

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Quotation from Schneiderman

Editor, Daily Worker:

William Schneiderman wrote (DW Feb. 8) of a quotation I cited in "The Khrushchev Report and the Crisis in the American Left" from an article of his as being "out of context." The question involved is whether or not the given quote clearly reflected Schneiderman's views regarding the postwar trends of the American economy. My arguments in the section where the quotation appears is as follows:

1. Most capitalist wars during the last 250 years have been followed by inflationary booms ranging from five to 15 years.

2. All Marxist, and many liberal economists, regard the present buoyancy of the American economy, its warding off of sharp cyclical crises, as due not to any inherent, permanent or exceptional features of American capitalism but as due to the rebuilding of cities and factories destroyed in World War II, the re-equipment of obsolete plants, the rising tributes for the American monopolies from colonial and semi-colonial areas, credit inflation, the Korean and Indo-Chinese wars and above all, the immense armament expenditures.

3. Some American Marxists, however, tend to overlook the overriding influence of these temporary factors upon the American economy and speak of some "built in," "permanent" features which may prevent a crisis of over-production.

Among others, I quoted Schneiderman, who wrote: "The fact is that American production has not yet outstripped its market. We have explained the economic measures which made this possible as temporary measures props which could not last. But these measures are increasingly being adopted for prolonged periods. They may become more or less permanent features by which American monopoly capital seeks to maintain itself at home."

Schneiderman objects that this quotation is "careless" and "out of context," first, because I omitted the two sentences following the above, namely, "The contradictions of capitalist society remain and even multiply. But we must examine in what way these new factors act on the operation of economic laws." Second, because I did not quote a preceding sentence which reads: "We have made no real analysis of what new

factors, both within the American economy and its relations with the rest of the world have delayed the anticipated postwar crisis of over-production."

But these additions are clearly in full context with the part I quoted. Indeed, they furnish added proof to my argument in that some American Marxists (a) tend to dismiss the role played by the enormous arms expenditures as well as the other temporary props (shown by many Marxist and non-Marxist economists to have delayed the crisis of over-production) as being "no real analysis." (b) tend to regard our economic analysis of the postwar period as outdated and are thinking of some new, still undiscovered and perhaps permanent and specifically American features for explaining why American production has not yet outstripped its market. (c) are more optimistic regarding the maneuverability of American capitalism than most non-Marxist economists.

All this may not accurately reflect Schneiderman's present thinking on the matter. Judging, however, by what he wrote, it was not my quotation but rather his attempt to change its obvious meaning that I find "out of context."—Hershel D. Meyer.

Honest Reporting

Feb. 19, 1957.

Editor, Daily Worker:

It was only in the past few days that I learned that Howard Fast has quit the Communist Party, and I must say I am not surprised. In spite of the step forward the recent convention signalized, it is my opinion that the party does not yet warrant the confidence of those who believe in Socialism.

Not too long ago we boasted that criticism and self criticism was a fundamental law under Socialism. But today the leaders of the Party look with suspicion upon those who criticize the errors of the Soviet leadership. The whole world knows that the Soviet Union has done nothing to re-establish the Jewish culture that was virtually wiped out under Stalin. The reason? I believe it to be power politics. The Soviet leadership does not want to offend some of the Feudal anti-Jewish rulers of the Middle East.

Furthermore, very little has been done to democratize the Soviet Parliament or the trade unions. Last year Khrushchev called Stalin a murderer, this year he calls him a fighter for

the workingclass. Do all these facts inspire confidence in Socialism?

As for our own Daily Worker, is it reporting the news impartially or does it play down and cover-up the errors of the Soviet, and our own Party leadership?

It was only after a letter from a reader was received that the news of the interview between Canadian Party leaders and Khrushchev was published in the Daily. In publishing excerpts of this interview, the Daily omitted all the anti-Semitic reasons Khrushchev gave for not re-establishing the Jewish culture in the Soviet Union. Why?

Several weeks ago Harry Schwartz reviewed a report of the Soviet Ministry of Education. This report, according to Schwartz, showed that the situation in the lower and middle schools was one of overcrowding, double shifts, old and run down school buildings. Was Schwartz telling the truth? Why didn't the Daily review this report?

I could cite many more examples of the lack of honest reporting by the Daily when it comes to shortcomings on the part of the Soviet and our own leadership, including the cutting out of a portion of a letter, written by a reader, criticizing James Ford.

If we want the confidence of the American workingclass we must be honest in our words and deeds and let the chips fall where they may. After twenty three years in the Party, I hope to see the day when our Party will become the true leader of the U.S. road to Socialism.—G.

Danger in 'Humble Pie'

Editor, Daily Worker:

I've been listening to all the talk about left-sectarianism and the right danger during the past months, and I'm one of those who feels that left-sectarianism has been one of our most serious weaknesses during the past years. But in the Daily Worker of Feb. 19, there are two pieces, one a column, the other a letter which, to me, illustrate glaringly the very real right danger in our party today.

The column is Abner Berry's, on the subject of the reaction of Roy Wilkins to our national convention's resolution on the Negro question. Mr. Berry says toward the end of his article:

"The Communists have not put forward a program to make

Communism a trend in every organization fighting for democracy in the U.S.; they have simply sought to chart a path that would increase Communists' contributions to the advance of democracy in the U.S."

If that is the case, then why on earth continue with a Communist Party? How does this differ from the point of view of those who have left the party because they feel they can work along as individuals?

I agree with Mr. Berry when he says that we do not seek to impose our views on the NAACP or other organizations whose work we wish to support. But does that mean that we abdicate the right to persuade and win our co-workers in shops and organizations to our point of view, that we forfeit the right to urge and try to carry through policies in those organizations which we feel will hasten the victory of socialism? A united

front, yes, but as Communists, not just as "nice fellows" and genial "yes-men."

I.S.'s letter in the same issue is on a very different subject, that of Howard Fast, but it illustrates the same point of view as Mr. Berry's. It says: "... let us try to make of the American Communist Party the kind of organization which Howard Fast will want, some day, to rejoin."

Permit me to object! I am not interested in belonging to a party which bases its principles on the desire to please. Let us rather concentrate on making the American Communist Party an effective, strong organization which meets the needs of the American people by continually challenging and weakening the power of the capitalist class.

Yes, we can learn valuable lessons from our mistakes of the past. But comrades, please, I'm beginning to gag on some of this humble pie!

ALLEGRA

Lawyers

(Continued from Page 3)

delegations to the United Nations and the UN Office of Legal Affairs were represented.

Delegations came from Denmark, the Soviet Union, India, Finland, Egypt, Chile, Peru, Thailand, and Ceylon.

Brig.-Gen. Hugh B. Hester, retired, spoke approvingly of comments by two former commanders under whom he served, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He quoted Eisenhower's recent statement after King Saud's visit that we can't promote peace only by talking to those who agree with us, and MacArthur's that man's inventiveness in weapons had made impossible the settling of differences by violence.

The real enemies of men, he declared, were poverty, ignorance, bigotry, and fear.

He urged summit meetings, pointing out, "As long as you're talking, you can't be shooting."

He pointed out that the Russians lost "from 15 to 20 million people killed or starved to death" in World War II, and asked if there was any sense in "talking about these people as wanting a new war."

Brig.-Gen. Hester urged economic assistance to underdeveloped nations, and opening of avenues of trade and cultural exchange. "Let's fill this iron curtain so full of holes it looks like a sieve," he declared. "We can do it by doing what Jesus said, 'Do unto others.'"

Prof. Hugh H. Wilson, associate professor of political science at Princeton university, assailed efforts to stifle disagreement, "behind a facade of pseudo-prosperity."

He warned against the tendency to relax since demagogues such as Sen. McCarthy had been downgraded, and inveighed against the refusal "to recognize the totalitarian potential in the modern economy." The choice "is not between individual enterprise and the collective, but between which type of collective is to dominate," he said.

The professor suggested "there is some evidence that young people are anxious to work for something other than pursuit of self-interest." We "cannot protect humanist values," in his opinion, "if all of society is to be directed toward production of commodities," with 10 billion dollars spent annually for advertising and two billion for education.

Resolutions yesterday urged a return to government employment policies practiced prior to "the ill-advised and misnamed loyalty security employment program;" called for the repeal of the Subversive Activities Control Act to allow "a free trade union movement;" and urged discontinuance of prosecution of the United Electrical Union and Mine Mill and Smelter Workers union.

Repeal of the Smith Act and cessation of prosecution under the act pending the U.S. Supreme Court ruling was urged.

One resolution urged the State Department to let reporters visit China. The resolution also opposed "political tests" for passports.