

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

A Trend Away from Rubber-Stamping

UPSTATE NEW YORK
Editor, Daily Worker:

M. W.'s letter of July 27, charging that a lid is being kept over differences among American C.P. leaders, expresses most aptly an idea in many folks' minds and referred to in letters, etc. How much such uneasiness is nurtured by the N. Y. Times "news" of July 26 about the three "factions" or by the Post feature of July 22 by Joseph Lash is beside the point, to my thinking. Any careful reader of National Committee statements, alongside of leading reports and articles together with D.W. editorials, can discern changes in emphasis and new formulations as events pile up that go to make up what I myself would take to be a transition from rubber-stamping a leadership to a dynamic self-critical collectivism. I cannot see that this involves deliberate "suppression."

As the preconvention discussion goes on, what more basic differences there are will be aired, I feel sure. But I doubt that they will be grouped around particular individuals; because I feel that such a high-caliber leadership will divide different ways on different issues especially with all of us speaking up constructively.

I myself want to speak up on a closely related topic—namely, Foster's "Reply to the N. Y. Post." This time I regret that I cannot say that he "has hit the nail on the head;" though previously an unpublished letter of mine greeted his well-directed and deeply thought out analysis of the Stalin cult. Not being a Post reader I want to ask if the Joseph P. Lash involved is not the same one, regarded as a Socialist, with whom many Communists had united front relations in the unemployed movement of early FDR days? Even if he isn't, the Post, as I gather from hearsay, is in a different category than the Wall St. press and merits a different approach.

Any writer, as I remember the rules, should first decide what audience he wants to reach; and afterwards, should not change his goal. Foster's "goal" however, was not to write to Post readers; but only to those who are also D.W. readers, and even in this, the overtone is that he is speaking to party members. I agree heartily with the principled points that Foster made; but I think the article was out of step with the times tactically. To my mind, the reply should have been specifically addressed to the Post; and with their readers always as its goal. With such an audience, naturally the futile gesture of "repudiation" would

be replaced by elucidation! Of course a copy would be kept for the D.W. (since "suppression" could be expected). But it would constitute a reply of much higher value, I'd say.

Also didn't Foster show a bit of bad temper over what he called "some of the weaker-kneed comrades?" Cedric Belfrage cast kindly illumination on this in the recent Guardian issue. And what Albert Blumberg said in the Sunday Worker seems more reasonable: "While there are many in and around the party who have adopted a wait-and-see attitude, experience in a number of areas shows that very few have abandoned ship. This trend is real, but it is quite small, and is not our main problem today."—G.W.K.

Freud and Lysenko

BOSTON

Editor, Daily Worker:

Dogmatism and bureaucracy have created ridiculous party positions in the recent past that must never be allowed to recur. I should like to mention just two and at the same time raise the question as to why we ever let our leadership get involved in these fields anyway. Neither is a political issue in this country. Experts were shouted down by people who knew very little about these subjects. Many who did know left the party. Personally, I trailed along in the castigation with the other party "experts" although these did seem ridiculous topics for political polemics.

1. Freud and psychoanalysis. Right or wrong, you really would think Freud was a Trotsky or a Hitler to hear all the scorn heaped upon him. He conflicted with Pavlov, some said. Others said the ego, libido and id were idealistic concepts akin to the soul—actually, they are attempts to explain physical functions of a very physical brain.

It seems to me we were the idealists in refusing to discuss this rationally and in denouncing without any grounds experts in the field who understood the subject. It was like the reasoning of Hearst writers in attacking Marxism. Some experts in France issued a very brief polemic against psychoanalysis in their country and it was like lighting the fuse of a firecracker that exploded in our ranks.

2. The Lysenko hoax. J. B. S. Haldane resigned or was kicked out of the party in England for refusing to swallow this. Mendel's Law was relegated overnight to the trash can along with psychoanalysis.

Scientists who understood the subject and protested were all wrong, of course. We knew more than they did. We have heard exactly nothing from the

ardent Lysenko supporters since this reappraisal began. Where are they now—out looking for new Freuds to conquer and new Lysenko to embrace?

In the future, in any technical field, let's at least ask the qualified experts in our midst to tell us a little about the subject before we jump on them.

VACATION THOUGHTS

Where Are the Loquacious Ones?

BOSTON.

Editor, Daily Worker:

The "bureaucracy of silence" on the part of many district and national leaders is holding them up to ridicule as persons with no opinion or viewpoint worth expressing at this time of the party's greatest crisis.

Never before have our functionaries been so lost for words. Right or wrong, they are usually at least loquacious.

It is a very unpleasant spectacle to see people for whom one has always had great admiration and respect go into a coma at the very time when they should be giving an account of themselves in a national discussion.

Perhaps they are all afraid they will get a reception like Max Weiss did in the Daily.

However, we will long remember that Max Weiss, right or wrong, at least spoke up at this time and said what he thought. What are we going to think of those who didn't speak up but just sat back waiting to endorse the conclusions of others?—if that is what they eventually do.

Right or wrong, they should say something—anything except a joint statement. Individual opinions and analysis are called for today. If there are no differences of opinion at this time, there must be something wrong.

—UNEMPLOYED.

Effect on Fund Drive

Editor, Daily Worker:

If you want to know why the fund drive is lagging, many people have been shocked by the Khrushchev speech and the attitude of the Party and the paper to it. We are not satisfied by the explaining resolution printed July 2 and we cannot go along with the apparent unanimity in accepting it.

When the N.Y. Times prints articles about differences in the leadership and nothing is stated in the paper about them, we doubt the wisdom of the leadership.

The discussions in the paper have gotten too involved and unclear.

Notwithstanding all the above I believe very firmly in the need for the Worker and Daily Worker to continue. My contribution of \$10 affirms my belief.—N.N.

Sees a New Subtle Attack on CP

Editor, Daily Worker:

Judging by some letters in Speak Your Piece I might well guess that a new and more subtle attack is being used to obliterate the Communist Party from American political life.

I refer to letters calling for wholesale overturn in the Party's leadership and arguing for various kinds of Party dissolution.

The most corrupt and vicious elements of American monopoly capital and of McCarthyism have been spending millions, perhaps billions to dissolve the Communist Party, negate the effectiveness of all liberal and progressive thought in America, and terrorize and drive out our leadership by jailing our most devoted and trained people. It is beginning to be evident that thus far they have failed by means of a frontal attack.

Of course not everyone who

is for overturning Party leadership or for Party dissolution is a phony, super-leftist, but let any honest progressive who is for these aims ponder their coincidence with the aims of McCarthyism.

If anyone is looking for a reason for the necessity of retaining democratic centralism let him also ponder some of the ramifications of the above.

We Americans of Communist or Socialist persuasion still have the responsibility to ourselves and our descendants, of leading this country toward Socialism. Let's get on with the business at hand by the means that are at hand.

This doesn't mean that changes in leadership may not be on the agenda in accordance with common sense and tried practice. But should this and Party dissolution be our program to achieve our long-term aims?

—S. G.

Reading Labor Opens Fall Election Fight

READING, Pa.—The organized labor movement here definitely entered the political arena with endorsements by the Central Labor Union of Reading and Berks County and by the AFL - CIO Committee on Political Education (COPE) of the following ticket for this fall's election:

For Congress (14th District)—George H. Rhodes (incumbent).

For State Senate (Berks County)—Frank W. Ruth (incumbent).

For Assemblyman (Reading)—Albert S. Readinger (incumbent).

For Assemblyman (3rd District)—Robert R. Adam (incumbent).

For Assemblyman (4th District)—Harold A. Yetzer (incumbent).

For Assemblyman (2nd District)—Sanford Schwaber.

For Assemblyman (Reading)—Gus Yatron.

For U.S. Senator — Joseph S. Clark, Jr.

All are Democrats.

The endorsed candidates, according to John T. Haletsky, COPE chairman, either have impressive records of backing labor-sought legislation or have pledged to support such measures if elected. Yatron and Schwaber, the new candidates, have conferred with union leaders and taken the position favored by the workers, Haletsky stated.

READING Councilman Harold E. Guldin, president of Branch 10, American Federation of Hos-

tery Workers, warned that "Labor is faced with a real challenge this year and can take nothing for granted."

COPE plans to raise funds for a vigorous campaign by enlisting members on a mass basis. Membership cards at 50 cents are to be sold by union officers and members. Congressman Rhodes and his running mates will be elected," said Haletsky, "provided the Rhodes story can be told to enough people."

"Fifty cents certainly is a small investment in such a valuable asset as a worker-congressman," explained Haletsky. "Any worker who thinks about this for just a few seconds must realize that his job is directly tied in with the kind of laws passed in Washington. Just one example should prove that.

"WE KNOW that the big money manipulators of the Eisenhower Administration have put a 'hard money' policy into effect. This means that interest rates are higher and every worker who buys anything at all on the installment plan is forced to pay more interest. The bankers and investors reap this profit."

Republicans, according to the New Era, official weekly of the labor movement here, are "piling up a high war chest in an effort to buy this year's election and unseat a Congressman who has an outstanding pro-worker record