

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

A Job for the U. S. Marxists

Editor, Daily Worker:

I heartily agree with the letter of Sept. 20, in which "Jeannie" pleads for an attitude of friendliness toward those who have left the Communist Party. She specifically mentions Joseph Clark, Joseph Starobin and Howard Fast.

Some comments on these resignations indicate they are viewed simply as the acts of a few misguided individuals. I believe such a view is mystic and non-historical. It fails to consider that they represent a massive trend consisting of many thousands of Communists, and this cannot be explained by subjective or accidental factors.

In discussing why the above three left, Jeannie suggests it is because of past errors, both in the USSR and here. I believe their statements reveal she is wrong. Fast has made it plain his resignation came as a result of current failures of Soviet socialism today to correct some of the malpractices of the past. I think he is impatient and tends to disregard the tortuous course that history inevitably takes when a vast nation must change drastically.

But this is his position as I read it, and it ought not to be distorted as some previous commentators on his action have done.

As regards Clark and Starobin, both have made it clear their actions were a result of lack of confidence that the party here in the U.S., and now, can make the necessary, profound changes required of it by reality. Here, too, they may be expressing too great impatience, and a disregard of the difficulties in changing the direction and nature of a political movement.

Not that such hardship is inevitable. Greater Communist movements in other lands have made sharper policy corrections with less trouble, and with tremendous results.

Nor is a successful change inevitable. Great progressive movements in our land have in the past powerfully affected the course of events, and have them become reduced to futile sects because they did not keep up with the social changes which sometimes they themselves had helped bring about.

The chief point here is that the actions of Clark and Starobin reflect what I believe to be the major reason for the mass departures from the C.P. in the past couple of years; namely, its failure to break with the sectarian practices and dogmatic ideology of the past.

The CP's national convention in February tried to chart such a break. But so far, the party's leadership, both national and in New York, has been under continuous, unremitting pressure, from within and from without, to

HERE'S YOUR

NOTE:

PRINT →

1. DID YOU PREVIOUSLY VOTE IN N.Y. STATE
YES NO

2. SURNAME

3. STREET ADDRESS

NO. ST.

10. HEIGHT 11. COLOR OF HAIR 12. COLOR OF EYES

13. FILL IN ONLY IF APPLICABLE
IN WHAT YEAR DID YOU LAST VOTE AT A GENERAL ELECTION IN THIS STATE? DID YOU UNDERSTAND THE BALLOT?
YES

IF NOT, FROM WHAT ADDRESS? DID YOU UNDERSTAND THE BALLOT?

NO. ST.

14. FILL IN ONLY IF APPLICABLE
ST. ADDRESS BIRTHPLACE (IF IN CITY)

NAME AND ADDRESS OF EMPLOYER

15. TO BE FILLED IN WHEN REGISTERING
PAPERS NAME
OWN FATHERS
SIBLINGS WIVES

CITY AND STATE NAME OF PERSON

TO THE REGISTRATION BOARD: IF A VOTER, WHAT PAPERS HE MUST EXECUTE AND HAS APPROPRIATELY EXECUTED?

FORM #4706 PAGES 2

This is a reproduction of the form you will be asked to fill out. Registration continues through November 5. Voters who register will do so this November but in all

reverse the convention's direction. This has come from those who opposed that direction prior to the convention, and continue to oppose it now while swearing fealty to it.

An interesting case in point is William Z. Foster's review (Sept. 20) of a Soviet symposium on "People's Capitalism" published in the May, 1957, issue of International Affairs. It is fine for us in the U. S. to study the views of Marxist economists and political scientists abroad regarding developments in our land. But Foster writes:

"It would have been well could it (the symposium) have dealt more concretely with a number of vital questions, including the so-called "managed economy" policies of the Eisenhower government and their relations to Keynesism . . . the prospects for an economic crisis in the U. S. . . . a more thorough treatment of real wages and living standards.

"The International Affairs discussion . . . furnishes a wealth of valuable material with which to clarify workers' minds and especially to counteract opportunism in the American labor movement. . . ."

I find it strange for a U. S. Marxist-Leninist leader to ask the Russians to do what is obviously the job of American Marxists. I find it even more strange for him to look to their discussions and findings about U.S. Life to "clarify workers' minds" and "counteract opportunism" among U. S. workers.

I do not know which U. S. workers' minds would be "clarified" by Soviet discussions. And I wonder whether he is saying that U. S. Marxists cannot develop the material to combat opportunism and must look to the Russians, whose past estimates of U. S. economic and political development have been less than accurate.—M. G.

Sept. 23, 1957