

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

A Reply To James Ford

Editor, Daily Worker:

James W. Ford in his letter to the DW on April 3 criticizes the paper's editorial "Aid British Labor" and accuses it of following a reformist opportunist policy. He cites the DW editorial, which "tells the American Labor to cable British Labor Trade Unions, assuring all the aid, moral and financial need to carry through their gigantic strike struggles to victory."

Now, what is wrong with this? It is, says Ford, because "it is treating symptom instead of the disease. The disease is American imperialism and U.S. monopolies." What would Ford expect the DW to do? Would he suggest to urge American Trade Union movement to send aid, but with an accompanying note pointing out the evils of American imperialism. Or perhaps, withholding aid and confining itself to a sermon on the wickedness of American monopolies. The DW in urging American Trade Unions to aid British Labor performed its workingclass duty honorably. George Morris followed the editorial and correctly criticized the American Labor for not beginning to move in this direction. The very act of aid is an expression of solidarity against a common enemy sometimes is more eloquent than editorial comments and pamphlets.

In analyzing the DW editorial on aid Ford writes: "That is like an American banker expressing concern over the plight of poor British workers." To make such a comparison requires stretching an imagination a bit too far. I have as yet to see bankers shedding tears over the plight of any workers. Whenever any workingclass organization offers help to its brother organizations in their struggles it doesn't presume to lecture them. When the Soviet Trade Unions offered aid to the British general strike in 1926, which was called in sympathy with the British miners, they didn't expound on the evils of British mine owners. This aspect of the question was dealt by the Brit-

ish T.U. Likewise, in the present situation, the advanced elements in the British Labor point to real causes responsible for the plight of British workers.

But what about the DW? To its everlasting credit it never ceased to advocate the key questions, affecting also the British conditions,—namely, the ending of cold war, peaceful co-existence, East - West Trade, banning of nuclear tests, abolition of military bases, and dissolution of all military blocs,—NATO included. Indiscriminate, tossing around of the word "opportunism" doesn't contribute to clarity.—F.

Baffled by Mandel

Editor, Daily Worker:

With respect to the letter of Bill Mandel, truly I do not know what to make of it.

Mandel reminds me of "off again" "on again" Finnegan. First he's in—then he's out. Then he's in, then he's out, and now over again he's in. If he is preparing to be an Olympic Diver he's doing great, but seriously I doubt some of Bill's thinking, to quote an old line "The lad seems in doubt."

There are several things in the letter that are disturbing however. Bill seems to have repented some of his mistakes in one part of the letter, but then he goes right back to them later. That he doth not love the Soviet Union we know, that he could do a far better job there with all his years of experience leading the workers we also know, but it is nauseating to say the least for Bill to repeat the same old shiboleth against the Soviet Union.

The most disturbing thing is that Bill who tempestuously walked out of the Convention didn't listen to the decisions of the Convention. It was that the objective was to rebuild and strengthen the Communist Party and the divisions (the three trends of thought he mentions) and build unity.

Please Bill if you're going to stay around for a while stick to the game as the rest of the boys decided it was to be played.

Jack Beveridge.