

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

## From Another Cleveland

CLEVELAND

Editor, Daily Worker:

I have read another letter by a Cleveland reader which appeared in Speak Your Piece of July 16. This reader follows the same pattern of another Cleveland reader whose letter appeared a few weeks ago.

This pattern is simple: "Hear nothing, say nothing, do nothing" with regard to the current discussion of such a "small" issue as the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party.

To make sure their pattern is the "real" Marxist stuff, they dislike the Marxists in New York, in the first letter, and the intellectuals, in the second letter.

Being an old timer and reading the Daily Worker from its inception, I know well the good folks in our movement as well as the readers of the DW. I have been to several good discussions on the Congress and had many talks with our folks. I am glad to say that the great majority of the membership is very concerned with the deliberations and revelations at the 20th Congress.

I have yet to meet any serious Marxist in our movement—leader or rank and file—who disagrees with the position taken by the Daily Worker from the inception of the Congress.

It is my personal opinion, and of the many I have talked with, that its frankness and boldness—right from the beginning—as to some of the shortcomings of the Congress itself and of ourselves in the U.S.A., has been a tremendous help for us in our discussion.

No serious Marxist could have ignored the horrible violations of the fundamental principles of socialism in the USSR by the anti-Marxist methods of the Stalin cult. The very revelations were meant to open up the sharpest Marxist discussion of self-criticism that was so well provided by the staff of the Daily Worker.

I fully share the opinion in the letter by Alex Leslie that never before has the DW risen

to such heights of true Marxist leadership.

I have just returned from a 10-day vacation spent with a group of friends in Canada, all old timers. There, too, they expressed high opinions about the role of our DW here, which was the first Marxist paper anywhere to take the correct critical position on the 20th Congress.

They were particularly inspired by the recent article in the Worker by Steve Nelson of Pittsburgh. So am I. Brother Steve Nelson knows pretty well that true Marxists must distinguish between the morality and methods of justice used in a decayed capitalist society and in a flourishing and growing socialist society—OLD TIMER

## Political Stagnation

Editor, Daily Worker:

The N. Y. Times Magazine of July 15 had an article by William S. White, "The Nation's Mood—And the Issues." It said that in Washington the opinion prevails that "the U. S. has rarely been in so contented and so languorous a mood—some even say in a mood of such profound complacency."

Or is this "languorous" mood actually a disillusionment among the people with the stale, unimaginative attitudes the functionaries of the two parties display at a time when statesmanship of the most enlightened progressive quality is called forth?

Particularly in Congress the leadership of both parties has been acting in strange ways. Outstanding examples of this are the activities of the infamous House Un-American Committee and the Senate Judiciary committee which are instrumental in keeping up a prolonged assault on civil liberties; the eagerness with which they have been voting astronomical sums for arms, while they have almost completely ignored the great needs of the country for schools, hospitals, low-rent housing projects. Much more beneficial to well-being of the people can be projects for soil conservation than the approved multi-billion dollars for automobile highways.

The time has arrived for

every forward-looking citizen liberal, socialist and communist for joining hands against dragging the country toward stagnant political life. As the magazine The Nation (April 14) editorially pointed out: "The forward movement of American politics has been brought to a nearly dead halt by the passionate determination of both parties to preempt the Center position. Modern democratic political systems are not self-starting; they need a "left," in the generic sense, to set the not-so-vital center in motion."

AMICUS POPULI

## A Pointed Question

Editor, Daily Worker:

I have just read the article by Joseph Lash in the New York Post which purports to describe political differences in the leadership of the Communist Party. Don't you think that Nikita Khrushchev would have a legitimate complaint if he asked how come he has to learn about the discussion in the American Communist Party's national committee from the capitalist press instead of from the Daily Worker?

Reader.

## Hold The Fort

Editor, Daily Worker:

Increasingly complicated problems are confronting the Communist Party. In view of admitted errors in the past and the new possibilities for peaceful transition to socialism, the Party has to revise its program and organizational functioning and to seek ways and means for uniting with other Socialist groups and elements. At the same time it has to withstand continuing attack under the Smith and McCarran laws.

In the discussions too, criticism is piled on criticism, often without any constructive value. And circulation is given to the disruptive, defeatist idea that the Party has outlived its usefulness and should be liquidated. It is said that we don't need the projected broader party of Socialism either—that all we can

and should do is only to work in the existing mass organizations.

Work how?—Everybody on one's own? Without collectively worked out Marxist program? Without collectively worked out tactics and strategy?—Doomed to failure?

According to Erna McNeil (July 12), the Communist Party work in the shops and trade unions only adds to the disunity of the workers, and the proposed mass party of Socialism would do the same, unless it represented an alliance of all existing socialist-minded working class political groups, such as, says she—the ALP, Liberal Party, Trotskyites and Zionists. As if all these were really socialist-minded. As if any such all-inclusive unity were really possible.

Some of the debaters seem to forget altogether that the class struggle is not a dogma, but a most palpable reality; they seem to forget that the workers have to engage in bitter strike struggles even now, during "good times, and they will have to fight for their very lives, when "bad times" and widespread unemployment will sooner or later hit them again, as they have hit repeatedly in the past.

The capitalist class holds political power through their two-party system. The working-class surely needs a political party of its own. Looking ahead, it will have to have a real third party of a broad anti-monopoly coalition character, and, included in the coalition, also a party of scientific socialism, a party based on the scientific Marxist analysis of the economic and political factors in the development of society.

Such a Marxist party (at present—the Communist Party, later—the projected united party of Socialism) is indispensable in the fight for Socialism in general, and specifically, during the coming years, in the fight for the formation of a broad anti-monopoly coalition.

Eugene Dennis is so right: "As one of the essential preconditions for establishing a broader mass party of Socialism, it will surely be necessary to strengthen our Communist Party politically, ideologically and organizationally—and, above all, to extend its mass influence and United Front relationships."

Hold the Fort!

C. DIRBA