

UNEASY RESTS THE HEADLINE

By ALAN MAX

IN THIS CITY both the Times and the Herald-Tribune—along with the Daily Worker—printed the full statement of the American Communist Party on the Khrushchev speech.

The headline in the Herald-Tribune was an interesting one:

"U. S. Red: Declare Independence - Reject Khrushchev Line."



Having printed this headline, the H-T was confronted with the problem of what to do about it. The H-T came up with its answer the next day in an editorial titled "The Red Party Line." It read:

... the local Communists tell Mr. Khrushchev that he has made 'only a beginning' and that 'a basic analysis' of Stalinist errors is still owing. On the surface this sounds as though the party boss were being taken to task. But this will hardly discommode Mr. Khrushchev, for such 'criticism' fits exactly

into the impression which he seeks to give the world of a new and benevolent rule of the collective. The appearance is that of non-conformity among the Communists, but it is worth noting that the supposed non-conformity takes pretty much the same shape in every outpost."

So now the Herald-Tribune has explained everything. It's all a plot. In fact, it always was, always is and always will be a plot. If the Communist parties of the world are not independent, that is a plot. If they are independent, that is a plot.

In other words, if the Communist Party of the United States or any other Communist party thinks that the deep-going changes now under way will make these parties more palatable to the New York Herald-Tribune, such is far from the case. The fact of the matter is that even if the Communist Party were to go out of existence, the reactionaries would declare that was a plot too and would decide that the United Auto Workers or the NAACP or the U. S. Supreme Court was

the Communist Party.

But, of course, in standing more fully upon their own feet, the last thing the Communist parties have in mind is to make the reactionaries happy or lenient or soft-hearted.

Behind the changes now being discussed or being put into effect in the communist movements of the world lies the same thing that is behind the changes in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries—necessity. Moving by this, the necessity to remove every type of obstacle to further progress.

TAKE THE QUESTION of theory, for example. Some people may think the new situation calls for throwing all scientific thought out of the window, and some may consider this would be good while others hold it would be bad. Actually the present situation is laying the ground for the greatest advances in scientific socialist thought in many years. Let me quote here. Point 5 in the recent declaration of the Soviet and Yugoslav parties:

"The modern material and

spiritual transformation of the world, which finds expression in an enormous growth of the socialist forces, in the strengthening of national liberation movements, in increasing the role of the workingclass, in solving concrete questions of present-day international developments, confronts the international workers movement with a number of huge tasks. This fact also indicates the indispensability of a scientific analysis of the manifestation and fundamental material and social factors and tendencies of development in the present-day world.

"For these reasons, the delegations have agreed, guided by the principles of Marxism Leninism, to a prompt mutual cooperation and exchange of views in the field of socialist scientific thought both in their mutual relations and in the international workers movement in general."

All of which means, it seems to me, that no one party or leader of one party is the infallible fount of theoretical wisdom, but that scientific thought to be valid—meaning to keep up with changing conditions—requires

cooperation and exchange of views of Marxists (and other types of socialists as well) throughout the world. It also requires a critical study of all social thinking regardless of source.

WHEN KHRUSHCHEV, for example, discussed the question of peaceful transition to socialism at the 20th Congress, he was generalizing from views already developed and expressed by Communists in the various capitalist countries, including the United States. And Khrushchev's generalization itself is certainly not the last word on the subject—witness the further contributions by Palmiro Togliatti and by left socialist leader Pietro Nenni. Nor is this surprising—after all what is more natural than that scientific thinking on problems before the working class in the capitalist countries should come, in the first place, from the Marxists in capitalist countries?

To the Herald-Tribune all this is a "plot." Even worse—in the eyes of the H-T—it is a "plot" that shows every sign of succeeding.