

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

## Says Dennis

### Evaded Question

Editor, Daily Worker:

While agreeing with many aspects of Dennis' article "The USA and Khrushchev's Special Report," I wish to take issue with the following:

1. In attempting to answer the many questions people are raising about the present Soviet leadership, Eugene Dennis says that "self-criticism in its highest form and in its very effective form is being applied today in the S. U., i.e. actual self-correction."

True, there is correction going on in the Soviet Union, but surely this is evading the question. If in the past we accepted uncritically the hero-worship of Stalin and even added to it in our own inimitable fashion, and if we now see that as a serious error—why should we hesitate to voice criticism of Khrushchev and the other members of the Central Committee of the Soviet Party?

It seems apparent to me that one man alone could not have accomplished all the misdeeds attributed to Stalin, and using the cliché of "Beria and his Gang" is no answer! What role did Khrushchev and the other leaders play in helping to cultivate the one-man hero-worship and leadership which lead to a whole period of repression and violation of people's rights in the Soviet Union?

Of course, the answer to this must come from the Soviet Union, not from Dennis—but I was frankly disappointed in the way Dennis approached this question.

2. I disagree with Dennis in his criticism of the Daily Worker Editorials—I think we need more of that kind of writing, not less. I also resent the implication that such criticism of the Soviet Union is anti-Soviet or helpful to those who hate Socialism! This kind of attitude can only serve to stymie free and frank discussion which we need so sorely in our Party today—and would put us right back on the path of the errors we are now trying to correct.

JEANNE NELSON.

## An Analysis Of Stalin

Editor, Daily Worker:

A number of questions have been pressing in my mind dur-

ing the past few days with reference to the USSR 20th Congress and its Stalin slanted (in my opinion) report, by Khrushchev.

To my knowledge it has not been as yet explained, either inside or outside the Soviet Union, that Stalin's far reaching excesses came about because of Capitalism itself. Stalin was haunted to the last days of his existence by the threat of attack, subversion, espionage, encroachment, etc., from capitalist countries. And was not his "Trusted" chief of police a tool of outside interests?

So in my opinion capitalism itself was in a great measure to blame for Stalin's and his government's blunders and serious deviations. This blame was indirect and direct.

I feel sure that Khrushchev, and the present leadership, inhabited the same glass house that Stalin did, so when throwing stones they should do so very carefully, without vilifying.

Friends, some of the Left and some not so much from the left have approached me and confessed that even though Stalin proved that he was no Saint, the style in which he has been exposed is not Cricket.

"It appears so much like American dirty politics with its mud-slinging," they added.

And may I project the questions following?

1—Was Mr. Khrushchev's secret report meant to be secret?

2—Was it delivered in good faith?

3—Things are changing tremendously for the best in the Soviet Union, without doubt, but why then still employ capital punishment?

4—Collective leadership exists in the Soviet Union, but why is so much being done, written and published in the name of Khrushchev?

5—Long live the reconciliation of the peoples of Yugoslavia with the peoples of USSR and all Socialist states, but the fuss made over Tito (not his collective leaders) smacks, in my opinion, of adoration of the individual. I wonder if the really great Yugoslav leader has pondered about this without thinking about Stalin.

6—Why not permit recently freed leaders to lead in the new formation of Soviet government and Party?

RAMON ACEVEDO.

## Charges Paper Slanders Stalin

Editor, Daily Worker:

These past few months the editors of the DW and W are trying hard to discredit their name and a glorious past. And, what's worse, they systematically disorient (actually deceive) the American workers.

Here are just a few examples:

1. It slanders the Soviet CP and the USSR for anti-Semitism. No proof was presented. There's no basis for such charge, except, of course, the provocations of the late Beria, who was well rewarded by the USSR long before our editors woke up.

Questions: a) Why didn't the Worker publish a denial by N. Khrushchev and Pravda on this anti-Soviet nonsense? b) Why didn't they even try to send a letter to Pravda and the Soviet Jews, to get some actual facts, before passing their "verdict?"

2. In the Middle East, right under our editors' noses, there is a historic anti-imperialist revolution taking place. And our editors shut their eyes and instead campaign for U.S.A. arms to imperialist stooges like the Ben Gurions. In other words they tail the tails of the State Department. And there's a joke here: this is presented as a further development of Marxist-Leninist tactics!

More: the Arab countries, having thrown off the imperialist shackles, are now fighting for the implementation of the 1947 UN resolution on Palestine. The Ben Gurions, and definitely NOT the Israeli people who are betrayed by the Ben Gurions, are fighting to keep the extra Arab territory they grabbed by force, and carry on the Dulles line for a war against the Arab anti-colonial revolution. A real Israeli policy is a neutral, peaceful, democratic policy, not one made in Washington, U.S.A.

Question: Are you defending the real interests of the Israeli people or are you selling them out?

3. On the so called "crimes" of Stalin. You're inflamed with a holy indignation, equal perhaps to Dulles. You keep on hammering on Stalin's "crimes" on name-calling (tyrant, despot, etc.) You censor, distort or minimize the real nature of the Marxist evaluation of Stalin (the statement by the Chinese CP, the Togliatti interview, the French criticism, etc.)

When a worker reads the last

few months the DW and W, he gets the impression that the USSR was led for 30 years by Nero. To which, only Saint Dulles, and perhaps John Gates, agrees.

Stalin, as W. Z. Foster points out, was not a murderer. Stalin, as N. Khrushchev points out, was not a "giddy despot." Stalin, as the Chinese, Italian, French, etc., Communist parties point out, was, in spite of his errors, a great Marxist-Leninist. And this fact the American workers will understand much sooner and much better than some of our utterly confused and utterly confusing editors.

Criticism is one thing, slander is another. Our editors, it seems, after long years of lack of any criticism, are trying to catch up with the lost time. So now we have the Age of Blunders. But if the DW and W are to overcome their chronic crises (isolation) from the working masses they must, 1) see 2) recognize openly and 3) correct the above mistakes. Otherwise some of our editors should be given a permanent vacation. We have had enough.

—A.N.Y. WORKER

## "Reputable Evidence"

Editor, Daily Worker:

Max Gordon's letter in your issue of June 25, concerning my letter which appeared in the paper on June 12, requires comment.

His letter does not accurately represent either the Daily Worker editorial to which I took exception, or what my letter said.

That editorial did not, as Max Gordon says, "imply that facts regarding the brutalities of the Stalin era were available but we wouldn't listen." That editorial implied nothing; it said that Communists had been deliberately blind to reputable evidence that was fully available. My letter objected to that statement, and I repeat that that statement is very far from the whole truth and misses the point as to why we made the errors we did make, and how to avoid their repetition.

My letter did not mention a "few dignitaries of the bourgeois world" who also denied the stories of brutalities. My letter cited leading bourgeois correspondents of the past 35 years in the Soviet Union, the writings of one U. S. Ambassador, the reports of all COMMUNIST correspondents in the USSR, and

the eyewitness writings of leading Communists from the entire world. And my letter stated that Communist leaders within the USSR were responsible for having misinformed the world Communist movement, and, indeed, the world population, of salient features of life in the Soviet Union. All this is quite different from Max Gordon's "summary."

Shall we from now on believe only the worst about the USSR, and so have nothing but pleasant surprises hereafter?

The point is that the editorial, and Max Gordon's letter, dodge the heart of the problem. The problem is: Given the necessary relationship of personal and party conduct among comrades, how is one to operate when faced by deliberate falsification, and how is this to be overcome and guarded against in the future, and further, what is the nature of "reputable evidence" for the future?

For instance: I. F. Stone returns from a brief visit to Russia and reports it is a terrible land in which to live and has a dishonest leadership. Is this "reputable evidence?"

Or, the New York Times reports "rebellion," again, in People's China; is this "reputable evidence?"

The question of criteria, of scholarship, of weighing evidence, this is what is involved and this is what must be considered and solved.

—HERBERT APTHEKER

## CORRECTION

A typographical error in Harry Mann's letter Tuesday transformed the meaning of one sentence into its opposite. As it appeared in print, the letter said that "the DW placed the matter of a new party of socialism in a way that is indeed with perspective." Mann had written it to read "without perspective."

## Daily Worker

Published daily except Saturday and Sunday by the Publishers New Press, Inc., 25 E. 12th St., New York 3, N. Y. Telephone ALgonquin 4-7954.

Reentered as second class matter Oct. 29, 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