

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Advocating Socialism

NEW YORK.

Editor, Daily Worker:

Max Weiss' "Reply to Questions" was a brilliant Marxist analysis—except for one detail which I'm sure he would agree was a matter of poor formulation rather than fuzzy thinking. (I would have said two details, but today's paper carried the necessary correction about "Exploiting" classes and not all classes being abolished in the USSR).

Weiss correctly points out that he has not "predicted" a peaceful transition to socialism, but that he has only showed 1), that it is possible, given the objective historic conditions of our time, and 2), that it is desirable, since surely no revolutionary advocates violence for the pure enjoyment of destruction, but always and under all conditions prefers the course of peaceful change.

But to say that something is both possible and desirable means "to advocate." "Advocate" according to Webster, means to "plead in favor of, to support, or recommend publicly." It does not mean, either, to predict. Yet Weiss goes on to say "no one in his right mind advocates the transition to socialism today." This is nonsense! All Communists and Socialists "advocate" such a transition to socialism. To advocate this does not mean to believe that it will happen today.

This is not just carping at words. For as a matter of very important fact, it will not be possible tomorrow to have the transition to socialism, nor will it be possible tomorrow to "predict" the transition to socialism on the day after tomorrow if we do not precisely start "advocating" socialism today, right here and now. The advocacy of the transition to socialism is always current. The possibility of achieving that which we advocate is, of course, not always on the order of the day. But we do not advocate only that which is immediately possible. Unless we are trying to hide our aims from the masses, we do indeed advocate the transition to socialism today. —HANK.

Disagrees On Israel

Editor, Daily Worker:

I cannot agree with A. B. Magil that the American Communists ought to raise the slogan of "Arms for Israel." I don't think they should favor an arms race in the Middle East, with the United States on one side and the socialist world on the other.

Is Israel an anti-imperialist state linking itself to that vast array of new nations like India, Indonesia, Burma and Egypt in

a friendship with Soviet Russia and Red China, and a sympathy toward the national aspirations of all peoples still chained to colonialism?

If Israel is to survive and prosper in the heart of an Arab world, it must cease to be an imperialist splinter in that heart, become truly independent, and seek fraternal relations with its neighbors. A beginning in the search for such fraternal relations can be made if Israel offers equality and justice to its Arab citizens, today treated as an enemy within: second-class, curfewed, ghettoed and impoverished subjects denied elementary freedom and opportunity in their own country. Israel can advance the search for friendship on her borders by a generous offer of redemption to the Arabs formerly resident in Israel and now refugees in miserable camps beyond the limits of their ancient homeland.

I earnestly suggest that the Communists study the proposals of Rabbi Magnes, Dr. Harry Grandfest and other proponents of Unity (Ichud), the political basis of which I understand to be a sort of Palestinian Belgium, Switzerland or Canada: a Palestine equally Arab and Jewish, brother-peoples sharing dominion over their historic home in a spirit of mutual respect and mutual aid.

I do not think that a fear of political isolation on the part of the American Communists should be appeased by their assumption of opportunistic positions.

Sincerely yours,

E.F.G.

Careless Labeling

Editor, Daily Worker:

I almost started by saying "I am not a Trotskyite, but . . ." then realized how unimportant that should be, for a thought should be examined no matter from what quarter it comes.

I think that reader N. J. (May 27) continues a harmful practice in our movement, a practice which is to a great extent not only a manifestation of, but also a reason for many of the errors and shortcomings now discussed.

Reader N. J. lumps together Trotskyites, racists, White Citizen Councils and McCarthy.

How about thinking rather than parroting old phrases? Is reader N. J. really convinced that the Trotskyites are equal to the other three groups, the worst in American life? It might interest him that the independent Socialist "Monthly Review" (no enemy of ours, let's admit) speaks of the CP, Socialist Party, Socialist Labor Party and Socialist Workers Party (the Trotskyites, that is) as the "four socialist parties." Perhaps it is

not exactly so, but it is much closer to the truth than N. J.'s tactics.

It is this kind of irresponsible phrase-mongering, insensitive so-called "hard and smart" tactics which obscured many of the truths from us. I myself see the Trotskyites as a sectarian and rather divorced from life emotional group, but I need not continue to attack them as the worst enemies. —B.

Sub-Standard Pensioners

Editor, Daily Worker:

You, no doubt know that fabulous increases in salary were granted to the top level city officials; granted for the reason, and on the basis of a rise in the cost of living.

There is a group of people in the city existing in slow misery, due to the rise in the cost of living, who have been trapped by inflation, with no consideration of their plight shown by the governing officials, who talk, talk, talk and more talk, about equal rights, square deal and justice for all.

These people are the sub-standard pensioners, those who have retired before increases in salary was granted to city employes and who now retire on increased pension. The sub-standard pensioners have no power of union and no one advocates their cause.

Numerous newspapers have been appealed to; no response. They all adhere to the powers that be with no thought of those living out life in slow misery. There should be justice for the sub-standard pensioners by granting them a pension increase to match those granted today.

Your paper has pointed out injustice in the past so if you call attention to this injustice against the sub-standard pensioners they will be grateful.

—A GROUP OF SUB-STANDARD PENSIONERS.

Farmers Know What They Want

Editor, Daily Worker:

Why a recent letter-writer singled out "parity" for particular abuse, I don't know. The reasons given were two: (1) that it is not an adequate farm program and (2) it is not a Marxist concept.

To reverse the order, let me ask: Do the farmers have to adopt Marxist concepts before we or the labor movement can support their struggles? Are there any "adequate" concepts or proposals, Marxist or non-Marxist, which will save the small and middle farmers from ruin under capitalism?

If we apply the reader's "Marxist" yardstick, we would have to reject not only parity but also everything else that

MAX WEISS RE PUBLISHED IN

The report of Max Weiss, national education director to the recent meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, dealing with the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, is being readied for distribution this week, according to an announcement by New Century Publishers. The pamphlet, "The Meaning of the 20th Congress of the CPSU," is priced at 25 cents.

The pamphlet has five subdivisions: new features of the present era, the 20th Congress and its creative approach to Marxist-Leninist theory, the self-criticism and self-correction of the 20th Congress, the discussion in the CPUSA, and a final section dealing with political unity of the American working class.

Weiss explores the objective changes underlying the work of the 20th Congress. Among the new theoretical questions he discusses are: the new approach to

DAILY WORKER THE WESTINGHOUSE

This really belongs in a "How Crazy Can They Get" department.

As our readers know and would expect, the Daily Worker backed the strike of 55,000 Westinghouse workers (IUE and UE) from beginning to end. In fact, we were one of the few daily papers in the country to do so.

At one point, we reported the joint campaign of the New York City AFL and CIO to raise funds for the strikers. Our staff members, who are in the Newspaper Guild, took collections as did all unionists taking part in this campaign.

Posters were put out by the City AFL-CIO to push the drive and naturally some of these were put up on the walls of the Daily Worker. John Gates, our editor, displayed a poster prominently in his office.

Lo and behold, the April 25 issue of Westinghouse News, publication of the anti-union corporation, runs a picture of Gates' office (and a good picture of Gates,

farmers and many other people support—e.g., school lunch program, food stamp program, public power projects, low cost credit, tax cuts, etc. I don't think that we should try to tell the farmers that they have to find "Marxist" programs that will save them from the effects of capitalism before we will have anything to do with them.

Ike promised the farmers 90 to 100 percent of parity, and farmers are sore that he hasn't made good on it—it isn't up to us to tell the farmers they don't have a right to collect on the promise. They do, and we should help them. —B.R.H.