

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Asks Statement On Browderism

Editor, Daily Worker:

The N.Y. Post claims the present Communist Party line is a return to Browderism. Frankly I don't remember enough about Browderism to know if this is true or not. I should like to see some answer to this in the paper, even a flat no. Also I think there should be a statement on the colonial war in Algeria, and something about what stand the large French CP is taking on this.—M.H.

Howard Fast's "The Intellectual"

NEW YORK

Editor, Daily Worker:

In the issue of Monday, April 23, appears a column, "The Intellectual," by Howard Fast.

I think the article was quite unusual and in need of comment.

1. "Anyone who believes that the political area of a writer's thought contains the secret of his creative urge, is talking sheer nonsense." Of course, it should be understood that we're not talking about lack of creative urge which gives rise to the imitative potboilers from the hacks on the right. Who are they imitating? Each other from time immemorial and currently the man in the grey flannel suit—and pink shirt. But what reason could there be for a writer on the left such as Mike Gold or Howard Fast, or Lenin to sit down and write at all if it weren't for the "political area" of his thought? And I certainly like that neat subdivision. Has Howard Fast, maybe, a simon-pure non-political area of thought?

2. "He (the writer) is seeking the freedom to speak the truth as he comes to know it; for however he may rationalize it, he knows that at the core of his creative effort is the necessity to speak the truth as he sees the truth. Right or wrong, his necessity is not merely to create, but to create without letters." Perhaps Mr. Fast did not mean to give the impression that a writer of the left must have the freedom to come up with his own subjective version of the truth as he sees it and have it published. I do not quarrel with any writer's right to that freedom, but I do question the implication that there may be as many versions of the truth as

there are writers exercising that freedom; that the truth is something subjectively arrived at. As I say, I'm not at all sure that Mr. Fast meant to give that impression, since I am fairly certain that Mr. Fast would agree that truth is something objectively ascertainable independently of subjective viewpoints.

Cordially,
A Reader.

Thoughts of An Old Timer

Editor, Daily Worker:

Most of us are dated from the Depression era, and for almost 25 years now we have lived and worked close to the eye of the storm. If it wasn't one thing it was another, and more often than not it was many things combined that taxed us to the limit of our credulity and our endurance. Many lost their lives in the struggle; others, exhausted, worn out, fell by the wayside; still others abandoned hope and embraced despair, or became cynical; a few, their livelihood at stake, compromised, and not unsympathetically, unconsciously taking as their models the renegades of frontier days, and, like them, committed unspeakable depredations on former comrade-in-arms.

The first 15 years, one might say, were dedicated to the defeat of Fascism, first at home, then abroad. And by the skin of our teeth we emerged victorious, along with the great world-wide peoples coalition. And then immediately embarked on another struggle . . . as if all that had passed were but a series of rehearsals for more trying days to come. For it soon became apparent to us that the struggle to win the war against fascism was as a child's play when compared to the struggle impending . . . that of securing the Peace in the face of the threat of atomic annihilation. We just could not afford to spare ourselves, we just could not run the risk of losing; because if we lost the Peace all would be lost, and a dreary, dead planet would senselessly chase its tail in a vast orbit encircling the sun. 365 days would still be 365 days, the only difference being that nobody would be here to record the passage of time. Millions of people finally understood this elementary fact and instinctively, once they understood, they shrank back and in horror loudly protested against being consigned to the abyss. Their cries did not go unheeded; the mob-

sters were compelled to lay low. And all because the people could no longer say; "if you want to go crazy, go, . . . but you're not taking us along." The people had to act; they couldn't permit, this time, their proverbial enemies the luxury of running amok.

In a world so recently torn by anxiety and fear, so rent by suspicion arising from hysteria, disharmony and discord, we now emerge like a vessel seeing port for the first time, after a long and extremely perilous voyage. And we can scarcely believe our ears, let alone recognize the familiar landmarks of Peace. We ourselves have changed; time and experience has made us sadder and wiser, more mature men and women. Some things in the past may make us feel ashamed when we recall them, other things will cause our hearts to quicken with modest pride. Let us separate the wheat from the chaff, and more confidently face the future, now that it is here at long last.

Sincerely,
—Old Timer.

Urges Readers Listen To Rank and File

Editor, Daily Worker:

The 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party projected basic changes in the theory of Marxism, concerning the possibility of peaceful transition to Socialism. We are sure that Khrushchev, Mikoyan et al studied, debated and discussed at great lengths the historical situation before they developed this new formulation. (We wish to stress that although the science of Dialectical Materialism remains the same, this conclusion is nevertheless new).

For years American Communist policy has been that we do not advocate the violent overthrow of Capitalism, but that the ruling class itself will use violent counter-revolutionary methods to regain power once the working class has won it. Now we are told that this isn't necessarily so and that in the most powerful well organized Capitalist nation the world has ever known the ruling class will relinquish power peacefully. Not only peacefully, but the people will give them the right to advocate a return to wage slavery.

Couldn't Mr. Weiss, John Gates and Eugene Dennis wait till the rank and file of our Party gave them the benefits of their thinking?

Surely one of the great lessons of the 20th Congress is the

MOM AND POP WASHINGTON

The "mom and pop" who run the neighborhood candy store are big in the news from Washington, D. C. these days. The swanky lobbyists for the multi-billion dollar retail industry are pleading—for the sake of "mom and pop" to be sure—that Congress should leave the federal minimum wage law as it is.

The Chamber of Commerce, American Retail Federation, National Retail Dry Goods Association and other big money outfits are going all-out in the nation's capitol to stop Congress from extending the coverage under the minimum wage law to millions of low-paid American workers now left out in the cold.

The 20,000,000 American work-

need for the fullest participation in formulation of Party policy by all members, especially those in the working class.

—Gary Steelworkers.

P.S.—Since the discussion that led up to the writing of this letter, Wm. Z. Foster has printed in PA an article that is by far the best Marxist contribution on the subject. Unfortunately, like all the other material printed, we are made to feel that these are not discussion articles, but rather the acceptance of a new "Line" taken without benefit of our thinking.

Praise for Anna Louise Strong

Editor, Daily Worker:

We think that of all the speeches we've read and heard, discussions we've attended and articles we've read on the re-evaluation of Stalin and the Stalin era; the one in Thursday's DW by Anna Louise Strong was the clearest, the most honest and the one with the most historical perspective.

We couldn't help contrasting it with the articles by Communist Party leaders which appeared. These articles suffer by comparison. They were too pat and often righteous and dealt with things in a relatively superficial manner without the more searching and honest historical approach of Miss Strong. In a word, they were too "workman-like."

We also liked Howard Fast's article in the same issue on comparing crimes, in which he criticized L'Unita of Rome. Here again is a searching article which is not prompted by desire to "save face" and achieve a petty "victory" at the cost of honesty and perspective.

Two Close Friends.