

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

For Marxist Analysis Of Israel Situation

Editor, Daily Worker:

One of the most disturbing features which became apparent in the course of our "critical revaluation," may well be the extent to which some of our comrades have been influenced by the propaganda of elements inimical to the cause of Socialism. This fact has reflected itself in both the columns of the D.W. and in the discussions now going on in the Party organization and committees. And may I state that the New York Times, by the use of its half-truth tactics, has proven to be very instrumental in this case. Moreover, as far as certain letters which appeared in the D.W. is concerned, I would not exclude the possibility that behind the mask of the "worker" or the "reader" there is the class enemy disguised.

And lest there be any misunderstanding, let me state that I would not consider as an alternative any attempt to reverse or even "regulate" the course of the present discussion. As a matter of fact, it is my humble opinion that if some of our comrades have been so vulnerable to certain ideas alien to scientific Socialism—such as the exaggeration of American exceptionalism, failure to see the limitations placed on individual liberties by the bourgeois State even at its best, Zionism, nationalism e.a.—it is precisely because of lack in the past of such a genuinely free discussion, where ideas could be expressed, respected and aired out. For it was a common practice, only till recently, to transplant whole paragraphs from the classics of Marxism, without any regard to the present realities as they reflect themselves in the American scene.

Parrot-like memorization was the substitute to creative thinking. This, of course, could only lead, as it actually did, to a blind alley.

And now, again with the same ease, we tend to go overboard and in the name of Marxism (of all things!) we are ready to fall, body and soul, in the swamp of opportunism. Our position in the arms-for-Israel campaign may well serve as an example. But let me state, in order to prevent being called one-sided, that I do realize the difficulties arising from this sort of a situation. However, I feel that many of our comrades fail to differentiate between the legitimate rights of the Israeli people and the Ben Gurions, nor do they see the progressive role

that the present Egyptian regime is assigned to play in the subjugated peoples' struggle for national independence.

It is the Party leadership's duty then to offer an honest analysis of the situation in accordance with the socialist principles—and not to be blackmailed by exaggerated fears. Such a stand is the only due to a mature revolutionary party. For Zionism cannot be the solution to anti-Semitism, as certain of the DW readers have stated or suggested. Nor can it be its antidote.

—Ypsilon.

Comment on Letter By Steelworker

Editor, Daily Worker:

"Speak Your Piece" in the Daily Worker is a feature both revealing and instructive. Among the excellent letters that have appeared is one by Steelworker, in D.W. July 13. I like its tone and approach: "We don't mean we've lost our faith in the fight for human decency, for Socialism. . ."

But if Steelworker expresses the present mood of the majority of American Communists, the job "to build a really effective . . . Communist Party" is not only possible, it just begs to be done. The 20th Congress and the "revelations" following it, for all the hurt and pain they have caused, have also caused an intensification of the struggle for Socialism, not alone abroad, but in the United States as well.

Togliatti, in a speech before the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party in June, said: ". . . We intend to orientate Italian society toward an economy founded on a guarantee of the maximum well-being of the workers, on the elimination of unemployment, on the struggle against poverty. . . We want this progress, and we denounce monopolistic capitalism because, if here and there it guarantees some island of progress and reaps great advantage from it, it does not guarantee the general progress of the whole nation — technical, economic and social." (N.Y. Times, June 26).

Likewise the American Communist Party program must be based on American conditions and traditions, and directed to American society, but first and foremost to the American workingclass. Why keep repeating "Socialism is not on the agenda at the present time"? This is a defeatist slogan, and should have no place in the thinking of a militant Party, oriented to-

ward advance. What sense is there in advocating Socialism and in the same breath apologizing that it is not meant for here and now? In the words of Steelworker: "Let's face it."

One word more. I cannot agree with Steelworker on his reference to "arrogant pride," this is just not so; nor with his argument about democratic centralism. The principle of democratic centralism is too important a subject to brush off in a sentence. I hope Steelworker will re-think his remarks and consider this in its historical setting.—A. A. Heller.

Unanswered Questions

Schenectady, N. Y.

Editor, Daily Worker:

Many people in the Capital District were very pleased with the National Committee statement criticizing the Khrushchev speech when it was issued, although many were disappointed that the National Committee waited until after Togliatti had made his criticisms.

Since that time, the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party has issued a statement which in my opinion was a vast improvement over the secret Khrushchev speech, but still very inadequate. It explains the peculiar historical conditions, external and internal, in which the cult of Stalin emerged and the crimes that followed took place. It emphasizes the great achievements which took place in the Soviet Union over the last 30 years. This, in my opinion, is all positive. But unfortunately, it left many serious questions unanswered. Such as:

1—Why the complete silence on the excesses against Jewish cultural leaders?

2—Why the complete silence and the criticism of the way the Khrushchev speech on Stalin was handled?

3—Why the complete silence on the criticism of why the present leaders so eulogized Stalin while he lived if they disagreed with his policies?

4—Why Eugene Dennis' statement, which was the least critical of the Khrushchev speech on Stalin, was the only one printed in the Soviet Union and why his most critical statement—on the Jewish cultural leaders—was deleted?

I urge the National Committee not to wait for Togliatti or some other leading Marxist to show the way. The party rank and file want the leading committee to lead.

—I. H.