

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Mr. Stone Sees It Through

Editor, Daily Worker:

In Brussels, Belgium, there is a statue which is known to every European traveler. Not because it is a rare Venus, or a work by Michaelangelo; it is that of a little boy on top of a flowing fountain—every guidebook features this statue. I recalled this on reading I. F. Stone's Weekly of May 28, 1956. Mr. Stone discovered "The Whole Truth Out of Moscow"—(whole underscored). For this discovery Stone may claim world renown, much as the Brussels' Manneken Piss.

Let us examine several of Mr. Stone's truths.

... "the morass on which the Russian Communist State is built"—two assertions which are not so. That which stands on a morass has the tendency to sink. The Soviet State, on the contrary, is growing in weight and strength. Hence the State must be standing on solid ground, solid enough to support a vast and expanding population, solid enough to have withstood invasion, famine, civil war, the Hitlerite attack, the pains of growth, of reconstruction and construction, of tactical and human errors. Mr. Stone admits: "Russia has advanced on giant boots," "Socialism in Russia is there to stay." Today, 39 years after the Socialist State was born, it is still a Socialist—not anything else—State, Socialist in the consciousness of its people, and materially strong.

But it is not today a Communist State, as Mr. Stone avers.

"This is not a good society and it is not led by honest men"—all in italics, for emphasis. Such may be Mr. Stone's opinion, but it is not true. The Soviet society is a good society: it has created, in 39 years, the kind of a State toward which mankind has been groping, through hardships and pain, since the beginning of time: a State of equals, secure in their needs, with free play for their aspirations. That this is so is demonstrated by the vast upsurge of peoples in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, even in the Western Hemisphere, striving to establish a similar type of society in their own lands. And it is a good society for the two hundred million Soviet citizens—

with few exceptions, of course, —who are literate, who are secure in their jobs, whose children are guaranteed an education and a place in society, where men and women are economically equal, and where material wellbeing goes steadily up.

That "the society is not led by honest men"—here Mr. Stone runs (blindly) into an obvious absurdity. What is the motivation for this statement? Why, these men did not tell everything to suit Mr. Stone. "It is amazing how little anyone knows of what really goes on in Moscow," says he. An accusation such as this is thoroughly irresponsible and nonsensical.

Another part of the article is headed: "Lenin Didn't Trust the Working Class." In proof of this assertion Stone quotes from Lenin's pamphlet "What Is to Be Done?" as follows: "The history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only trade union consciousness, i.e. the conviction that it is necessary to combine in unions. . . ." Mr. Stone leaves out two essential words here; what Lenin wrote was: . . . "develop only pure and simple trade union consciousness," and that gives the the passage a different sense altogether. Again, in the second part of the quotation a still more unpardonable omission: Stone's version is: "Hence the task is . . . to divert the working class movement from this spontaneous trade union striving . . . and to bring it under the wing of revolutionary Social Democracy." But Lenin wrote: . . . "to divert the working movement from this spontaneous trade union striving to go under the wing of the bourgeoisie, and to bring . . ." Mr. Stone's omission of the underscored part adulterates Lenin's text and twists the meaning to suit Stone's purpose.

Further on Stone asks—What is Marxism-Leninism?—and answers—"Whatever the men at the top of the party say it is." With is much logic one can ask—What is Atomic Energy?—and answer—"What the Congress of the United States says it is." Marxism-Leninism brought about, in Stone's own words: "Socialism in Russia is there to stay. Capital-

ism will never be restored. . . . Russian industrials . . . has advanced in giant boots, thanks to economic planning." Marxism-Leninism did more: saved the USSR from the Hitlerite onslaught, succeeded in keeping the Soviet resources and manpower on the side of the allies. It needs but little imagination to grasp what the subjugation of Russia by Hitler would have meant for the rest of the world, including the United States.

Mr. Stone does admit, grudgingly it seems, that in the 39 years of its existence, the Soviet State achieved enormous strength politically, industrially, culturally. That despite invasion by the United States and thirteen other powers in the early years of the revolution, despite the war of annihilation which Hitler waged, despite all the pain and hardships of invasion, famine, war; as well as the pain and hardships of rebuilding a poverty stricken peasant country, semi-illiterate, without industry to speak of, into a modern industrial giant; despite natural blunders in the course of Socialist construction, and the terrible blunders of the latter years of the Stalin rule—the Socialist Revolution, in Stone's words, "has Succeeded." Mind you, not receded, as happened to most revolutions in history, including the Great French Revolution, and to the American Revolution. The Soviet Union still is a society based on Marxism-Leninism, a Socialist society, a system which today is operating successfully in Europe and Asia among nearly a billion people.

Surely the Soviet Union faces great problems, many difficulties; surely there were serious violations of Marxist-Leninist principles during the Stalin regime. The publication of these violations at this time marks a turn from a state of encirclement, from a state of "cordon sanitaire" of Churchill and Clemenceau, and of a trade cordon of Washington, D. C., to freer, more sensible relations of co-existence. . . . A well informed journalist should know all these things, and should retain his sense of humility before the greatest event in modern history.

Lincoln Steffens visited the

Soviet Union in the early days —how terribly hard life was then, but Steffens was a generous man and a prophet: "I saw Socialism, and it works."

—A. A. HELLER.

No Judgment Before Discussion

Editor, Daily Worker:

New forms and new methods to meet new conditions. Excellent idea. But how about trying out the old ones before discarding them.

For instance—the Weiss and Dennis reports, though only reports and not decisions, have become the accepted line of the Party without discussion by the membership—so much so that when Allen writes a dissenting article the Editors of The Daily Worker carefully dis-associate themselves from his opinions. And Gordon writes about what "we Marxists" believe, as though anyone who disagrees is a non-Marxist.

Is this Democratic "Centralism?"

No, boys, this is out and out beaurocracy — that stuff we're supposed to be getting rid of.

The effect, if not the purpose of these acts, will be to have the new line an accomplished fact by the time of the National Convention in December.

I am one who disagrees with the New Line. I believe that carrying it to its logical conclusion will weaken the Party to the point of making membership in it equal to membership in the Liberal Party. I want to see both sides of this New Line presented to the membership without one side being approved and the other rejected by the leadership before discussions begin. Trust the members to arrive at a proper conclusion.

You have undoubtedly heard the story of the two opposing attorneys who were told by the Judge: "Gentlemen, your points so far have been most erudite and excellently presented. I know you each have several hours of further argument to present. Unfortunately, I must leave now. But do not let that prevent you from presenting your full arguments. When you have completed them, you will find my decision here under by blot-

ter." Don't let the Editorial Board or the National Committee put itself in the position of that judge.—FISHER.

Lest We Forget

BRONX, N.Y.

Editor, Daily Worker:

Far be it from me to condone the excesses of the Stalin era. They were undoubtedly a brazen violation of the spirit of socialism and deserve the sharpest condemnation of every believer in socialism.

But (and this is a very important "but") why all the breast beating? Why the atoning? What has the American Left to be ashamed of? Perhaps for defending a little too ardently, too blindly?

Have we forgotten the crimes and excesses of capitalism during our lives? Have we forgotten Hitler, Mussolini? The rape of democracy in Spain? Churchill's crimes against the Irish people and later the Greek nation? And more recently Kenya, Cyprus, Israel?

And how about our own country? Scottsboro, the Memorial Day massacre in Chicago, the Ford massacre, etc., and most horrible of all, the frameup of the Rosenbergs.

This does not mean we must not protest and feel indignant over violations of socialist justice. But neither does it mean, as some of your staff and also some letter writers do—indulging in self-pity and shame for advocating the cause of socialism. Our face may be somewhat smudged, but the water of self-criticism will cleanse it, but not even a Niagara of water can wash clean the face of capitalism.

So, I say, self-criticism, by all means! Shame of socialism never. Let us advocate proudly and loudly. That is the road to socialism in our own land.—M.G.

Daily Worker

Published daily except Saturday and Sunday by the Publishers New Press, Inc., 35 E. 12th St., New York 3, N. Y. Telephone ALgonquin 4-7954.

Reentered as second class matter Oct. 22, 1947, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

	3 mos.	6 mos.	1 year
Daily Worker only	\$4.00	\$7.00	\$12.00
PUBSCRIPTION RATES			
(Except Foreign)			
Daily Worker & Worker	4.75	8.00	13.00
The Worker	2.00	3.50	