

Dear Editor:

I am still confused about what happened in the Party. Did Simmons, Hoffman, Lamm, etc., drop out of all political activity? Did they join another group, or what? There were serious charges published in the **People's Voice** against Comrade Laski. Were they all, or what? Did a majority of the Central Committee vote to expel him?

I was never a member of the Party, but I think all the people who oppose the system should get together and fight it. A worker who wants to do this looks for a serious, experienced, revolutionary organization. By reading the **People's Voice** one can see how people in Progressive Labor can say the CPUSA (M-L) are "a bunch of crazy kids," "immature," "a handful of inexperienced people," etc. If there were principles involved in the split, what were they? All the theory isn't as important as getting stable people who can work together effectively. I hope the **New Worker** clears this up in the future, but it seems there are too many splits in supposedly radical groups. We should be fighting the bosses, . . . not each other. —B.J. —Boston.

Dear B.J.:

You raise two questions which we would like to take time here to answer. The first is the question of Comrade Laski's supposed expulsion. In the **People's Voice**, (Dec.—1967) the proceedings of the Central Committee meeting at which the criticism of Comrade Laski was dealt with and the receipt of Comrade Laski's resignation as General Secretary was rejected. At no time did the majority of the Central Committee vote to expell him. The so-called expulsion was carried out by a renegade split from the Party and had no validity. At the recent National Party Congress, Comrade Laski was re-elected to the Central Committee and also re-elected as General Secretary by unanimous vote.

Hoffman & Lustig, renegade CC members, were formally expelled at the 2nd National Party Congress (see communique in this issue). Lamm, who was never a member of the Central Committee, has since joined with the counter-revolutionary chorus in praising Liu-Shao-chi.

The second question you raise, that of getting stable people who can work together, we agree that that is necessary. But we must look at the practice of the right-wing Communist Party. They have many stable people who work together, but they maintain their unity in an unprincipled way. Therefore, we must clarify the question by saying unity coupled with a correct political outlook and revolutionary practice. Our Party has gone through a period of splits in the past year. However, as a result of the splits and the questions raised, we have been able to draw certain concrete lessons which have strengthened our ideological understanding and corrected certain errors in our practice. Not all splits are bad. 'Be it so. At all events, a split is better than confusion which impedes the ideological, theoretical and revolutionary growth and maturing of the Party . . . ' The recent period of splitting has provided a new unity for our Party and swept away much of the confusion that we had faced.

For The Editorial Board — E. Stover.