

# U. S. REDS DEMAND RUSSIA TELL MORE ON STALIN TERROR

## Attack Restricting of Blame for Mistakes to Dictator— Khrushchev Hit on Jews

*Text of the Communist party's  
statement is on Page 12.*

**By WAYNE PHILLIPS**

The United States Communist party yesterday added its voice to the chorus from its international colleagues demanding that the Soviet Union's present leaders explain why they had not prevented Stalin's excesses.

A statement by the party's National Committee declared that it was "deeply shocked" by the revelations of Stalinist terror made by the Soviet party secretary, Nikita S. Khrushchev.

"We do not share the view that the questions dealt with, no matter how painful and abhorrent, are exclusively the internal affair of the Communist party of the Soviet Union," the statement declared.

"We cannot accept," it went on, "an analysis of such profound mistakes which attributes them solely to the capricious aberrations of a single individual, no matter how much arbitrary power he was wrongly permitted to usurp."

The committee confessed that "we uncritically justified many foreign and domestic policies of the Soviet Union that are now shown to be wrong."

**'Basic Analysis' Urged**

It called on the leadership of the Soviet Communist party to make "a basic analysis of how such perversions of socialist democracy, justice and internationalism were permitted to develop and continue unchecked for twenty years."

"Also required," it declared, "is a further and deeper examination of such questions as the structure and operation of socialist democracy in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries."

The committee statement went on to attack Mr. Khrushchev directly for the treatment of Jews.

"We are deeply disturbed by facts revealed in information coming from Poland that organs and media of Jewish culture were summarily dissolved and their leaders executed," the statement said.

"Khrushchev's failure to deal with these outrages, and the continuing silence of Soviet leaders, requires an explanation."

The statement also sounded the new Communist theme of independent relations between national parties.

"We have begun to re-examine," it said, "our previously oversimplified and wrong concept of the relations which should exist between the Marxists of various countries, including the Socialist countries."

These relations, it continued, should be based on "the equality of parties" and "the right and duty of the Marxists of all countries to engage in friendly criticism."

The general tenor of the na-

---

**Continued on Page 12, Column 2**

**The New York Times**

Published: June 25, 1956

Copyright © The New York Times

# U. S. REDS DEMAND FACTS ON STALIN

Continued From Page 1

tional committee statement was the same as declarations last week-end by Palmiro Togliatti, secretary general of the Italian Communist party, and the politburo of the French Communist party.

And the sentiments were similar to those expressed in The Daily Worker starting last March, soon after the conclusion of the Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, where Mr. Khrushchev made his attack on Stalin.

The national committee statement closely paralleled an article published yesterday in The Worker by Steve Nelson, the party's leader in Western Pennsylvania.

"It is inconceivable," Nelson wrote, "that after such major mistakes were revealed, that there is not a resolution or a speech at the Congress, nor even a whiff of self-criticism by the leadership of its own errors."

It was wrong, he wrote, to lay the blame at the door of the "cult of personality"—for, he said, this cult was but an outgrowth of Stalin's concept that as progress toward socialism advances, the class struggle sharpens.

## 'Frameups' Devised

"The theory that the class struggle sharpens under socialism calls for extermination of the enemy," he wrote. "Thus the secret police, the legal arms of the government, and the courts, could and did devise frameups of people and those who did it even felt justified in doing it."

The experience in satellite countries after World War II indicated that this theory was not entirely correct, Nelson implied, for he said "new answers were sought and found."

Although linked with criticism of the present Soviet party leader, the analysis by Nelson was strikingly close to that of Mr. Khrushchev on the transition to socialism.

In his foreign policy speech at the party congress Mr. Khrushchev declared, "It is quite likely that the forms of the transition to socialism will become more and more variegated."

Under certain conditions, Mr. Khrushchev said, the revolutionary movement could triumph without resort to violence, and possibly even by using existing parliamentary institutions."

## One of Six Articles

Nelson's article was one of six published yesterday by The Worker in the opening salvo of a public discussion of party policies leading up to the national convention in December.

The call for the discussion and convention was made by the party's National Committee last May, after a meeting described as "the most self-critical in the party's history." The last party convention was held in 1950.

The meeting heard a report by Eugene Dennis, the party's general secretary, which held that the party had lost its influence and become politically isolated by policies too far to the left.

He embraced the Khrushchev theme of peaceful transition to socialism as an idea developed years ago in the American movement—without commenting that this was the essence of the policies for which Earl Browder, his predecessor, had been ousted in 1946.

## Independent Course Urged

A report by Claude Lightfoot, Illinois party chairman, on political action called for the Communists to pursue "an independent course which influences the direction of the democratic party."

And a report by Max Weiss, national educational director, on the Soviet party congress, held that American Communists, "like other parties, were affected by the cult of Stalin and his infallibility and made many serious mistakes."

Fred M. Fine, public affairs secretary, complained that the party was "weak and uncertain" as to its future course, and said "the main fault for this lies in the tardy and inadequate lead given as yet by our national committee."

Discussion had actually been going on within the party for many years, he wrote. "It could not have been otherwise in the face of the developing and acute isolation our party was suffering and the apparent sterility of many policies and tactics we were pursuing."

In the discussion, however, he warned against either underestimating the magnitude of the changes called for, or going so far with them as to wreck the party altogether.

William Schneiderman, former California state chairman, wrote that "whatever the reason for them, our mistakes would have been uncovered and corrected sooner if we had genuine party democracy operating at all levels of the party."

## Calls for 'Overhauling'

"Our state and national leadership is justified under the severest criticism for its responsibility in this situation," he wrote. "We need an overhauling of long-standing practices in our methods of work, and to re-open the channels of party discussion."

Two writers using pseudonyms were even stronger in their criticism.

One, signed Gene of the Bronx, declared that the party was "in the nadir of our existence" and he added, "on lots of things we are a spit in the wind."

"I think we have to go back a lot more than ten years to appreciate the fix we're in," he wrote. "I think we have to examine the manner in which we banished Browder (shades of Comrade Stalin and the way the Communist party of the Soviet Union destroyed elements which

disagreed with them) and began to label everything which didn't smack of military discipline as Browderism."

Another writer, using the name Philadelphian, turned the attack directly against the party chairman, William Z. Foster.

"We absorbed the cult of the individual from the Soviet party and proceeded to surround Foster with an aura of wisdom and ascribed to him qualities of leadership that were way out of balance with the weak position our party found itself in," he wrote.

## Calls Foster Responsible

"Certainly if our party has made serious left-sectarian mistakes, Foster, as its chairman, bears a large responsibility," he concluded.

Mr. Foster, when the Stalin controversy first became public, wrote an article for The Daily Worker warning against those who would tear Stalin "to political shreds as some in our ranks seem inclined to do."

He appeared to be taking issue with Alan Max, editor of the newspaper, who had written that the Stalin issue raised important questions about the role both of present Soviet leaders and those of the American party.

The national committee meeting that had opened the current discussion was attended only "briefly" by Mr. Foster, according to the party announcement afterward.