

## Welcomes Discussion

Editor, Daily Worker:

Your decision to open the columns of the Daily Worker to critical comment and opinions is encouraging; more, perhaps, to me than to others, because I am one of the Italian-Americans who sent you a series of letters last year which were neither published nor discussed.

The letters now appearing are, in my opinion, the most vital and the most hopeful aspect of your paper at the moment. Concerning following suggestions:

1. Much more space should be given particularly at this time to the Letters to the Editor Column. These letters from the grassroots are more important than news reported in yesterday's Times and Post.

2. Why not broaden participation for inviting comment from other socialists especially from those not in sympathy with all the policies of the Daily Worker? Many of them were alienated by the policies now condemned by the Daily Worker.

3. The recent events at the 20th Congress and other spectacular events of the last several years (fall of Beria, Khrushchev's visit to Belgrade, the arrest of the doctors, etc.) have led me to believe that a fruitful topic of discussion might be, How do we create an independent American left? Independent not of directives, but of dogmatism and bias, capable of seeing and evaluating events in the US and the USSR in a manner expected of dialectical realists.

Lastly, I would like to direct one paragraph to Joe Clark. Mr. Clark, you were in the Soviet Union for a good part of the early fifties, during a period when the rights of the Soviet people were being abused and violated by the secret police, and when Stalin's one man anti-Marxist rule was as blatant as ever. Why is it that you were unaware of these happenings (reported by other bourgeois reporters), or if aware of them, why did you not report them?

—GUIDO

## What Are The Facts

Editor, Daily Worker:

If we separate the trash from the facts all we know is that:

1. The 20th Congress sharply condemned the cult of the individual and reinstated collective leadership.

2. Mikoyan criticized certain thesis of the "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR."

3. According to the news agencies, Ulbricht said that Stalin was not considered a classic of Marxism. . . .

And so what? What some peo-

# Letters from Readers

Following are more letters in the current discussion of American Marxists and the Soviet Union. Letters over 300 words cannot be printed in full.

ple have forgotten is that in criticizing Stalin and themselves, the 20th Congress recognized the great achievements of the Soviet Union under his leadership.

The same people that make such an uproar because of these criticisms are exactly the ones that are implying that Stalin was God and that he could never commit an error. But anybody who knows a little of capitalism encirclement, knows too that the Soviet Union was not in a "layer of roses"; that it had to crush the invaders from outside and the enemy within, that errors were unavoidable.—MAURICIA.

## Revaluation of Entire Attitude

Editor, Daily Worker:

The discussion carried on among Marxists on the error of the past must not overshadow immediate struggles, such as the fight for full rights for the Negro people, for peace and other. This discussion and its positive results will, however, be instrumental in strengthening the Left and in aiding every phase of the struggle.

It is a mistake to see the whole problem primarily as a "revaluation of Stalin," as headlines in The Worker now imply. It is not the individual leader, not whether he "took the lion's share of credit," not whether he was right or wrong on foreseeing the Hitler-attack, etc., that is of prime concern.

We must reevaluate a whole attitude, one which flourished among American progressives as well as elsewhere. This is the tendency to leave a gap between reality as seen by the leaders and the way it is, in the name of hard and "smart" tactics, presented to the masses.

Every opposition and dissent was fought on two or more levels: more or less accurate theoretical evaluation in the top echelon and wholesale condemnation and traitor-enemy epithets-throwing for wider consumption. Rank and file leftists seldom received a clear picture of what various oppositionists (Trotskyists, Titoists, etc.) want and why they are wrong.

The errors of the Stalin era are righted. I hope that the present leaders do not fall into the

same mistake and do not, in the name of tactics, exaggerate the errors made by Stalin. That would be the same mistake carried on in reverse. The tremendous role of Stalin, under whose leadership the USSR reached such heights, must remain in history. It is not just Stalin who is being reevaluated, but practices, tactics and policies we all shared.

I feel that Foster does not face up to the questions in his article, though he is right in calling on us to assume a positive attitude and remember the basic fact that the USSR remains the greatest force for progress on this earth.—R.B.

## Proletarian Dictatorship

Editor, Daily Worker:

I am here following an urge to give one reader's answer to Alan Max's column of March 13, since Max asked for it.

The changes now going on in the Soviet Union, about which the commercial newspapers and magazines of this country are making such blatant fools of themselves trying to explain, had me fooled for a time, also. But now, this event appears to me in a new light as the ending of a period in history known to Marxists as the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

Russia, under the Czar, had little or no proletariat, and so, after a brief period of bungling bourgeois rule under Kerensky, it was necessary to create a new working class by building industry and educating the people. For this purpose and to defeat the enemy within, a dictatorship (not yet socialism) had to be set up, having more military powers than economic. Therefore, a Premier was given high prominence with a number of five year plans for building Socialism.

During 29 years of dictatorship under Stalin (1924-1953) it was easy to make mistakes because of lack of correction from an unoriented people. But now this people has become articulate and critical, and, as reported by Bulganin and others there is Socialism in the Soviet Union.—  
G.A.

## Need Not Fear Truth

Editor, Daily Worker:

The difficult and painful reevaluation of the role of Stalin must be welcomed by Marxists throughout the world. Certainly, we who believe that the future belongs to communism have nothing to fear from historical truth.

Even from the incomplete reports so far received here, it must be obvious to all that one of the greatest dangers facing the Communist movement everywhere is the tendency to-

# Marxist Le 'Personality'

By GEORGE MORRIS  
(Second of a Series)

THE "CULT OF THE PERSONALITY" they are discussing in the Soviet Union is not a strange cult to American unions. The vesting of excessive, even unlimited authority, in a leader, for perhaps a lifetime, has been cultivated in the American labor movement for many decades.

It is not unusual for heads of American labor unions to hold their positions without interruption for 30, 40 and even 50 years. The late W. D. Mahon of the streetcar men, held the presidency for more than 50 years when he chose to retire. Samuel Gompers was president of the AFL for 40 years. William Green succeeded him for 25 years. John L. Lewis headed the miners for nearly 40 years. So the record runs.

Many of the present-day major leaders are so entrenched in their organizations, fortified by a clique of yes-men and bureaucratic machines, that it is virtually impossible to differ with them, much less challenge them in office.

Their judgment is warped by advanced age, inability to pace the times, and inclination to look back rather than ahead. Even their close friends hardly dare advise them. In fact, the yes-people help to build up an infallibility for the personalities around whom they dance, and in time they themselves believe that the strength and unity of their organization, is tied up with the maintenance of a god-like authority for the president who can do no wrong.

American unionists are quite familiar with disastrous consequences for the labor movement from such "leadership."

IT IS not my intention to make the comparison mechanically to the situation the people of the Soviet Union now seek to correct. But our experience illustrates at least in a limited way, how the menace of one-man rule can creep up.

The campaign to wipe out the "personality cult" has implica-

ward eliminating inner-party democracy. Apparently the slogan of "democratic centralism" has been honored more for the centralism than for the democratic procedure which is its indispensable counterpart.

It seems to me that the American Communist Party suffered severe weaknesses in this respect.