## N. Y. Party Leaders Take New Look at Browder Line

## By Herman Chauka

The New York State Committee of the Communist Ine New York State Committee of the Communist Party has decided to publish in its discussion bulletin a vigorous defense of Earl Browder and his period of leadership of the Communist Party. The decision to make the document available to the mem-bership marks a new stage in the struggle now taking place in the Communist Party and comes as a fresh blow against National Chairman William Z. Foster.

Foster. Joseph Lash reported in the Aug. 23 New York Post that the State Committee had decided to publish the defense of Browder in its bulletin, Party Voice, de-spite vigorous protest from spite Foster. Written by "Chick Mason," an otherwise unidentified party member, the 15,000 word document, has been circulated among 200 CP leaders. Mason prepared a 4,000 word has abridgment for Party Voice.

sound, especially for one who's just had his eyes opened." Asked if he thought publication of the document foreshadowed overtures for his return to the party, Browder said he "would not predict that sort of thing."

Again according to the Post, Mason demands acceptance of the thesis that the "so-called Browder position was correct." Mason charges that with the expulsion of Browder in 1946 a "stampede back to isolation" took place and that the expulsion was seized on by Foster "to take over the 'theoretical' leadership of the Party."

In the Aug. 24 Daily Worker, State Board have existed since denies any conflict with Foster on publication of the Mason gle against our sectarian line document and says that it will be circulated "in line with our policy of publishing all views submitted in good faith by party members" used the 'fear of factionalism' to stifle onnosition. We need members."

Coleman also asserts that "While there are differing views in the N.Y. State Party leader-ship, all, however, are in direct disagreement w i t h Mason's views." This assertion flue at views." This assertion flies di-Committee on party perspectives. ent discussion,

of the Dennis report. . . I pro-pose that the National Committee issue a statement about the many wrongly expelled over the past ten years. The Party must take an official stand on these questions. The Party must take another look into the Browder period."

1 ( I 1 Į ł 7 c

2

f

£

t

ć

t

0

ź

1

1

1

I

t I ( C

t

(

\$

x

b

1

C

E

t T

2

i 8

I

ŀ

.

Coleman himself, in the July issue, after tipping his hat to the fight against Browder's "opportunism," declares • that "In our anxiety to purge ourselves of Browderism. . . we dumped out many of the valuable fea-The Post reports that Browder has read the Mason document and that he considers it "pretty sound, especially for one who's last 10 years.) "And we were quick to retreat from any policy or analysis that might be stig-matized as Browderite or revi-sionist or tainted with Amaican exceptionalism."

Again, Don Lester, writes in the July PV, "It is my firm conviction that any effective struggle demands a, re-evalution of the so-called 'Browder period.'" Lester also "holds no brief" for Browder, but he thinks "it is undeniable that Browder made the first serious effort to apply Marxism to the American scene and to relate it to the Amer-

ican past and future." "It is no secret that sharp t DO ALL DISAGREE? The editor of Party Voice, Sam Coleman, in a statement in the Aug. 24 Daily Worker, difference within the national leadership and between the na-tional leadership and the N. Y. State Board have existed since r t ¢ b e S n t 2 to stifle opposition. We need t ŧ C i t

In the Aug. 26 Worker, Fose rectly in the face of the printed record. The June and July issues of Party Voice are devoted and to re-organize its forces on I of Party Voice are devoted and to re-organize its forces on a mainly to expressions of state committee members on Eugene Dennis' report to the National ghost looms large over the pres-