

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

About Anna Louise Strong

Editor, Daily Worker:

The two letters that I saw published in the DW on Miss Strong's evaluation of Stalin had nothing but praise for her ideas. I agree that her analysis was very good, but only up to a point. I cannot agree with some of her concluding remarks:

1. She claims that the present leaders of the Soviet Union might have been "rightly shot" had they spoken out on Stalin sooner.

2. In connection with this Miss Strong claims "that to attack leaders at the wrong time" is to lose the "collective struggle" be it strike or war. Furthermore, she says that she refrained from mentioning things wrong in the USSR thinking that, "this is no time to spread suspicion of the first Socialist state."

Miss Strong refutes her own ideas when she said: that she felt like shouting "At last, at last, at last," "when the People's World of San Francisco had an editorial telling Moscow to explain the fate of certain Jews." Why should Miss Strong shout "at last," if she thought that there should be no criticism sooner than today? What makes criticism legitimate today and not yesterday? World War II was no excuse since a claim of inadequate military preparation was laid to the Stalin "cult of the individual." Furthermore, the major injustices against individuals were committed after the war.

Does Miss Strong think the present criticisms so minor that they could have been put aside in favor of reaching some collective goal? Obviously the lack of these criticisms made it possible for "distortions of Socialism" to creep into Soviet and People's Democratic governmental work. The list is all too long and gruesome to need rehashing here. I am still waiting to hear from the Soviet leaders why they brought these criticisms out at so late a date and what connection, if any, there is between Stalin's death and the revela-

tions of his faults after it.

Last but not least, I would like to say to Miss Strong, that people who are reporters of world events, who travel and see for themselves should report accurately these events.

—B'KLYN READER.

What About Editors' Note

Editor, Daily Worker:

I am rather confused by a little note with which you prefaced the article by James S. Allen last week in which you disassociate yourself from his position. In all the many years I have read the paper this is the first time I saw anything like this. I also note that in all the hundreds of letters you printed in the past months you never mentioned a point of view one way or another, although some of them were decidedly crackpot.

I read Mr. Allen's first piece and I am moved to write this letter because I feel he expresses my own feelings with great clarity and in the spirit and tradition of Marxism—with solidity regarding the basic foundations on which our theory and practice are based (which have not been negated by anything that has happened before or after the 20th Congress) and yet with a keen awareness of the need for Americans to seek new methods of implementing these fundamental concepts.

You categorically state that the Editors (who are nameless as far as the reader is concerned) disagree with Mr. Allen. What do you disagree with? Everything? If so, then you have abandoned Marxism. This I cannot and do not wish to believe. If the "Editors" have adopted some new philosophy the readers have a right to know it, and soon. I just believe you have made a terrible mistake because Mr. Allen has the right of dissent, as you admit by printing his article. If so, the "Editors" should sign their names to an answer to Mr. Allen. We want to know who is thinking what and we don't want you to lead us to some nameless path, mark-

ed by a disregard and rejection of fundamentals of Marxist thought and history. Have faith in your readers! If you present all points of view, without bias, they will make the correct decisions!

—R. B.

Cheers for James Allen

Editor, Daily Worker:

Cheers for James Allen. His articles clearly expose some of the fallacies of Max Weiss' reasoning.

Weiss puts forward the theory that the majority of the population will vote for Socialism. As Allen points out, history has no example of the ruling class giving up power peacefully. Neither was there even an example of the majority of the people in a capitalist country voting for Socialism.

To speak of the Workers' Republics as being in the category of those nations which did so, is to ignore the fact that these nations are now going through a form of Proletarian Dictatorship—a phase which Weiss' reasoning rejects.

Bits from the current writing of other leaders, plus the Weiss articles, plus the fact that the Weiss articles though "personal opinions" are to be reprinted in pamphlet form while the Allen articles had the forewarning to readers that these articles did not express the opinion of the editors—plus talk of Constitutional Communists—plus the emphasis on peaceful transition—plus editorials (commented upon by other correspondents) which would fit perfectly into the N.Y. Post, would make it seem that at least a portion of our leadership has had a relapse into Browderism.

I am in no way opposed to using every constitutional means to improve the lot of the working class—but it must be recognized that this is but one form of a struggle which must be waged on all fronts and by all methods if even a small percentage of our people will vote for Socialism—much less a majority.

The "Constitutionalists" on the

National Committee and on the Editorial Board of The Worker must not be allowed to put this line into effect until the issues have been put clearly to the membership. I have no doubt that under such circumstances, the "Constitutionalists" will be massively rejected.

GRISELDA.

Civil Liberties Under Socialism

CHICAGO, ILL.

Editor, Daily Worker:

James Allen's argument against full civil liberties under socialism is wrong and how wrong is revealed when he turns history on its head and says: "... the abolition of chattel slavery was written into our constitution. ... Thereby all efforts by propaganda or otherwise to restore the slave system, were rendered illegal."

To this day there is nothing whatever illegal about propaganda or any other form of political activity aimed at restoring the slave system by constitutional amendment. The slave system is utterly smashed, though, and no one (not even the most rabid Dixiecrats, who would like to restore slavery) is absurd enough to enter the political arena with the slogan of restoring it.

A transition to socialism, should the American people at some point vote it, would be much more decisive, with few of the contradictions and hangovers that characterized the abolition of slavery. Apparently Allen has no faith that the majority for socialism would hold firm to its victory if the arguments for a return to the old society were permitted political expression. Some Marxist.

Secondly, a question: What has the paper to say about the execution of four more Soviet leaders announced only after the fact and with only the vaguest information on the charges and trials? It would seem to demand some sharp questions as being typical of exactly the sort of thing that is now being profusely apologized for.

LE ROY WOLINS.

P.S.—When you print letters asking questions of the paper

why not try to answer the questions. You have ducked some important ones.

Ed. Note: Managing Editor Alan Max dealt with the Azerbaijan case in Tuesday's D. W.

Praises Fast's Column on Freud

Editor, Daily Worker:

I notice that one M. M. has a letter in the D.W. contemptuous of Howard Fast's column on Freud. Fast's column was superb. . . .

M. M. is obviously another of those would-be "Marxists" who could not tell a correct from a false statement about Freud and believe that it does not matter if the statements are false.

Freedom of discussion in the D.W. and The Worker has now been extended to all sorts of views on revisions of Marxism and on religion, etc.—but not on psychoanalysis. The healthy new freedom is still only for matters where it has first been introduced, if only by implication, in the USSR. It has apparently not been introduced as yet in the USSR in the area of psychoanalysis, and so psychoanalysis is not eligible for it in the pages of the D. W. and The Worker.

At the same time it can be betted with perfect safety that when any substantial change in the attitude toward discussion of psychoanalysis appears in the USSR, the D.W. and The Worker will not hold to their present policy, but will open their pages to free criticism of presumptuous ignorance in anti-Freudian extremists, and will promptly self-criticize their previous policy.

—W. R.

Daily Worker

Published daily except Saturday and Sunday by the Publishers New Press, Inc., 35 E. 12th St., New York 2, N. Y. Telephone ALgonquin 4-7854.

Reentered as second class matter Oct. 22, 1947, at the post office of New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

3 mos. 6 mos. 1 year
Daily Worker only \$4.00 \$7.00 \$12.00
SUBSCRIPTION RATES—
(Except Foreign)
Daily Worker & Worker 4.75 8.00 13.00
The Worker 2.00 3.50