

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

**Marxist
Philosophy**

Editor, Daily Worker:

I would like to address myself to a review by Ben Levine, 5/3/57, on Howard Selsam's book *Philosophy In Revolution*. Although I have not read the book, nevertheless certain questions from the article itself arise.

A question to Mr. Levine on his statement; "... unfortunately a generation of Socialists has been so imbued with the truth and strength of dialectical materialism as to shut out from their minds the contributions of non-Marxist philosophers."

I cannot figure the first part of this statement out. Is it so terrible to be "imbued with the truth and strength of dialectical materialism." I do not understand you, Mr. Levine. What do you suggest? Are you challenging anything in Marxism that you believe to be false?

As to the last part of the statement "... shut out from their minds the contributions of non-Marxist philosophers." I think Mr. Levine is far from the mark here. It has been the study of Marxism-Leninism which has opened and familiarized the minds of many people with philosophers and philosophies which they never even knew existed. Marxism does not deny to any man past or present the contributions made to the enlightenment and freedom of humankind. If anything, Marxism has always advanced and stressed these positive contributions. Marxism is the philosophy of positive action and enlightenment. It does not "shut" the minds of people. But struggles incessantly against backwardness and ignorance, to open the minds of men.

Mr. Levine continues: "The result has been that many people, complacently riding along in the vehicle of a perfect system that they had been taught to regard as Marxism." And that all this went to pieces "... on encountering a stone in the road," namely the 20th party congress.

One is confused from such a statement. It is too general. Does Mr. Levine refer to Marxism as a false perfect system, or does he refer to a false perfect system passed on as Marxism. In either case I wish Mr. Levine would fire his words to hit the target.

Mr. Levine goes on to say we have much to learn from rationalists and skeptics of past centuries. That "... they can help us solve our present problems, if we take into account ... the historic context in which they are written." I personally am very interested in knowing how to go about using e.g. the

works of such men to help solve problems of an industrial society.

Further in the article Mr. Levine suggests that Mr. Selsam discuss in his book such questions as the situation with Comrade Stalin, or why the Soviet leaders have not opened the archives on the political trials under Stalin as they have promised. Or why they still hide the truth on the death of Jewish leaders. In reference to the question of Comrade Stalin, I think that the article based on the discussion of the C.C. of the Chinese Party; ONCE MORE ABOUT THE HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT, answers the question of Stalin very well.

As to why the Soviets have not come through yet on the Jewish question. Why ask Selsam? He's a philosopher, not a mind reader. I would suggest a letter to the Soviets might bring a more fruitful answer.

Going on, Mr. Levine says we should "imbibe" from bourgeois rationalists "... something of the spirit of inquiry." Does Mr. Levine suggest that Marxism does not imbue one with the spirit of inquiry? If this is so I think that Mr. Levine is bringing forth a very serious and false charge against the Marxist movement. Marxism itself implies the serious work of inquiry, and I do not think that we have to turn to bourgeois rationalists for the concept.

I would like to end this letter in agreement with Mr. Levine when he says that Marxists should be stimulated in an interest in non-Marxist philosophers.

F. B.

Nuclear Radiation

Editor, Daily Worker:

I am deeply concerned about the whole question of nuclear radiation and your Worker story about Dr Schweitzer was what gave me impetus to get this check off.

I for one, believe that not enough can be written about the deadly radioactive fallout in order to shake people out of their lethargy—and particularly those who profess a belief in progress, peace, etc.—who actually should be out mobilizing. I believe around this issue we can again—needless to say, I for one didn't go along with some of the "changes" in the D.W. and for a while—well, no need to go into that.

I just want to add that for the first time in a long time I've taken the last issue of the Worker and am "pushing" it wherever I can.

And while I'm in the mood of writing, I just want to add that

COMING

on May 19

in The Worker



Four pages describing the history of the H-bomb and H-bomb testing.

Including exclusive material uncovered by reporter Virginia Gardner in interviews with scientists, Atomic Energy Commission officials, physicians, and others.

Illustrated with charts, maps and cartoons.

Order a bundle today for your friends, acquaintances and shop-mates—at a special price of five cents a copy for five copies or more. Detach the coupon below and mail. (Make all checks payable to Robert Dunn, Box 231, Cooper Station, New York.)

Send me.....copies of the May 19 special issue, Facts about the

H-Bomb. Enclosed find \$.....

Signed

Address

I for one, believe that as much as a working class daily newspaper is needed, nevertheless, if continued financial difficulties come up, then let's concentrate on an enlarged Worker and for the time being, suspend the Daily. Many times, the lead stories are for the New Yorkers. I get it late and so do others—one day or two days—and even then pressure of events make it a day or two later before I read it. But over the week-end, I do read The Worker and find it useful. Too much of the stuff in the Daily Worker is "old stuff" anyhow, by the time I read it. If I do get around, then it's just the editorial page and that could be read on a week-end.

I know the subject I touch is a "touchy one" but this is what I think would be best—at least for a temporary spell—to increase The Worker by at least

MAO, VOROSH PEKING MAY

PEKING. — Chairman Mao Tse-tung and Soviet President Voroshilov, standing side by side at the Gate of Heavenly Peace, reviewed the May Day demonstration.

The half million paraders—workers, peasants, intellectuals, religious people and other citizens—marched in colorful columns almost 100 abreast, waved and shouted to greet the heads of state of the two countries, other Chinese leaders, and the more than 1,000 guests from all parts of the world who reviewed the three-hour parade.

Also on the central rostrum were the President of the Presidium of the Uzbek Supreme Soviet S. R. Rashidov, the President of the Rumanian Grand National Assembly Constantin Pirulescu and the Speaker of the Chamber of Nationalities of Burma Sao Shwe Thaik.

Liu Shao-chi, Chou En-lai, Chu Teh and Chen Yun also reviewed the demonstration from the central rostrum.

Portraits of Marx, Engels, and Stalin hung in Tienanmen Square where the demonstration took place. Chairman Mao Tse-tung's portrait was on the Gate of Heavenly Peace and facing it a portrait of Dr. Sun Yat-sen. Huge slogans in golden letters stressed the unity among the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, among the world-working class and other sections of the people throughout the world; peace and the strength of Marxism-Leninism.

The ceremony started at 10 a.m. with artillery salvos, the national anthem and the Internationale.

Mayor of Peking, Peng Chen, who opened the ceremony greeted the achievements of the workers, peasants, intellectuals, army-men, students and other sections of the people since last May Day. He also extended May Day greetings to the foreign guests.

Peng Chen stated: "We will forever unite with the people of the Soviet Union, the socialist countries, and all peace-loving countries and peoples in the world, and persist in the struggles for world peace and human progress."

The Mayor said that China had already entered the period of socialist construction in which class conflicts on a large or mass scale had been fundamentally ended and contradictions with-

four pages—more theoretical articles—from China, Poland, etc. and of course, concentrating on what forces and what money is available in building The Worker.

Sincerely,

—B. K.