

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

## Defense Of Israel

Editor, Daily Worker:

Since my student days I have been an adherent of Marxism and consequently deeply interested in the Soviet Union and sympathetic to the policies of socialism.

At the moment, I believe that The Middle East policy of the Soviet Union is extremely destructive to the best interest of socialism. The Soviet Union and other communist countries are giving support to the Arab countries in their preparations for the destruction of Israel.

First of all Israel has the greatest potentiality for leading that area of the world toward socialism. Secondly, all the governments which are benefiting from Soviet friendship are extremely notorious for their disrespect for even the most fundamental rights of their citizens.

It may be true that Israel would not have existed in the first place had it not been for imperialism, but neither would the Suez Canal. Even if this charge is true, the individuals living in Israel are anything but imperialists. To the contrary they are examples of the extremes of imperialists. Rather than indifference or hostility from Communism these people should be able to depend upon us for assistance in their current struggles with the Arab dictators.

A further point of personal information is that the writer is not motivated by religious bias as I am of Christian background, neither am I influenced by my Jewish friends, as most of them are indifferent to this question. I simply feel that not to befriend this country's just position is inconsistent with Marxist principles.

—Regular Reader.

## New Forces Shown By Workers' Letters

HILLSBORO, N.H.

Editor, Daily Worker:

Letters and articles on Stalin in the Daily have opened up for discussion the whole question of collective leadership and the qualities Marxist leaders should have.

An important prerequisite for a left leader has been forgotten in the U.S. Namely, do they know and understand the workers and is he or she known and understood by them? The style of organization, of assignments, of promotion is wrong unless this factor is considered of first rate importance.

Pete Cacchione was certainly an excellent example in this respect. At no time did he allow any assignment to separate him from the day to day struggles of the workers.

As for ideology, leaders who do not participate in struggles with non-left workers cannot possibly achieve a consistently correct program and tactics.

I salute Bill Foster for his leadership in formulating an anti-imperialist, anti-war line. But I also believe that this anti-war lead has often not been applied correctly nor effectively on national and state levels due to the subjective weakness mentioned above.

During the Steven-McCarthy hearings everybody I knew was discussing and taking sides. For the first time a real mass movement against McCarthy was under way. Bill Foster and the Daily took a position which seemed to me ivory tower, plague on both your houses, sort of stuff. I wrote urging the Daily to jump in with both feet on the side of Stevens, regardless of his limitations, and I had confidence that the people would go and pressure Eis-

## Letters from Readers

enhower for more victories once they had defeated McCarthy. I received not even a form rejection explaining that the Daily did not print letters disagreeing with Foster.

If this discussion of Stalin could result in the Daily at least acknowledging workers' letters that would be a healthy step against bureaucracy and sectarianism.

The letters to the Daily indicate that many capable of being theoretical contributors are writing for the first time. This is proof in itself that the "cult of personality" has been a big factor in the U.S. The opening up of this discussion is wonderful. It means new enthusiasm and new forces will rapidly swell the ranks of the left.

—HOMER B. CHASE.

Editor, Daily Worker:

The exact heart of the entire matter is that the Soviet Union has reached a decisively new stage, arising directly out of its present advanced methods of production. It appears that they can now oppose successfully anybody's war program with a peace program because they have the A and H bombs; that they can threaten our own country's leadership in productive power — with the promise that they soon will surpass them; that most of the world's population and area looks to them for both help, friendship, and perhaps leadership.

In this new situation, the entire structure of their society can begin to change its form and content, in fact its civilization of police powers, courts, civil liberties, unions, and every other institution. This flows naturally out of the situation that they can look forward to the day when they can produce aplenty.

What more natural then that they should deepen the civil liberties of all their citizenry, invite criticism from their own people in or out of the Communist Party and from other parties of Socialist or even capitalist countries.

We must not deceive ourselves either, that there is now an end to injustice in a country of 200 million people. There will be anti-Semitism in some hinterland hamlet, an unjust accusation in more than one individual situation; and civil liberty curbs. Civil liberties is a growing and dynamic thing, and there it will be permitted to grow rather than be braked by a theory of gradualism; while here we will have to struggle for socialism before our liberties can spring upward.

CASANDRA'S BROTHER.

## Disagrees With Khrushchev

Editor, Daily Worker:

I read Khrushchev's speech, also the editorial of Pravda about Stalin. Khrushchev and the "self-proclaimed collective leadership," as the letter in your paper of March 25 says, couldn't do any better service to the enemies of Stalin and the workers all over the world.

I don't understand Khrushchev, telling us about the achievements of Stalin while he attributes it to the Communist Party and at the same time blames Stalin as being a one man ruler. If Stalin was a one man ruler than all these accomplishments are thanks to Stalin. On the other hand, if the Communist Party accomplished all that, then Stalin was not the

ruler but they were the rulers.

Khrushchev says the Soviet Union was warned about the Nazi attack and still was unprepared. Where were they? Why didn't they correct it? The mistakes they blame on Stalin but the great accomplishments they take for themselves.

What do they blame Stalin for? He encouraged the people to love him. Stalin couldn't encourage the people to love Khrushchev and the present leadership.

I think it's terrible to attack a great man like Stalin, the Stalin who saved humanity from Hitlerism.

I am thankful for the following three letters, March 25 (A.F.) March 29 (A.S.) and April 1 (SOS). I've been a working woman all my life and have very little education. My conscience made me write this letter. Thank you.—E.H.

## Our Own Responsibility

SAN FRANCISCO

Editor, Daily Worker:

The present criticism of the role of Stalin and 'the cult of the individual' raises certain questions in my mind which I believe the Daily Worker should be helpful in resolving.

1) Do American Marxists bear a responsibility for the situation that developed in the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and for the grave injustices and errors that stemmed from it?

2) Has the American Communist Party and progressive forces generally been weakened by these mistakes?

3) If the answer is yes to the two previous questions (and I think it is), what must now be done to dig to the root of this error, to bring about a fundamental change and win for the organized left the increased confidence of the American working class?

With the left under constant harassment and persecution, discussion of these questions on the broadest possible basis is difficult but all the more necessary. The danger does exist that reaction will attempt to take advantage of such a discussion to split and divide the left. But I think that the danger is a thousand times greater if it is avoided for this reason or any other.

All who have a stake in this issue should be involved including the thousands, who, like myself, have drifted or moved away from the Communist Party and yet have remained loyal to the interests of the working class. It could be a serious mistake to assume that the isolation of the left and the thinning of its ranks in recent years has been the result solely of the attacks and pressures of the right.

Can we afford to assume that American Marxists have remained immune to 'the cult of the individual'? It is possible that here too 'democratic centralism', maintained in form, lost its democratic content in application.

We have an opportunity today to break the binding fetters of sectarianism. In this new situation with the forces for peace and progress in the ascendancy all over the world, it is possible to build openly and publicly a vigorous mass Marxist left based upon unique American conditions that will help lead the American working class and the American people forward to a socialist tomorrow. I believe that the broadest possible discussion of the afore-stated questions is a necessary step in that direction.

Sincerely,

—M. V.