

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

## Norman Thomas Corrects a Quote

Editor, Daily Worker:

Doubtless as a result of an incorrect hearing of what I said, I was misquoted in your issue of July 26. On the Communist trial in reply to questioning from reporter, I said:

"As you know, I am anti-Communist and I am anti-Smith Act. And I am becoming more and more anti-Smith Act." That is, more anti-Smith Act even than when the act was passed and signed by Roosevelt in 1940.

Obviously I am not more anti-Smith Act than I am anti-Communist, if for no other reason than the fact that Communism in power always imposes far more restrictive legislation than the Smith Act.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN THOMAS.

## Takes Issue With J. W. Ford

Editor, Daily Worker:

In the Daily Worker of July 24, James W. Ford strongly objects to H. K.'s letter criticizing William L. Patterson's article. I, for one, strongly object to Ford's manner of criticizing H. K. He says H. K.'s characterizations of Patterson's article smells like white chauvinism, and that we are used to hearing such things from enemies. Period.

In what way is it chauvinism? Perhaps Ford is right. Certainly then, the readers and H. K. would like to learn how the use of the term "irresponsible huckster" is chauvinistic. But Ford does not favor us with an explanation, to help us all to avoid such chauvinism. He simply accuses. This is not Communist criticism.

This incident seems to me a corroboration of the suspicion I have heard expressed in several quarters that the rank and file of the party is ahead of the leadership in drawing lessons from the XX Congress. I think H. K. is to be commended for doing something that in the past has been all too rare in our ranks; namely, criticizing a Negro leader, or Negro member, for that matter.

His criticism was sharp, and may or may not be correct. If it is incorrect, let us know in what way, but let him not be annihilated by the single word "chauvinism," as if that settles the matter.

In the past this practice has served to make white members afraid to criticize Negro leaders, it has served to prevent Negro members from getting the healthy criticism we all need in order to develop, and it has made it all too easy to silence opposition on any question where the Negro question could possibly be brought into the discussion.

From Ford's letter, I also suspect it has helped to create smugness among leadership, a confidence that their use of

standard bogeymen will safely cut off criticism. This smugness is also a result of the general atmosphere of dogmatism that has plagued our Party, and it is time that leaders such as Ford drew the necessary lessons from the recent criticisms in the Soviet Union.

Rank and filers like H. K. apparently have already drawn them, since a criticism like H. K.'s would have been unthinkable in the Daily Worker a year ago.

Another lesson to be drawn is that perhaps we should re-think our ideas as to what constitutes white chauvinism, since there is apparently a difference of opinion on the matter, between Ford and H. K.

Brooklynite.

## Objects to 'Huckster' Term

Editor, Daily Worker:

The Daily Worker of July 19th printed a letter signed "HK" in which the writer accuses William L. Patterson of "huckstering" in his writing. Mr. Patterson's role in helping to win the restoration of the Social Security pension for Communists is well known. It should be highly praised. I, for one, am very grateful to Mr. Patterson and also to Mr. Harry Sacher, the attorney, and to all those who did write letters and articles in the press.

A great many letters were written to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare protesting the unjust and unlawful act of denying Social Security pension to Communists. Mr. Patterson is a sincere, devoted and courageous fighter for Civil Rights that is well known here and abroad. To accuse Mr. Patterson of "huckstering" in his writing is impermissible, Mr. HK.

—Eva Bittelman.

## Sees Two Main Errors

DETROIT.

Editor, Daily Worker:

Eugene Dennis, in his report to the national committee and his article on the secret Khrushchev report, lacks the profound self-criticism and analysis that is necessary in this crisis. I believe that we must look beyond the past ten years for the causes. Some of our problems have existed, perhaps, since the inception of the CPUSA, but they came home to roost when we were faced with the rough conditions of McCarthyism and the war drive of U.S. Big Business.

I believe at least two of our most serious errors were (1) mechanical acceptance and application of the USSR foreign policy to our American scene and (2) hypocrisy and confusion on the civil liberties position.

To take a blatant example of error No. 1, let's look way back to 1939-40, when we raised the slogan "the Yanks are not com-

ing"—fascism, the greatest danger the human race had ever faced was riding high, with Hitler taking over Austria, Czechoslovakia, France, etc., killing Jews by the millions. The whole world was aroused by this danger, including the American people.

The CP had helped sound the alarm by its excellent work in defense of Republican Spain against fascist invasion. Many brave CP and YCL members fell in that heroic fight. Yet a year or two later, when the fascist danger was even greater, we took a "hands off" policy in effect. This position caused havoc in the people's organizations that had emerged from the struggles.

The CP had considerable stature among the progressive masses because of its excellent leadership and participation in the fight for unemployment insurance, the organization of the trade unions, and its alerting the people to the danger of fascism. The CP sacrificed this position in order to follow the USSR position of the non-aggression pact.

And similarly in the post-war period, we aided in creating crisis in organizations because of an insistence that they adopt our foreign policy line which always was identical to the Soviet line. Many honest liberals began to think we put the Soviet Union's interests as the core of our political thinking and in a number of instances they were correct.

Lest these criticisms be misunderstood, I still fully recognize the enormous contributions the Soviet Union has made in beating back fascism and its struggle for human liberation within its borders.

On error No. 2 we were hypocritical in saying we believed in the indivisibility of civil liberties and the Bill of Rights. We were charged by honest liberals that we used our civil liberties to support and advocate a system that denied civil liberties to dissenters. We were also charged with our refusal to aid others that were being denied protection of the Bill of Rights. It was over our errors in this area, particularly, that we lost support for our right to function as a legitimate political party.

It is true we were not aware of the great violations of civil liberties that existed in the Soviet Union, but we did know that there was darn little opportunity to dissent there, yet we justified it in the Soviet Union, while insisting on our right to dissent here in the U.S.

The future of this country, especially under Socialism, will provide much wider opportunity for free exchange of ideas than exists today under capitalism when the main channels of communications are controlled by a small minority.

But even today, our tradition of free thought (though violated left and right during the last

ten years) might well be studied by many countries abroad. The American's pride and dignity is in his feeling that when things get too rough he can tell the VIP in question, where to get off. Though desperately fighting for economic security, he never will support a system that doesn't simultaneously guarantee free speech. Being the apostles of truth and social justice, we too must never be satisfied with less.

Finally for those who feel the CP membership will become demoralized by frank analysis and by letting the chips fall where they may (a view prevalent among some Michigan CP leaders), let me say the greatest hope for the future lies in seeing the true causes of our present crisis. Only in this way can we change ourselves and our party. To think we can maintain a party membership based on blind loyalty, believing in the infallibility and holiness of an organization and leadership that has committed such serious errors is to set as a prerequisite for membership an ability to adhere to fanaticism or just plain stupidity.

I feel exhilarated by the discussion. I feel we're at the threshold of great new development. Many are emerging from a mental prison. A program of economic and political democracy is irresistible. A program of humanism—the aspirations of all peoples, combined with the Marxist scientific analysis, can make our dreams a reality.

—A.M.

P.S.: Warm greetings to the excellent job the DW and staff are doing.

## Clean House At Home First

Editor, Daily Worker:

The Communist Party national committee's statement on the recent Soviet resolution is, as far as I can judge, a complete endorsement of that resolution. As to the two points of difference (disagreement)—the mistreatment of Jews and the questions of bureaucratic distortions of Socialist law and principle—the American statement leaves me somewhat confused. Who's responsibility is it to clear this up; ours or theirs?

However, my main criticism of the national committee's statement as well as with the previous statements by this and other Communist Parties, about the Stalin dictatorship, is that they were demands for the Soviet Party to be self critical about this mess. As if we were innocent bystanders, unaffected by it!

Let's face it. We were severely hurt by our apologetic defense of Stalinism. And we've got to explain how we came to do it. Khrushchev and all the Russians can't do it for us.

I tell you it is most aggravating to see our leaders constantly ducking this question. For me, the biggest lesson to be learned of all the great contributions

made at the Twentieth Congress, is that it pays to be self critical.

But for us, we seem to think that our past errors will be forgotten, and also never be made again, without using the method of self criticism. It just can't be done for one main reason: because in the past our errors were rooted in tailor-made lines from abroad and not sunk deeply in independent thought of what was good for the American working class. And, today the national committee's thinking does not seem to have changed much.

Now this is the third letter I've ever written to a newspaper in my life. And, maybe it ain't written with any Marxist finesse. But a little common sense will tell anyone that the place to clean house first—is at home.

—O. L.

## How to Promote The Paper

Philadelphia.

Editor, Daily Worker:

Anyone who wishes to increase the sales and subscriptions of the Daily Worker can do so without any special preparations (like bundle-drops). He locates a newsstand convenient to his travel from work to home. He buys five Daily Workers at the stand, with the agreement that the stand dealer will buy back any unsold. He sells the papers to passers-by who otherwise would not think of asking for it at the stand. He tells the purchasers they can get them at the stand when he is not there. After a number of days he may have regular customers. He can suggest that they become subscribers.

In order to raise the prestige of The Worker and Daily Worker in trade unions which are on strike; the front page, or at least half of it, should have a headline suitable for a picket line; for example, "A DROP OF BLOOD IS A PERFECT CIRCLE, IS THERE BLOOD ON YOUR PISTON RINGS?" asks J. Smith, Union President." When a non-union restaurant is being picketed the front page might read: "WOULD YOU EAT IN A SWEATSHOP?" asks the union president." Photographs, statements by union officers which the local papers wouldn't print, interviews of strikers, could be concentrated on the outside double page. Some pickets might carry the paper as a picket sign. Sellers of the paper might form a "roving picket-line." Newspaper photographs sharper than many hand-painted picket signs.

At the end of each year you could reprint a page of photos of The Worker and Daily Worker being carried on picket-lines. "A picture is worth a thousand words."

The page of letters to the editor is a great improvement. "Speak Your Mind" would be a better title, because only children "speak pieces."

Occasionally, excess mucilage on the wrapper, glues the wrapper to the printed page. When unwrapped, the page is torn or the ink has been lifted off the paper.—PHIL O'MEL.

## Want Information

Baltimore

Editor, Daily Worker:

Our club feels very strongly that the national leadership of the Communist Party has a responsibility to the membership to furnish it with the differences that arose at the national conference.

The national leadership should have the fullest confidence in the membership and should make known the points of departure so that they can be used as a guide in the discussions now taking place.

Baltimore Club.

# These Little Piggies Went to the Laboratory

If there are similarities between pigs and people, it may be significant for people that short, fat pigs consistently maintain a different blood chemical balance than long, lean pigs.

Since the nature of this blood chemical balance could be of prime importance in the "hardening" of the arteries of people, the pig experiments of Drs. Lena A. Lewis and Irvine H. Page of Cleveland have sharp interest.

They experimented with 12 pigs—six short and fat, six long and lean. All 12 were the kind of pigs they were because of their heredity. Their ancestors had been either long and lean or short and fat, but not both.

The scientists took them over when they were 12 weeks old. Intricate tests of their blood serums revealed that each kind had a characteristic chemical pattern of balance among the proteins which have fatty molecules attached to the proteins without such molecules, and cholesterol.

For nine months the pigs ate the same food, lived the same lives. Their serum proteins and cholesterol were measured periodically. All through the nine months, which is the period of most rapid growth for pigs, the chemical balances of the two kinds formed two distinct patterns and each pattern remained distinct as the animals grew into hogs.

The short and fat at all times had a proportion of the fatty proteins and of cholesterol in their blood serum. Since these are the blood constituents which are associated with hardened arteries and shortened lives of people, the point of interest needs no emphasis.

The experiments inevitably carry the suggestion that blood chemical balances depend not so much (if at all) on what you eat as it does on what kind of body chemistry you inherited from your ancestors. This is by no means proven, however.

The scientists noted that unlike their experimental pigs, people are all different. Their ancestries

are scrambled. Science can't divide them with any close accuracy into this kind or that kind. Furthermore, they eat all sorts of things.

All this, the scientists remarked in their report to a technical journal of the American Heart Association, "may help to explain" why there are so many "normal" values for fatty proteins and cholesterol in the blood serums of human beings.

They were chary, of course, in applying their findings for pigs to people. They pointed to what evidence there is that heredity has a part in establishing and maintaining protein balances of human blood serum.