

Letters from Readers

The views expressed in the letters printed below do not necessarily reflect our own. However we are glad to present their opinions and invite others to write to this column.



America Not Yet Ready for Socialism

RICHMOND, Ind.

Dear Editor:

Mr. William Norman, writing in the Daily Worker of Sept. 20, says that "Socialism, here in the United States, as elsewhere . . . will come into being here . . . when the American people are ready for it."

The American people, from the standpoint of production, both agricultural and industrial were over-ripe for socialism quite a few years ago and in fact America needs socialism very badly today, for only through social reorganization of society, putting economic power equally in the hands of all Americans can we hope to settle our pressing internal problems.

We need socialism very badly in order to solve the problems of growing unemployment, the distribution of so-called surplus production, undemocratic racial discrimination, and the constant need to keep business going by government spending on a fake defense program of which there is absolutely no necessity in a world working for peace.

Yes, the American people, from every practical aspect are ready for socialism and have been for quite some time, but from the educational standpoint the American people are not ready for socialism, and as long as the radio, press, television, schools and churches are under the domination of capitalists and capitalist propagandists, the American people will never be ready for socialism because they don't know what it's all about.

In my opinion the progressive and leftwing forces in American life have one paramount job, and that is to get busy and educate the American people for socialism, and quite bickering so much among themselves. Half of the job is already accomplished—half of the world is already socialist.

There is only one section of American society that will ever educate the American people for socialism, and that is the left of center part of American society, and they might as well get busy for the job has to be done some time, and the sooner the better.

A HOOSIER.

The Case Against Chiropractic

CHICAGO.

Dear Editor:

From his letter (Sept. 30), it is clear that Charles Strong is not familiar with the "roots" of chiropractic to which he glibly refers. They are reported in a completely scholarly fashion, from first-hand sources, by Dr. Fishbein in his book on medical fads and follies, and will curl the hair of any reader.

If Strong is still incredulous, he can turn to the original "literature" of chiropractic itself. Cancer, tuberculosis, diabetes, and everything else were described as curable and cured by chiropractic—until there were so many criminal suits and convictions, and civil suits and awards in behalf of the victims, that the chiropractors had to change their tune.

What they now do is send seriously ill patients to medical doctors and medical hospitals for the vitally needed treatment, and then have them returned for their own lucrative "manipulations," after which they publish and

broadcast the cases as cases of cure by chiropractic.

The medical profession cooperates because it can hardly refuse the patients and allow them to die. And the chiropractor's "case reports," after all, do not conceal the lend-lease of the patients to the medical hospitals, but merely slur over it as if something incidental.

I personally visited a chiropractor some years ago. I told him I just wanted a check-up, if it were free, but that I had no symptoms or complaints whatever. Nor did he himself dare to claim he found anything wrong with me, but he urged me nevertheless to take a course of treatments from him.

As one of their standard "diagnostic" techniques, he ran an electrode slowly up my spine, and part-way, at a couple of places, he sent a little shock in me. He then pretended that it was abnormalities at those places in my spine that closed the circuit automatically in this marvellous machine of theirs. But something about the mild way I looked at him made him hesitate to insist that there was anything wrong with my spine.

STRONG is clearly without knowledge of even the rudiments of physiological science, much less of medical science. Dislocations of vertebrae are rare except with fractures, i.e., actual breaking of bone. More important, any injury to nerves is surprisingly rare even when there are severe dislocations or severe fractures.

And Strong appears unaware that medical physicians have highly scientific methods of treatment of all such cases as do occur. Accounts are to be found by those interested, in the appropriate medical text books of neurology, surgery, and physical therapy.

He also makes it obvious that he is unaware that "preventive medicine" was the creation of medical scientists, and that there are whole medical text books of Preventive Medicine.

If chiropractors are becoming legally and medically more tolerated, it is only to the extent that they are borrowing more from established medicine, while continuing for the benefit of the gullible to claim that their "manipulations" are the most important thing.

Osteopathy had similar but less unscrupulous beginnings, but today, except for one course in "osteopathy," its curriculum is literally identical with that of the medical schools, and its graduates are in every sense medical practitioners.

W. R.



Stop Deportation Of Diamond Kimm

Dear Editor:

Five years of struggle to prevent the deportation of Diamond Kimm to South Korea and almost certain death has reached a shocking climax in an Immigration hearing officer's recommendation to deport.

Diamond Kimm will be delivered to Syngman Rhee to be dealt with as a "traitor." As an editor of an anti-Rhee newspaper (the Korean Independence) Kimm has exposed the corrupt and anti-democratic nature of the South Korean government—and

such activities are labelled as traitor by Rhee.

Diamond Kimm is being deported on the legal technicality of having over-stayed his visa, but no one acquainted with the record can doubt that he is being deported for his denunciations of Rhee—and most likely at the direct request of the South Korean regime.

For only recently a leading newspaper in Seoul (South Korea) in commenting on Kimm's imminent deportation, exposed the fact that the Korean Embassy in Washington was watching the proceedings against Kimm with great interest. The article referred to Kimm as a "red propagandist" and "traitor."

Diamond Kimm must not be deported to certain death in South Korea writes today to:

Mr. David M. Carnahan
Southwest Regional Director
Immigration and Naturalization Service
Terminal Island
San Pedro, California

Urge him to suspend the deportation proceedings against Diamond Kimm on the humanitarian grounds that he faces death or persecution if deported to South Korea.

Friends of Diamond Kimm
1441 W. Jefferson Blvd.
Los Angeles 7, Calif.

Points of Difference With Davis Article

NEW YORK CITY.

Dear Editor:

Many critical comments have been made in this period of evaluation—after all, there all, there has been such a long period of silence. Silence, that is, on the part of the rank and file.

The tables have turned somewhat and now it seems, our national leadership in the main are silent. We welcomed therefore the statement made by Ben Davis in the Sunday Worker dated Sept. 3, 1956, which appeared under the heading "Some Areas of Agreement."

We do not agree with Ben Davis that the Norman Schrank report "tends to wipe out past achievements or that the Schrank report "stimulates tendencies toward liquidation and opens the door to all sorts of right opportunist dangers." It could very well be however that Davis did see what we were not able to. But we do "strongly disagree" with the lack of substantiation for the above comments made by Davis. We see no merit whatsoever in such generalities as "Tends to wipe out," "stimulates tendencies" or "all sorts of right opportunist dangers." These are just words and not proof, slurring words, which don't protect the Party.

Now what is really alarming is the following statement made by Ben Davis, "It is inevitable, in the present state of our Party, that other dangers besides sectarian ones appear, some honest and some not." It is really necessary at this point in the discussion to cast doubt as to the honesty of the contributors? Are we at this point in need of creating a suspicious atmosphere so that we devote our energies to finding dishonesty rather than looking for the positive contributions in order to solve our difficulties? Do we seek to cement relations within the Party or are we again to begin a witchhunt as to motives and thus destroy the Party?

We agreed with Davis when he wrote that "we cannot have an attitude of spoon-feeding our membership" yet he resorts to doing our thinking for us by writing off with one sentence a serious study of the Browder period as follows: "A lengthy document is being widely circulated in our Party calling openly for a return to Browderism."

This is what we would call prejudicing a case before the evi-



"TELL ME, IKE, ... JUST HOW IS YOUR HEALTH?"

dence is in, since the bulk of the membership has not had the opportunity to read this lengthy document as yet.

We have read this study of the Browder period and found that we were tremendously impressed with the facts presented, some of which we were completely unaware of before. We did not come to the same conclusion that this was a call to return to Browderism. It would not have occurred to us to write this before its publication, however, we again agree with Davis that "today there are no sacred cows" and "the present period in our Party is one of education as well as of basic self-critical examination."

Further when Davis says—"had we not defeated Browderism—with its rosy picture and American imperialism seeking co-existence with the socialist and democratic camps—we would have been more in the soup than now"—we can only say well, there is at least the admission that we are in the soup now. We cannot



however judge from the above quoted sentence how it is possible for anyone to know that we would have been "more in the soup now." Certainly it is not sufficiently substantiated.

Our reading of the document led us to understand that we—the Communist Party—was calling for co-existence and should this not have met with success, the burden of disunity between the socialist and capitalist sectors would have been on the heads of the capitalist sector, not ours.

I and J. K.

"Time for CP To Speak Its Piece"

PHILADELPHIA.

Editor, The Worker:

The time has come for the Communist Party to speak its own piece and to explain to its members and to the workers on the outside what its program is and how it proposes to solve the domestic and international problems facing us.

The spokesmen for capitalism keep up a daily barrage about communism constantly warning the people to steer clear of this

"sinister conspiracy." Because of their huge propaganda machinery—the press, radio and television—they have succeeded to a large extent in instilling fear of the Party and branded the Communists as persons to be shunned like the plague.

Ben Davis wrote an article in The Worker, Sept. 2, with which I find myself in full agreement. We find ourselves, today, in a period and under conditions unlike any that have gone before. We have passed through the most vicious attack in the history of the Party. In this attack they used the courts of the land to perpetrate the most brazen frameup in the history of the organization. Many of our leading comrades served long prison terms, and the cases of many others are pending in the courts.

The time has come for us to counterattack and make their assault boomerang. In order to do this we must take immediate steps to explain ourselves to the people in the court of public opinion.

The Daily Worker and the Sunday Worker should continue as usual, but besides these we should issue a special edition of The Worker, same format of 16 pages and same name. This special should serve both as a permanent organizer in building a mass party, and as a medium for rebuilding our tottering finances.

It would also be our best defense in the pending Smith Act cases. What we say in this document would be the best evidence of what we really advocate. We cannot be held responsible for what Marx and Lenin said, or what any foreign Communist has said, and the charge of foreign agent would fall flat.

It could be printed in editions of 10,000 and one edition would pay for the next one. . . . Circulate the papers one week, and return the following week to appeal for contributions and invitations to join the Party. In this manner we could start a chain reaction. We should be able to get out millions of copies between now and the time set for the Smith Act trials. By that time we should have greatly increased our membership and have rehabilitated our finances.

This special should be devoted solely to the Party program on all domestic and international issues and establish the Party as the vanguard and undisputed leader of the American working class. This document should give the answer to what humanity has been looking forward to for milleniums. This is why we must have democratic centralism to give cohesion and continuity to our work.

N. C. C.