday's issue of *The Call* [March 12, 1919]. The general character of the entire letter may well be judged after an analysis of the three leading charges made by him, not against the Left Wing, or its program, but against individuals.

I shall heed the editor's request and try to write a very short letter. Briefly, then, Gollomb charges that Left Wingers in the 2nd Assembly District Jewish Branch have colonized that branch with non-Jewish-speaking members; that Larkin and others in the 3rd-5th-10th Assembly District have driven the respectable elements from the branch, and, with 20 disruptionists out of a membership of 300, have taken possession; that 30 members out of 700 in the 17th Assembly District have followed the example of the 3rd-5th-10th District.

In reply to the first charge, I would write that, in publishing this at the present time, Comrade Gollomb, to say the least, appears to have acted unethically in the light of the following: These charges have been made to the Central Committee of Local New York, but have not been proved. At the present time an investigating committee is ready to report, and before that report has been heard, Gollomb decides in the columns of *The Call* that the charges have been found cor-

rect.

His second charge, that 20 members of the 3rd-5th-10th Assembly District are in control, seems to be a rank falsehood, in view of the fact that a letter to the Executive Committee protesting against the Left Wingers in that branch bears the signatures of 18 persons in addition to his own; and surely, even Gollomb won't say that he managed to muster the signatures of all the opponents of the Left Wing. Though I know as little of the conditions in his branch as he seems to know or cares to state regarding my branch, the 17th Assembly District, it seems very easy to guess that the real trouble with Gollomb is that somehow his branch does not act like he would like it to act. Especially is this true when it is considered that people such as Evans Clarch and Louis P. Lochner, among others equally well known, are members who have no objection.

The best example of Gollomb's accuracy is his charge that 30 people control the 17th Assembly District. Our headquarters seats about 300 persons comfortably. At this time last year about half of the seats were occupied at business meetings. This year, with a smaller membership on the books, all the seats are occupied at all times, in spite of the fact that we have held a number of special meetings. I can say, authoritatively, that no important transactions have been made after the body of the membership have left. This was done in fear of the Right Wingers, who might try

to put one over, as they did about two months ago, when, at 1 o'clock, 14 of them preferred charges against two members in the name of the branch. This action has since been twice repudiated, once by a vote of 70 to 40, but still the charges stand. Comrade Gollomb did not state the true criticism of the 17th District, which is, that out of 13 delegates to the Central Committee, 9 consistently vote with the Gollomb faction, and 4 of these 9 are well known as among the leading reactionaries of Local New York. As in all other branches, the 17th Assembly District has a Left Wing membership and a Right Wing representation to the Central Committee. This, of course, may be accounted for by the fact that at the last elections names, instead of principles, were voted for.

Undoubtedly, there have been unfair tactics employed. In my opinion, this is much more prevalent among the Right Wingers than the Lefts, but both sides are equally guilty. Why people on both sides — undoubtedly honest and sincere in their convictions — should descent to the use of these methods is more than I can understand. Thus far I have not heard a single criticism of the Left Wing program and platform, anywhere. All that I have heard from my Right Wing opponents everywhere is that the individuals backing the Left Wing program are dishonest and -----! For example, I myself was told by a person who does know better that I am dishonest and insincere. I

have since been trying hard to detect these traits of mine and isolate them.

Again, if our Left Wing program is correct in itself, but we, the Left Wingers, are corrupt, etc., then why don't our honest, respectable Right Wingers, whose reputations already have been made and who can be elected because of their names, then why, I repeat, don't they take away our platform and make it theirs? I am perfectly willing to let them take it and enjoy the honor of its practice. I am perfectly willing to withdraw, even resign, from the party if they wish it, if only they will put into practice our proletarian demands.

In conclusion, might I suggest what I believe to be the only possible solution of our problem: Let us stop calling each other names. Let us act like real men, and not like kids. Let us face the absolute fact — that both sides are honest and sincere. Let us try to calm ourselves; and let both sides elect or select about five delegates to hold a conference through which our differences may be settled without a party split. I suggest that these delegates be chosen by the caucus of the two groups in the Central Committee of Local New York.

Fraternally,

J. Codkind

Edited by Tim Davenport.

Published by 1000 Flowers Publishing, Corvallis, OR, 2005. • Free reproduction permitted.