

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

The AFL-CIO And Egypt

Editor, Daily Worker:

I cannot agree with the editorial in today's (Sept. 17) DW which, in connection with the Suez situation, mentions an AFL-CIO proposal "which recognizes Egyptian sovereignty." In my humble opinion this is precisely what the AFL-CIO plan fails to do.

It follows, too, that I disagree with the editorial in last Friday's paper, with George Morris' column in today's paper, and with Joe Clark's column in last Friday's issue.

To say (as the Friday editorial does) that the AFL-CIO proposals are a clear expression of the plan put forward by India and backed by the Soviet Union is to slander those countries and flatter the AFL-CIO Executive Council.

The Executive Council proposals do not, as George Morris claims, protect the sovereignty of Egypt in this situation. Rather, they abrogate this sovereignty by making the Hague Tribunal the arbiter whose decisions "shall be final and binding." Nothing like this is to be found in the Indian plan.—ARTHUR.

[Ed. Note — The AFL-CIO plan called for recognition of "two guiding principles: (a) respect for the sovereign rights of Egypt; (b) the maintenance of freedom of navigation in the Suez as an international" waterway open at all times to all people."

In connection with (a), the AFL-CIO proposed a Special Egyptian Suez Authority to operate the canal. In connection with (b), it proposed an International Suez Authority of the principal users to work with the Egyptian Authority.

However, there was some ambiguity in the exact meaning of (b) and just what the Hague Tribunal would arbitrate.

We agree the DW editorial should have made this clearer,

thus more effectively showing what there was in the AFL-CIO plan which could serve as a constructive beginning in the labor movement on the critical Suez situation.]

Calls for End To 'Mumbo-Jumbo'

NEW YORK.

Editor, Daily Worker:

I must say that I am getting a little fed up with the way our post-20th Congress discussion is proceeding. In the earlier stages we were beginning to open up. Now we seem to be getting a little frightened at our previous boldness and are hedging like mad.

The fact is that we have been the apologists of a foreign brand of socialism. What we need is our own brand. Let us not be afraid of turning our backs on all the mumbo-jumbo that has strait-jacketed us up till now, and just boldly start thinking our own answers.

I for one feel that I have been the victim of a hoax. For some years I took courses at the Jeff School, faithfully imbibing all the sacred principles. Yet, having swallowed much indigestible jargon, was I any more effective in helping to solve the problems of my shop and union? Did I have any better answers to the big questions facing our country?

The fact is, I didn't. On the contrary, all my Marxist baggage did for me was to make me talk like a square, unintelligible to my fellow-workers and therefore increasingly isolated from them.

And what was true for me was apparently true for the Party as a whole. Let's face it. Here we had a party kidding itself into thinking it had a "science" of politics. Yet when real life hit us a few sobering blows we had to recognize that our precious "science" had given us a bum steer for 10 years or more. Our book said "crisis," but in the real

world there was a boom. Our book said "imperialists want war," yet Eisenhower brought peace in Korea and then proceeded to go to Geneva. Our book said "fascism is coming," yet McCarthy got licked and democracy revived with no appreciable help from us.

Let us plunge into the political life of our country with no preconceived notions, with no axes to grind—only wearing our thinking caps and trying to find the best American answers for the working people of our country.

I enclose \$5 for the Daily Worker.

Yours,
—G.Y.

Lenin Wrote About Capitalist World

Editor, Daily Worker:

Bernard writes in the Daily Worker 9-19-56, "I believe that our general theory is Marxism, the application of it to Russia is Marxism-Leninism, and the application of it to China is Marxism-Maoism." He continues, "... the (continued) use of the term Marxism-Leninism becomes a symbol that we have not yet liberated ourselves from our previous uncritical acceptance, for use here, of Lenin's tactics for Russia. Therefore, I think, the tendency to drop the word (Leninism) shows progress."

I am one of those who does not believe that "Leninism" is a dirty word to be dropped from our vocabulary. But if I did I would not want to find "theoretical" justification for doing so by distorting theory. Let me pose a few questions to Bernard.

What is so "Russian" in Lenin's imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism? Was monopoly capitalism a feature of Russian capitalism only? Did industrial and banking capital merge into finance capital only in Russia and not in the U.S., and in every other advanced capitalist country in the world also? Were the Russian

monopolists the only ones in the world who exported capital? The American capitalists do not export capital? Did the Russian capitalists create international cartels with themselves and participate in them all alone? Did Russia divide the world "among itself" all alone?

Is not Lenin's "Imperialism," universal?

Or what is so "Russian" and "non-American" about Lenin's "Materialism and Empiro-Criticism?" Or his "Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism?" Or his "The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx?" Oh his "Marxism and Revisionism?"

Or take his "State and Revolution." What is so peculiarly "Russian" and "non-American" about his theories of the state? Will the state "whither away" only in Russia and not in the United States? When he speaks of democracy does he refer to Russia? Is the state a class instrument for exploitation only in Russia and not in the United States? And is the state the product of the irreconcilability of class antagonism only in Russia and not in every country in the world?

When Lenin wrote on "The Right of Nations to Self-determination" he was not writing something peculiarly "Russian." The fact of the matter is that in this work Lenin was quite specific about Russia. He entitled Chapter 3 therein "The Concrete Specific Features of the National Question in Russia and the Russian Bourgeois-Democratic Reformation."

True, Lenin was a genius in his application of Marxism to the Russian scene and especially as the leader of the Russian Revolution. His greatness, however, is not only because of his ability to apply and to lead, but also because he added to and extended the theories, the science of Marxism. Therefore, the term Marxism-Leninism.

WILLIAM ALBERTSON

Criticize Reports On UE Convention

Editor, Daily Worker:

A number of friends, all admirers generally of George Morris' splendid reporting of the labor scene and his detailed and invaluable handling of specific situations in the trade unions, have asked me to convey their deep disappointment at his treatment of the UE convention. None of us are familiar enough with the circumstances which have given rise to the debate in that organization to be partisan one way or another with respect to the discussion now going on. But we were disturbed by the violation of accepted journalistic practice in Morris' stories.

In places they have the character of a concealed editorial; the tone in which the facts are given is like an insertion adding to the facts, and does not appear frankly as the judgment of the writer.

If Morris wishes to comment editorially on this complex and painful episode, by all means let him do so. Our minds are certainly not shut to the probability of his being right, considering his record of correct assessments in the past.

But what he is doing here is not merely unfair; it runs counter to the principles championed by the editors of the paper themselves, and Morris' too. It can alienate good men and courageous fighters in the labor movement. Much is gained in the promotion of labor unity, but much may also be lost if once again we forget the fraternal courtesy we owe to those we think may be mistaken.

My friends feel so strongly about this that they have asked me to suggest that the Daily not only print this note, but honor it with a comment.—C. H.