

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

On Supporting British Labor

BROOKLYN

Editor, Daily Worker

I was glad indeed to read the letter by James W. Ford (Apr. 3) criticizing as "reformist-opportunist" your editorial urging the American trade unions to come to the aid of the striking British workers.

The reason I was so glad was that, seeing that I disagree most vigorously with the isolated and sectarian character of Ford's outlook, it was valuable to see, for once, a practical application of this outlook.

To urge upon our trade unions the sending of moral and financial support to the British strikers? Bah, says Ford, that is "reformist-opportunist."

What should we do? I quote:

"The key question is replacement of the cold war by peaceful coexistence, renunciation of aggression, banning of nuclear tests, and the abandonment of NATO and the use of Britain as a base of U.S. guided missiles."

Well, one has to admit this is a considerable quantity of fish n' chips to send the British strikers, something really substantial to see them through the strike.

No doubt this practical proposal is based on the existing facts in the American labor movement and what is really possible. It also corresponds, no doubt, to the actual nature of the British strike and the scope of its demands.

Possibly some political lynx with only a left eye will go Ford one better and detect the cloven hoof or reformism in his failure to mention Socialism as the only final solution.

The Daily Worker has long made its position clear on questions of the cold war, nuclear tests, NATO, etc. But **WHEN WORKERS ARE ON THE PICKET LINE FOR WAGES IS NOT THE TIME TO COME AROUND WITH A POTATO SACK EMPTY OF EVERYTHING BUT "PROGRAMS."** For the Daily Worker to have written such an editorial as Ford is suggesting would have been the most irresponsible phrasemongering.

The point of Marxism is not just to "understand" the world, but to change it. And in the given circumstances, the practical way of getting the American trade unions, if at all possible, to slap even backhandedly at American imperialism, was to urge that step which a deep sense of labor solidarity dictates:

to send aid to these striking British workers.

Again, I appreciate Ford's letter. It is high time indeed, to begin to test all views in the crucible of practise!

JACOB SAMUELSON

April 3, 1957

Dangers in Self-Deception

Editor, Daily Worker:

A few weeks ago the "Speak Your Piece" page printed a letter from me covering the ability of the billion dollar monopoly capital propaganda mechanism to limit the effectiveness of the progressive press and action, and also the self-deception some contributors to the "Speak Your Piece" page practice concerning this effectiveness.

Since then some friends have asked me concerning my reasons for contributing this letter. They seem to feel that almost everybody has a few illusions, and that those illusions that make us more effective fighters for progress "cannot be all bad." I acknowledge some truth in this.

It seems to me that all self-deception contains seeds of danger, but that this particular example holds peril to the progressive movement especially at this moment.

The number of people in the U.S. who have come into and left the active progressive movement in the last 40 years has been enormous. But, except for the stoolpigeons and those who remained anti-humanist in outlook, I believe they all profited by their selfless work in the progressive movement.

There are also two other large groups, which overlap each other, of former active progressives who do not accept the fact of such profit to themselves.

These are what used to be called the "disappointed socialists" and what I like to call the "personal socialists," who measure the worth of the progressive movement at any particular moment by their own progress in it, intellectually, emotionally, or otherwise.

These two groups are especially subject to this self-deception mentioned in my letter, and I believe the progressive movement generally is in a period when this is an extreme danger.

I would like to add one more item to those listed in Max Gordon's excellent "Speak Your Piece" letter on improving the Daily Worker. This would be—in addition to and as part of teaching about Socialism—to make many more, in addition to readers in progressive activity and a few handful of others, into scientists of society and social change.

SAUL GROSS

Chinese

Immigrants

CHICAGO

Editor, Daily Worker:

Speaking before a meeting of SEATO on March 12, John Foster Dulles, who refuses to recognize the People's Republic of China, said that most of the Chinese immigrants "remain loyal to the Republic of China now seated at Formosa, which symbolizes the China they know." This is the biggest lie I have heard in a long time. A Chinese worker told me the following:

"We Chinese immigrants are placed in a very awkward position because of the cold war. It isn't easy for us to speak out what we really feel. I understand that even native-born Americans don't have much freedom of speech, but our difficulties are beyond your imagination, as suppression of foreign language papers and deportations going on.

"I don't know much about socialism, but I am naturally concerned about what's going on in China. Among news from China, there are some I don't like, but there are lots that I like. The other day I heard from a friend of mine in China and learned that they are planting rubber trees in Haïnan. This is a very good news since rubber is one of natural resources China doesn't have. In Shanghai before the war, most hotels and restaurants were segregated, and we Chinese people were not allowed in them. These luxuries were built only for white people, and we had to live on the street or in boats. That wasn't right. But even today here in the U. S. there is still racial segregation.

"We Chinese, regardless of difference in political views, are proud of our 5,000 years of history and our culture. But wherever we went we were kicked around and spit at, because we didn't have a country we could depend on. We want a strong and healthy China, where no exploitation is possible, and I think that every fair-minded person all over the world supports this, regardless of his political ideology.

"The Chinese people on the mainland don't have much of so-called freedom today. But I realize that the new government of China is placed in a very difficult position by the cold war. Economic blockade and espionage works are being done by foreign governments who don't like to see a healthy construction of new China. The very existence of China is threatened by possible H-bomb attacks. Despite all these obstacles, the construction must go on, and it will