

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

## Warns of Unity With "Splinters"

Editor, Daily Worker:

The letter by L. Deaty in today's paper to my way of thinking is astonishing. The program he outlined is for combining with such people and groups as Schachtman and the Trotskyites. To establish a united front with them on various issues is one thing, but to combine with them is political suicide.

All our sectarianism and dogmatism is in no way to be compared with theirs. If we are isolated from the masses, are not the SWP with its few hundred members, the ISL with even less and the Cochran and Sweezy groups with a handful of intellectuals even more so?

I have had some experience with these groups and I can assure brother Deaty that these groups are as rigid and dogmatic as possible.

The only way we can break out of our isolation is not to combine with the splinters and, as the Nation recently called them, the Splinter of Splinter groups, but to get out to the people. To rebuild our party and build up our mass contacts. If the ALP was a limited organization, would not such groupings as brother Deaty suggests be much more so?

If any in our ranks don't think I am right, let them go to an SWP affair or listen to one of the blind anti-Soviet fanatics of the ISL and see what I say to be true.

—Let us not go backwards, but go-out to the people.

JACK BEVERIDGE

## On Browder's Expulsion

Editor, Daily Worker:

After listening to Earl Browder on Mike Wallace's program I read with interest Robert Friedman's letter published in the D.W. on Feb. 28. Friedman writes "that the time is long overdue for the C.P. to acknowledge that it was terribly wrong to have expelled Earl Browder and to have heaped obloquy and abuse upon his person."

I don't know what history's judgment will be, but is it not in order to view Browder's case against the background of conditions as they existed during the time of his expulsion? If my memory serves me right, Browder was not expelled for mere differences of opinions. These he stated during the Party convention in July, 1945. He remained in the Party and shortly after the convention his assignment for Party work was under consideration. He was expelled

in the latter part of 1945 or beginning of 1946, only after he began to fight the C.P. by issuing bulletins outside the Party.

During the interview with Mike Wallace, he innocently state that he wanted to remain in the Party on condition of having freedom of expression within the organization. Is it not a fact that many people during Browder's leadership were expelled from the Party for minor differences? Is it not true that at one of the meetings of the National Committee Browder appeared with his published report before it was submitted for discussion? Is it not also true that had William Foster submitted in 1944 his differences with Browder to the Party membership, the latter would have had Foster expelled?

It was certainly good to hear Browder say that the Communist Party was not a conspiracy during his leadership, implying ignorance of what the Party became after his expulsion. It is a bit difficult to fit Browder's characterization of Eisenhower as "a man of peace" into the framework of "socialist mindedness" unless this word has lost its meaning. Is Browder unaware of the policy of liberation, massive retaliation, Formosa, building of alliances and bases, rearming of West Germany, Guatemala, military and economic aid with political strings attached, Eisenhower Mid East doctrine, to name a few?

It is up to future objective historians to evaluate Browder. There is no doubt that at one time he made contributions. We still don't know what the program of a united movement for socialism will be. Whether Browder will or will not be included depends entirely on what Browder will say and do. In the meantime it would not be bad if Browder were less self-righteous and more critical of himself. One lesson that can be drawn is this: Our Party expelled people, some of them with long service, not because of their disagreement with basic principles, policies, strategy or even tactics. Some were driven out because they differed with some self-proclaimed "Marxist-Leninist." Expulsions should be the measure of last resort. Only in extreme cases it should be used. Methods of persuasion and conviction must replace it.

—R. F.

## Socialism In America

Editor, Daily Worker:

The basic problem, it would seem to me, would be how to build socialism in each country

and what lessons are to be learned from other's. As you may have guessed it is my considered opinion that the day-to-day routine is wrong. It is, with many, an escape from the really tough and disciplined thinking in which true Marxists should now be engaged.

If through some weird stroke of fate, a socialist government should come to power in the U.S. within the next five years there would not be to my knowledge any blueprint, sketchy or comprehensive, as to how the program would be put into effect.

There is many a polemic about the steel industry, for example, but not any real analysis of what it is, how far-reaching its tentacles, how it might be nationalized, the forms which such nationalization should take, the legal steps or forms to be followed. Not to mention the really weird amalgamations of industry: the magazines that own pulp mills, that own presses, etc., etc. or the relations of all the components of DuPont, GM, etc.

Do you nationalize an industry or a corporation? How do the latter cut across the former? What about banks, money, investments, stocks, the effect of mutual fund?

What sort of class structure is developing with automation?

It's things such as these that I think socialists should be debating and analyzing—dissecting and appraising.

Hungary and Russia and all the others are tangential. How socialism was achieved in these countries is historically interesting but really won't help in bringing it to fruition here.

Democracy plus socialism is the goal. But beyond the catchwords, what does it all mean?

This should be a matter for real discussion, as I gather it has been up to now—but much more deeply. It is of course tied in with the first point: analysis and philosophy always must be. But is either going on? And is it mere jingoism without real thoughts? I'm really curious.

Finally, I just think it's about time someone really started talking socialism. I don't suppose this to be really possible till the content is decided upon. But somewhere along the line it all should be done—and very soon.

R. C.

