

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

## Takes Strong Exception To W. Z. Foster Letter

Editor, Daily Worker:

In the Daily Worker of October 8, William Z. Foster took note of my letter of Oct. 2, and expressed his opposition to my views.

Foster takes exception to my support of an attitude of friendliness to those who—like Howard Fast, Joseph Starobin and Joseph Clark—have left the Communist Party, although they are still progressive in their views and concerned with the problems of socialism in America.

He likewise takes exception to my critique of his review of the May issue of International Affairs, dealing with a symposium in the USSR on "Peoples Capitalism" in our own land.

May I be permitted to comment on his letter?

First, Foster assails my plea for friendliness toward Fast, Clark and Starobin on the grounds that they are "quitters who are now doing their utmost to destroy the Communist Party."

I'm afraid he has lost touch with what has been happening in the Communist movement. Otherwise, he would not be unaware that thousands have dropped out because they have despaired of the Party's ability to overcome the sectarian, dogmatic exclusiveness revealed in his above remarks about Fast, Starobin and Clark.

These latter have certainly harmed the Communist Party by their resignations. But I'm afraid nothing they've done compares in its devastating effects with the position taken by Foster and a small minority of party leaders toward those whose confidence in the party's ability to make essential changes has been shaken. Fortunately, I believe most Communists today know Foster's view is that of a minority. Otherwise, his letter might cause still more losses.

Allow me in this connection, to quote the National Committee's resolution on people who have left the Communist Party.

**"Among the trade unions, in the building of which Socialists**

and Communists played a major role, among the Negro people, the working farmers, the professionals and the youth who are pondering the significance of the growth of the socialist world system, as well as among the many thousands who at one time were members of our party or who participated in mass struggles under our leadership, are to be found many who would welcome the perspective of a united party of socialism. The National Committee should be charged with fostering this perspective.

"The historic objective of achieving unity of all honest socialist-minded forces to develop the American people's anti-monopoly coalition, as well as for the ultimate achievement of socialism, throws an added light on our reappraisal of our Party's past and present functioning, its mass activity and its vast role in the period ahead."

I submit Foster's attitude is incompatible with the "perspective of a united party of Socialism," as outlined above.

As regards his objection to my critique of his International Affairs article, it would be helpful to clear debate if Foster were more scrupulous in presenting the views against which he argues. My letter did not say, as he absurdly charges, that we ought not to utilize the views of the Russians on "people's capitalism" or that we can learn nothing from the Russians, or that only Americans can write effectively about the U.S. I declared specifically that "it is fine for us in the U. S. to study the views of Marxist economists abroad regarding developments in our land."

My objection was to his specific, inescapable, intimations that the Russians need to give us the "line" on the "managed economy policies of the Eisenhower Administration": "prospects for an economic crisis in the U.S."; etc.

I objected especially to his not-too-subtle suggestion that we must look to the Russians to "combat opportunism" in our ranks here. I do not believe, as Foster apparently does, that this makes me an advocate of "people's capitalism."—M.G.