

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Isolation From Labor Movement

Editor, Daily Worker:

I have followed closely, practically every letter and article. Up to the present, in the main, the discussion revolved around the historical decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU and its impact upon the world situation. Some formulations of the letters and articles that have appeared, I disagree. But in substance, the analysis is correct. Dennis' and Nelson's articles, in my opinion are the most sober Marxist-Leninist analysis made so far in connection with the 20th Congress and the cult of one man—Stalin—which is contrary to the principles of a Socialist society based upon the Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

My objective here is to treat a phase of activity of the Progressive forces which I think is basic and fundamental in developing effective struggle which involve a very important segment of the American people. I mean the Labor movement.

The development of the CIO gave an opportunity to a large number of progressives to perform its loyal work for the betterment of the economic lot of the American workers. The progressive forces exerted themselves as a factor in determining policies, domestic and foreign for the welfare of the American people and for a peaceful helpful relation with the people of other countries. But, this influence was misjudged when the real task came to deal with the majority concept of the American labor movement philosophy. This, I feel, happened because the C.P. and progressive forces in general overestimated the political level of understanding of the American people.

The Taft-Hartley law has proved to be a real rope around the neck of the labor movement and has been used by the magnates of industry as a string to check labor. But, when the major labor movement accepted the law by compliance then, I feel that it was a time for the leadership of the C.P. to give the proper guidance by sober and adequate evaluation of the political understanding of the American working people and the leadership of the American labor movement.

An alerted leadership would be able to face without hesitation the real situation and on the basis retreat in order to save its face and wait for the opportune

time to advance. Instead the policy was to fight against a wall of resistance of not only the leadership of the labor movement, but against our own progressives, who were unable to understand the mechanical majority decision forced upon them.

And what was the fight—democracy. The workers did not understand our interpretation of democracy. Their democracy meant the majority rule, which is the correct interpretation. But anyone who adhered to that interpretation of democracy took the position of remaining with the main stream of the American labor movement and was called middle-of-the-road and even reactionary. Expulsion of entire international unions began because of the refusal to carry out the majority decision of the CIO executive board council.

I feel that the Communist Party today is in its most isolated period of its history in relation to the labor movement.

American democracy based upon the principles of equality, freedom and pursuit of happiness, can be maintained, broadened and perpetuated, if we will have a labor movement that will be the pillar of struggle for justice in an economic as well as in the political field. In the midst of this struggle the progressives can contribute constructively to the betterment of the economic want of the American people.

Leftism in the trade union approach must be eradicated and mistakes must be discussed without fear in order to accomplish the task of being the vanguard party of the working class.

Trade Union Reader
of New Jersey

The Three V's

Editor, Daily Worker:

This Thursday, July 26, would be Bernard Shaw's 100th birthday. Full of vim, vigor and vitality, he believed in and supported several things which most of the left wing (with the possible exception of Dyson Carter and some of the writers of Federated Press) isn't even willing to discuss... things like vegetarianism, anti-alcohol and tobacco, and anti-vivisection—not to mention anti-vaccination.

Because of the present day emphasis on palliatives, there is a deplorable tendency toward a wholly uncritical acceptance of prevailing (scientific - isolation(medical theories and toward the

acceptance of public health as a question which can be separated from public welfare. For example, groups show and praise films such as Danny Kaye's on UNICEF which sicken the viewer in at least one spot with shots of STARVING Indian babies getting diphtheria inoculations. Why this frantic emphasis, in the atomic power age, on emergency stopgaps, with the feeding of the starving and the housing of the slum-dweller and rural poor lagging so far behind?

Today sociology and medicine may battle each other for shares of government funds, both here and in socialist countries. But both have the problem of convincing government and public of the need for money for their agencies and administrations in a spectacular way—whether the new drugs, vaccines, etc. are really world-shaking or not.

At least in Russia we see some of the following kind of emphasis, in U. S. A. voiced but weakly by our public health men, who are not "up there" with surgeons and other doctors as the high priests of our society:

"No matter how useful medical or surgical treatments are, best of all is to correct our mode of life, so that people will never need to take medicines or have treatments." (Quoted by Dyson Carter from Dr. A. N. Bakulyev, president of the USSR Academy of Medical Science).

—A WOMAN READER

Qualities of Leadership

Editor, Daily Worker:

May I differ with some who say that the partial answer to the mistakes of the Communist movement in this country is that the leadership as a whole is in a rut and should be removed or rotated, etc. I'm referring to such leaders as Foster, Dennis, Gates, Thompson and others.

I strongly agree that there are some misplaced leaders who are not leaders, never have been really close to people in or out of the movement. Their bureaucratic tendencies and callousness are so strong as to create an atmosphere of great and painful irritation, separation and unpopularity.

But from where I can see, the top leadership have some brilliant qualities in the best American tradition — great courage, devotion to principle, modesty — their past readiness to face many needed changes in policy.

These are the very qualities

Soviet Jews

(Continued from Page 1)

Moishe Broderzen, Yiddish poet who lived in Poland for "most of his creative years," and Zalman Vendrosky, who once wrote occasional pieces for the New York Daily Forward.

"Salisbury has been badly misinformed," Suller declared. "I can pick at random at least a dozen names on the list I published in the Freiheit who are as well, or much better, known to those in the U. S. at all familiar with Yiddish literature."

He cited the following whom, he said, he was picking at random:

- Samuel Halkin of Moscow, "one of the outstanding poets of our time."

- Prof. Schatz-Anin of Riga, now completing a new work on the Yiddish classics, perhaps the most famous Yiddish writer now living.

- Noah Lurie of Moscow, novelist, now working on an autobiographical novel.

- Itzik Kipnis, world-famous writer now working on a novelette about the current Soviet scene.

- Abram Kagen of Kiev, who has just completed a new cycle of short stories.

- Aaron Vergelis of Biro-Bidjan and Moscow, an outstanding poet who has just completed a book of poems on Far East subjects.

- J. Sternberg of Moscow, who is writing a book of poems about Pushkin.

- H. Blaustein of Kishinev, who is completing a new book of poetry.

- Isaac Platner of Minsk, a poet who is well-known in the U. S. because he lived and worked here for many years.

- N. Auslander of Moscow, who has written a monograph about a famed Jewish poet who lost his life in the Civil War of 1918-20.

- Yuri Finkel of Minsk, who has completed a work on the 1905 Revolution.

- M. Belinky of Moscow, who has just completed a dramatic work dealing with the life of Spinoza.

Suller also took exception to Salisbury's statement that the Freiheit was a "Yiddish language Com-

that will enable them to learn and listen to the many voices for change and development; They have had the terrific disadvantage of not being subjected to criticism from below for many years. Imagine, if this force of criticism were developed, the kind of sensitivity we might expect from such stalwarts.

—Reader.