

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Responsibility To Israel

Editor, Daily Worker:

A few days ago there appeared in "Speak Your Piece" a letter which was critical of Israel and favorable to the Arab-block of nations. The writer felt that Israel was committed to the imperialist policies of the West while the Arabs are actively anti-colonist.

I do not see how it is possible for a Marxist to feel sympathetic to any country in which a small group of people have the entire national wealth to dispose of at their own convenience while its workers are living in poverty and illiteracy and not permitted to organize in any manner in order to alleviate their suffering and improve their circumstances.

In Israel, to the contrary, whatever wealth exists is used for the benefit of the whole community. What's more, there is complete political freedom although, considering the terrible danger, they have a better excuse to suspend political freedom than any country ever had.

It is asserted in many quarters that Israel is a product of imperialism. It may be true that the Israelis were able to take advantage of the imperialism of the British, but other peoples in the area did likewise.

Britain did not create Zionism but the anti-Semitism of the rulers of Czarist Russia did that. Hitler proved to the Jews of Europe that in order for individual Jews to survive, the Zionist dream had to be fulfilled. And the Communist failure to live up to its ideals was the absolute proof that for a Jewish culture to survive it could not depend upon non-Jews to protect it from the anti-Semites.

It appears to this writer that the Jews, as a people, have contributed more to higher ideals than any other group and that therefore the world would be better off for the existence of a Jewish nation. That nation now exists. And it is the duty of all peoples who have benefited from the cultural values of this nation to defend it.

They gave us Christ and they gave us Marx. They gave us much more. Now, more than at any other time in history, the Jews need the help of the rest of the world and both the Chris-

tians and the Communists shirk that responsibility.

The writer of this letter is a Christian, or was. However, I gave up Christianity long ago in favor of Communist ideas. Not that I believe the ideas incompatible. However I felt that on all levels the institution of Christianity did not attempt to reach the standards that it preached, now after a decade of devoting my time and energy to progressive causes it is becoming apparent that no one is able to live up to their own ideas.—A Reader.

Asks Foster's Aid On Questions

Editor, Daily Worker:

I have been in the party for 22 years and I have always respected Foster's contributions. But after reading his piece on the cult of the individual, may I still respectfully ask that he stop parroting alibis and apply his great ability to helping us answer these questions which our friends keep asking:

1. Why is there no democracy in the USSR? Surely the manner of replacing Malenkov by Bulganin, and the changes in policies, were not done by means of any democratic process such as we know.

2. We always thought that capitalist countries would rather export capital than raise the standard of living of their own people, and that the export of capital was the economic essence of imperialism, of finance capital. Now the USSR is engaging in vast programs of capital export when the needs of their own workers are far from met. Tell us how this socialism is different from capitalism.

3. How can he speak honestly of the "unspeakable Beria" when we all know that he and we have not seen the indictment nor the trial proceedings nor the Malenkov report to the CPSU central committee and have only a few phrases (from the men who had him shot) to go by: Do we have to quote back to Foster what he wrote about Tito, likewise on hearsay only?—A.B.C.

P.S.—"Speak Your Piece" must of course remain open to all without admission charge. However, I am enclosing \$5 and extend an invite to all who write to voluntarily do likewise.

The Stature Of Stalin

Editor, Daily Worker:

Dear Friends:

I like very much William Z. Foster articles and books, and for the past 25 years they have been a beacon and inspiration to me.

However, for the first time in my life, I do not agree completely with certain points on the July 2 article, "The Stalin Cult of the Individual."

For instance: after forty years of Soviet Power in the USSR, Foster conjures the rotten past of Czarist tyranny to imply that the Russian people still don't know how to exercise their rights. He compares the case of gangsterism in the trade unions in this country "despite two centuries of strong democratic tradition. . . ."

Methinks those are two different problems, absolutely antithetic.

Foster and all Marxists agree that "Stalin, in his best period, built for himself a tremendous reputation as a Marxist-Leninist leader . . . and was able to convince the CP and most of the Soviet people of the general correctness of the line to be followed. This was also a decisive basis for his deep influence among Communists on a world scale."

In other words: Stalin was the recognized and adored leader of the conscious workingclass of the earth, including myself.

I believe, therefore, that this profound faith and trust had nothing to do with ignorance of how to practice democracy. We saw in Stalin the champion of the oppressed, the leader who knew how to beat and crush our worst enemies, the anathema of the exploiters and fascist-minded.

We know that the Party made some important mistakes and that Stalin lost his head forgetting to practice his own teachings. . . . But with all his errors and mistakes Stalin was fighting for a great cause and the hundreds of millions of his followers were unable to know his deviations. . . .

In this country, on the other hand, the gangster in the trade unions, the politicians and the legion of misleaders are known to everybody. But with all the so-called "two hundred years of a strong democratic tradition"

the majority of the people do not give a damn and stay quiet like a bunch of sheep.—M.C.

Richard Wright's Bandung Report

Editor, Daily Worker:

My attention has been called to an article by Abner W. Berry in The Worker of July 1 on Richard Wright. In it reference is made to my review of Mr. Wright's book, *The Color Curtain, A Report on the Bandung Conference*, which appeared in the June issue of *Masses & Mainstream*. Mr. Berry apparently sees this review as an expression of the "Marxist Left" and inferentially states that I "damned" Mr. Wright.

A more careful reading of my review will show that I did nothing of the sort. On the contrary, the review underlined Mr. Wright's contribution in acquainting American readers with the tremendous victory over colonialism won by the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa—a contribution all the more important because of the lack of understanding of this factor in the United States.

At the same time, my review pointed out that Mr. Wright's subjective attitudes — which he avowed within the four corners of this book and which admittedly served as his frame of reference in viewing the events at Bandung—imposed severe limitations upon his ability to analyze and portray the conference itself and the full scope of the power exercised by the new Asian and African states.

Mr. Wright's book was reviewed by me not in relation to his former works, as Mr. Berry apparently would rather have it, but in terms of the Bandung Conference. Not only is this the subject matter of Mr. Wright's book, but I suggest it also provides a valid yardstick by which to measure Mr. Wright's progress, as Mr. Berry attempts to do. This, however, was not my purpose.

It is, of course, Mr. Berry's privilege to be "disappointed" by my review. However, I question the wisdom of sweeping under the carpet the "mystical" and other short-comings of Mr. Wright's book, which Mr. Berry is obliged to note, and the correctness of Mr. Berry's enormous

assertion that Mr. Wright's "anti-communism . . . is the same kind of anti-communism with which Nikita Khrushchev could be charged today."

In saying this, Mr. Berry accepts as gospel truth Mr. Wright's distorted picture of communism in Asia and countenances his gratuitous advice: "The 'communism' [Mr. Wright] describes and warns Asia against, is that which has been repudiated by Soviet Communists and all others who continue the fight for democratic socialism."

It is beyond the scope of this letter to discuss the larger confusions indicated by Mr. Berry's formulations.—Charles Wisley.

The Ring Of Danger

Editor, Daily Worker:

The writer on "Khrushchev Speech held Distorted" signing himself A Friend in your issue of June 29 raises a point of fundamental importance which we can neglect only to our peril. How could we possibly expect the State Department's version of Khrushchev's speech to be accurate and objective? Need it be said that acute hatred of the USSR is the basis of the State Department's thinking and that we must make large allowance for the State Department's inaccuracies and distortions?

I agree with A Friend that we play into the hands of socialism's enemies when we accept the Khrushchev speech without seeing the original text.

It is important always to remember and to emphasize on all suitable occasions that much of the hardness of the Russian administration is caused directly by the constant necessity of defending their country and their system against the multi-billion project of sabotage and infiltration organized with great skill and consistency from the outside.

—A sincere friend and regular reader who does dare to sign his name.

