

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Foster's Approach Most Sound

Editor, Daily Worker:

In the midst of the McCarthy-like seizure of your offices, it is certainly all to your credit that the very important discussion continued. The disruption of this discussion, and the confusion that might result, is no doubt one of the fondest hopes reactionaries everywhere are entertaining. However, it was Lenin who pointed out that Marxists have no fear of what the boss class may try to do with our self-critical explanations. It is our concern to convince workers, not keep peace with big business.

The letters on the criticism of Stalin as well as the articles have been a most wonderful evidence of the ability of American Marxists to use this science in a creative way. While certainly I for one do not agree with all that has been said, and especially disagreed with George Morris's columns, all that has been said was worthwhile saying. It is my opinion that Foster's columns have taken the soundest approach, primarily because they point out that all the evidence is by no means in. This is proven by daily developments, such as the recent Hungarian statement exonerating Rajk and company.

GARY STEEL WORKER.

Lessening World Tension

Editor, Daily Worker:

In the April 10 DW William Z. Foster explains why the re-valuation of Stalin takes place at this time. I think he missed the main reason—which is that we are living at a time of lessening world tensions.

When a nation is, or thinks it is, in grave danger of attack from a powerful foe, the people who support their government

are willing to give up, or may be convinced that it is necessary to give up, some of their liberties in order to defeat subversion.

But as soon as the danger of attack is substantially allayed they want all their liberties back. We can see this process taking place at a fair pace here in the U.S. today. In the Soviet Union I believe it takes place at a much faster pace because basic democracy is much stronger and because the people there understand the forces at work in their country and the world much better.

I say that if Stalin had even another 50 years to live he would have had to change his line at this time and/or be deposed. And there would have been no split in the Party because on the question of civil democracy and party democracy there is no issue, there are not two sides, there can be no factionalism. There is only one side—the people's side—and woe unto the leaders who think they can pull a palace revolution in the Soviet Union.—B. C.

Criticizes

Rajk Editorial

Editor, Daily Worker:

In your editorial on the Rajk Case there were serious theoretical errors which could not lead to a correct assessment of what happened and what actions to pursue. These errors were compounded in the editorial entitled "Grievous Deeds."

Moral indignation should be expected of a paper holding itself to be a Marxist publication. The tragedy of the misdeeds that occurred has caused all decent persons anguish. The heart of the question, therefore, is not merely to express moral indignation, but to show how these violations from socialist democracy occurred and

what the Daily Worker's responsibility is thereto.

The errors in the Rajk editorial were:

1. The juxtaposition of socialist and capitalist justice is unscientific. Socialist democracy, despite some bad judgments, is higher than bourgeois democracy.

While the former can, at worst, deface the virtues of socialist justice, the latter can at best ameliorate the defects of capitalist justice. It is the nature of the systems that determines the level of their democracy.

2. You say: "Not one, not some, but all those responsible should be brought before the bar of justice." Apart from the unseemliness of such self-righteousness, you again mix things up. As far as the "bar of justice" business is concerned, that should be left to the sovereign Hungarian government and their citizens, who, by the way, have already moved in that direction.

3. You say: "This we do know. The frameup of Rajk was a result of the false charges brought against Tito in 1948 by Soviet leaders." Now this is the first and only specific comment on a factual question, and it would have been better left unsaid because "this we do not know." Again, there is a mix-up of state and party. Any Communist Party anywhere had the right to criticize Tito's policies and pro-Titoites; but no Communist Party had the right to set into motion the apparatus of the state to eliminate—even to accuse—a citizen because of his political errors. (In fact, I predict that time will prove that the Cominform criticism of the Tito line of socialist progress was justified!)

Finally, it is regrettable that the paper so sensitive to wrongs committed by Parties elsewhere,

should be oblivious to what goes on at home.

Your editorial "Grievous Deeds" follows in the wake of the Rajk editorial, and one must ask: how is it possible that cries of pain over the tragic fate of the Jewish victims of a miscarriage of justice become stones hurled at the Soviet Union and other socialist states?

What their government committed—and their Communist Parties permitted—deserve condemnation and criticism, a fact which these countries plainly recognize by their public admission of guilt. But of even greater importance is what is to come now.

To those who are indifferent to the fate of the Jew, this tragic misfortune is another lucky chance to blast the Soviet Union and to slander socialist democracy. But to those decent people who believe in the rule of law and who seek the betterment of human life, whether they be non-Communists or even anti-Communists, the aim of condemnation is to impress the guilty with the gravity of the crime and to criticize to prevent a recurrence.

But for those who are Communists, even that is not adequate, for they have the duty to search out the causes of this tragedy and to make that understandable to their fellow citizens, so that they may learn that this is an unprecedented mishap foreign to the laws and ideals of socialist democracy.

But your editorial has no value in this respect. It condemns a civilized state in a way that only barbarous or fascist states should be treated, precisely because they are uncivilized. It does not point the way to improve the process of justice

so that injustice to man shall not occur again. It assaults not the violations but socialist democracy itself.

What you have done is to encourage honest American workers to come to the conclusion that what their leaders have told them about socialism and socialist democracy is not just hostile misrepresentation, but the honest-to-goodness truth.

You invite honest American progressives to succumb to the propaganda of groups calling themselves socialists, that the Soviet Union is, as they have always insisted, not a socialist land.

You promote the thesis of ideologists who say that it is hopeless for mankind to expect to emancipate itself through social change.

And I feel especially sorry for many American Communists of Jewish origin who needed aid and who, in this moment of sorrow and confusion will be easier prey for those elements who have been waiting for the day when they could draw away all Jews from their natural sympathy for a social system which is dedicated to the freedom and liberty of mankind.

This is a sorry service to the true friends of socialism in the U. S.

A. UNGER

Daily Worker

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

Registered 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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

(Except Foreign)

Daily Worker & Worker 4.75 8.00 13.00
The Worker 2.00 3.50