

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Khrushchev Speech Held Distorted

Editor, Daily Worker:

A socialist worker and a Daily Worker supporter for many years, I read the editorial comment and contributing articles concerning the Khrushchev's speech, presumed to have included among other subjects his observations on the "Cult of the Individual."

From the beginning it was apparent that you suffered collectively from a woeful lack of understanding, short-sightedness, confusion, I had hoped that as a result of the extended discussion that ensued, some elucidation would take place. But it did not. Rather as your ideas and attitude unfolded itself, it became evident that your confusion has increased, and the article in last Sunday's Worker is a shocking example of its degree and seriousness.

Whether you realize it or not and painful as it is for me personally to observe, you have joined the wolf pack in the bushes, snarling and sniping at the CPSU along with the Dulleses and their like. I will be charitable and assume that you have been victimized by a cold war stratagem of Washington's concoction and a hoax akin to the notorious letter that sent the labor government scuttling out of the English Ministry, and that you have taken this obviously distorted and for the most part, if not entirely contrived "version" of the Khrushchev's speech at its face value.

You make charges of the throttling of democracy and justice in the Soviet Union, losing sight of the condition of the armed camp that was forced upon her by her powerful imperialistic neighbors seeking by the foulest means to destroy her. As part of this scheme for the destruction of the first successful People's Government, billions of dollars were and are being spent to probe for any soft spots among its citizenry that can be used as centers of attrition.

Is it surprising—is it not rather inevitable that both democracy and justice should suffer some abridgement? In the defensive process and in the measures that the Soviet Union must use if she is to survive, it is entirely conceivable that with the best intentions, but with human limitations, some innocent people will suffer.

The French CP whom you quote to bolster your rickety structure, and Togliatti and other Socialists, with their heads still on their shoulders, tell you where to look for perhaps part of the answer. It will be found by applying the teachings of Marx and Lenin and other bygone and present thinkers, to a complete study of all observable factors, all events and all conditions, their evaluation and their ulti-

mate integration into perhaps an harmonious and comprehensible picture.

I am writing this letter not to defend the CPSU because they need no defense, nor because they will suffer seriously by your misdeeds. It is you and the peoples' interests in this country I am concerned about. You are hurtling yourselves and the progressive movement over the cliff and to disaster, and better than any Hoover can ever hope to do it.

—A FRIEND.

Book on Hungary Free of Cliches

Editor, Daily Worker:

The results of your reviewer's attempt to apply "cool, critical standards" to the recently published *Springtime on the Danube* seemed to me silly and unjust.

Apparently unable to find anything of a substantial nature to criticize, yet feeling impelled to criticize something in a book written with great (but not uncritical) sympathy for the Hungary of today, the reviewer decides that the book is poorly written and translated, although his examples are so petty as to prove nothing.

The editors of *New World Review* found the style delightful and the translation especially good. The book is free of the cliches, parades of statistics and dullness that have characterized much of the writing about the new socialist regimes. Especially valuable is the background of Hungary's history and cultural heritage against which the two French authors draw their picture of today. As guests of the Hungarian writers, their contacts were chiefly with intellectuals. They clearly were given a wonderful time by their hospitable hosts, and their pen pictures are warm and exciting. They do not attempt to give an all-sided picture, and the book, written in diary form, is not at all pretentious. The authors disclaim any intention of unqualified justification of the present system, wishing only to present "some of the original and attractive features of the country."

Since the authors' visit took place before the present period of re-evaluation and the revelations regarding the Rajk trial, the question could well be raised as to whether some of their generalizations would stand up today, and reservations of this nature are quite justifiable. Perhaps today the authors would write a different book. This does not mean that the impressions received at the time of their visit have no validity.

It seems to me just as uncritical to decide that everything written before the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR is no good as it was previously to insist that nothing

wrong could happen under a socialist regime.

Anyway, I think the book is delightful and profitable reading and deserves wide distribution.

—JESSICA SMITH.

Glossary of Sectarianism

Editor, Daily Worker:

For a great many years—25 or 30 maybe—I had the inclination to make a glossary of words and phrases used in Party language and in Political Affairs; to translate such expressions for the benefit of the worker at the machine.

So now when we are in the business of raking everything over and looking into all our errors, I believe this a good time to explain our language.

Glossary of Party language as it sounds to the man in the street:

Struggle to maintain—refers to fishing and fishing tackle.

To utilize—the use of broken parts.

To strengthen and maintain—repairing, holding the dike.

Main weakness—headache after childbirth—refers also to faulty plumbing—also trouble with main pipes.

Facing up to—fighting cocks, circling each other.

Shortcomings—short bread, with or without raisins.

Forces of reaction—internal combustion engine.

Linking up—refers to old fashioned cuff links.

In the first place—horse facing expression.

Significant gains—medical report—refers also to putting on weight.

Broad and flexible tactical line—adjustable television antenna.

Importantly—sounds like generals on parade.

Restore and maintain—put in new parts and keep them oiled.

Key issues—key factors—key trends—trouble with the looks.

Vanguard role—first roll out of the oven.

Effectively discharge—effectively maintain—military terms.

On all levels—traffic overhead, underground and street level.

Concretize—paving the streets.

I trust that this will make it possible to understand our language.

—S. V. A.

A Workingclass Movement

Editor, Daily Worker:

Chicago.

The last paragraph in the statement of the Communist Party National Committee astounds me! Has it become sectarian to even mention the words "workingclass" in Communist Party statements. The statement concludes by voicing its concern for the American people. It speaks of achieving "unity with all socialist minded groups to attain Socialism," etc.

The failure to place in the statement's conclusion the need for influencing the workingclass and participating with it in its struggles constitutes a serious omission, in my book. This taken together with the real inadequacies in the Dennis report to a self-critical analysis in regards to wrong policies on Communist policy in regard to the trade unions constitutes a warning signal.

Sure we want to break with sectarianism. Sure we want to develop, in due time and without any hot-house approach, a mass socialist minded united movement. Sure we are for constitutionally achieved goals of socialism, if that is at all possible.

But are we not more surely dedicated now and forever to the struggles of the workingclass first and foremost? While we wish to work for many of the goals enunciated in the national committee statement, the very first place that this work must be addressed to, is within the workingclass and the national committee should say so in plain unadulterated language.

—SAM KUSHNER.

Nenni's Statement Called a Model

Editor, Daily Worker:

If we are truly striving for a new kind of independence in judgement, there is much to be learned from the recent statement of Pietro Nenni, leader of the Italian Socialist Party. Nenni's stirring call for "political liberty" in the Soviet Union and his emphasis on the fundamental need for the protection of democratic rights of the individual goes right to the heart of the problem. And yet no one would accuse Nenni of being anti-Soviet.

Must we seriously debate, at this late date, the connection between socialism and political liberty? If we do not believe in the two together, without reservation, we are politically bankrupt.

—I. S.

Soviets Should End Secret Trials

PITTSBURGH.

Editor, Daily Worker:

The recent announcement of the execution of Bagirov and three former leading members of the CPSU after a secret trial has been received with happiness by the enemies of socialism in the American press. Pointing to the trial procedure they attempt to convince us that nothing has really change in the Soviet Union since the death of Stalin.

The Khrushchev speech made a damning indictment of police terror for over 20 years and

the 20th Congress pledged the correction of these monstrous distortions of socialist justice. In this context I feel that additional secret trials are harmful to the cause of socialism.

In our view the most important thing is not the correctness of the verdict. Soviet justice has been so compromised by 20 years of misrule that secret trials as this time can only gravely hinder the development of democracy in the Soviet Union especially when the Soviet press has not opened its pages to free and frank discussion and Pravda inveighs against "rotten elements."

The enemies of socialism are desperately trying to prove that nothing has changed in the Soviet Union, that new people are carrying on in the old way. We feel certain that millions of people reject this view and are deriving new substance for their socialist convictions by the many positive developments in the Soviet Union.

The emphasis on collective leadership as opposed to the "cult of the individual" the increased freedom of discussion in the fields of technology, art, science and literature, the emphasis on the study of the best of foreign achievements in these fields, the growing contact with foreign countries, the decentralization of some industrial control and administration of justice, the revision of some of the worst features of the prison system and the legal code and many other steps are surely steps in the right direction. On the other hand most people are cautious and will require more than this.

As Marxists we can note that the leadership has pledged itself to a new course, but for us more significant is the fact that the basic force for change is the necessity of socialist development. The socialist relations of production which cannot grow without the full flowering of industry, agriculture, science and culture demand full democracy. Further progress in these fields demands not only equality among the Party leaders but the widest opportunities for the humblest citizens in the most remote regions to fully express their viewpoints and to defend them.

Let us face up to the fact that the Soviet Union, while it has made solid progress, does not yet have political democracy, the socialist democracy of which Marx and Lenin felt was an indispensable part of socialism.

We must demonstrate to America that we are capable of formulating correct, independent attitudes and interpretations of those world and national events which interest and concern them.

Two Pittsburgh Readers.