

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Let's Think and Say What We Mean

Baltimore.

Editor, Daily Worker:

On June 5 Max Gordon examined the phrase "dictatorship of the proletariat." Certainly it would be better to just call it "working class rule." But let's not get tied to any particular phrase or expression. There are a lot of ways to tell someone what it would mean to have the workingmen and women running the government for their own benefit.

Some high-falutin' memorized slogans have been used in place of ordinary common sense. We still talk too much about "petty-bourgeois ideology," when we should be talking about middle-class thinking; and too many people call big business, "the big bourgeoisie."

Many terms Engels used in his earliest translations of Marx seemed to have stuck in our conversation like passwords between lodge brothers, but they have no meaning at all to the average American workingman or woman. Let's stop using a different language. Let's say what we mean, let's think what we mean and let's say it like ordinary working people.

And "hero-worship" is easier to understand than "cult of the individual."

ROY WOOD.

Better Organization Of Discussion Urged

BRONX

Editor, Daily Worker:

May I offer a few comments and a suggestion.

1. More discussion of "Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky" will better prepare us for the essential job of explaining why class content is more important than the words "dictatorship" and "democracy." But I think many miss an equally important point advanced by Max Weiss: the concrete world situation has changed, favorably to us, and one concrete force we deal with is the basic belief of the American people in the Constitution.

2. Herbert Aptheker was in my opinion justified in correcting some of the weaknesses in the Daily's editorial on the Khrushchev's secret report. But I regret that his remarks probably obscured a much more important consideration, the absolute necessity for such an editorial—even with defects.

3. A recent correspondent objected to the Dennis report as

being, among other things, too sketchy. I believe she is right. And I would add that it is astounding to find nothing at all in such a report concerning the actual organizational condition of our Party.

My suggestion is that, insofar as possible, the forthcoming articles from our leadership not only include the dissenting opinions but be published in an organized fashion. Conflicting opinions should be presented in the same issue, and that issue, should if possible include also relevant contributions from readers. Otherwise we shall all be confronted with a clipping and arranging job that should not be necessary; clipping should be enough!

STANLEY ARCHER.

The Leadership Is Lagging

CHICAGO.

Editor, Daily Worker:

I have just finished rereading the Khrushchev report of the closed session. It left me with a sick feeling. However, my responsibilities for that sector of the fight for socialism are only secondary. It looks to me as if the Soviet C. P. is well on the way to cleaning its own house and accelerating the drive forward toward Communism. Sadder as the revelations are to any feeling person, they cannot be allowed to cloud over the main picture. The U.S.S.R. is a Socialist country. It is correcting its errors. It is moving forward in a correct direction.

It is time that we American Communists did the same thing. ~~Correct OUR errors, clean our own house and straighten out our own policies; and perhaps even at the expense of the jobs of some of our own well entrenched leadership.~~ I say leadership because it is their official title. Misleadership would be more accurate if we are to judge by some of the mistakes we are now examining. From what I read in the Worker and the Daily, the majority of these leaders don't seem to have really learned their lessons in the past 10 or 20 years that they have held office.

We are now coming to the conclusion that some of our major policies of the past 10 or 15 years were in error.

Our postwar estimates of a coming depression (right away) were obviously and incontestably wrong. From this stemmed all manner of mistakes. Our work in the labor movement, our part in making the Marshall Plan grounds for a split in the CIO, our estimate of the war danger,

Prior to this was the wartime error of again misjudging capitalism. (We called our mistakes "Browderism" then).

Prior to this was our estimate of the war as strictly imperialist (until the day the U.S.S.R. was attacked).

I might add that in general a look at our policies and programs of the past periods does not encourage confidence in the wisdom of our leadership.

It was our responsibility as members of the CPUSA to correct these policies and when necessary change the leadership. To suggest this was often called "Rank and Fileism," "Anti-leadership" etc.

We have distorted our democratic centralism. We have had the centralism without the democracy. We discussed predigested, unanimously approved national committee reports. True, none of us was shot as "enemies of the people" but there was always the threat of expulsion as "enemies of the working class" if we differed too sharply. Many good Communists dropped out under these circumstances. Some were kicked out (and were not phonies or stool pigeons either).

And now what is happening. We have a good discussion going in the Worker and in the Party on what's been wrong and how to move forward correctly. I've read more good letters in the last three months than I've seen in 6 years in the YCL and 15 years in the Party. The suggestions from the long unheard Rank and File are for the most part good. I hope to see a lot of these Comrades at the convention.

But the leadership seems to be still following the pattern of unanimous reports handed down from above (Dennis, for example), new policies projected from above without prior discussion or convention approval (for example, Mac Weiss policy on peaceful change to socialism being in the cards here). These leadership methods **MUST BE CHANGED.** Many of our leadership have lost contact with our membership, the American working class, and in fact, reality. Many have become first class bureaucrats. These should be relieved of their heavy responsibilities as leaders and permitted to refresh their contacts with the working class at the point of production, to demonstrate their abilities as Worker salesmen and shop-club builders. This must be the real prerequisite for their "rehabilitation" not just breast-beating confessions of past errors. Let

COAST 'PEOPLE' ANSWERS SOME

The following editorial entitled, "A Reply to Critics," appeared in the People's World of San Francisco, on June 18:

By correspondence and word of mouth some readers have disputed the wisdom of publishing the text of Nikita Khrushchev's speech on Stalin, as released by the State Department.

Our editorial comment on the Khrushchev text has also been challenged.

Two principal questions have been posed:

• Was it proper to publish a document which the State Department obviously released to further its own ends?

• Did not our editorial continue an old vice in a new form by uncritically accepting what Khrushchev is supposed to have said, just as in past years there was an uncritical acceptance of declarations by Stalin and other Soviet spokesmen?

We published the text because, to us, it seemed authentic. (By now that is an academic issue, because if the document was not authentic then the Soviet government has had more than ample time to expose it as a forgery or a distortion.)

Whether one agrees or disagrees

us adopt a principle of rotating some of our leadership each year. If Stalin had been rotated some of the U.S.S.R. troubles might have been avoided. They would not have been worse. Ditto with Browder here. Let's not have a repetition of Centralism with no democracy. Only real party democracy now and in the future is the guarantee of avoiding the type of errors we have made in the past and correcting those we may make in the future. —M.

Asks Airing of Differences

Editor, Daily Worker:

I have learned that differences exist between Joseph Starobin and other Marxists on various aspects of current policy.

Since these differences have not been aired, and apparently there is no thought that rank and file opinion might aid in a correct resolution of the differences, I suppose I'll have to wait until Henry Schwartz, or some other "expert," writes an expose on the differences, giving me the opportunity of learning what they are and giving me the possibility of forming my own judgments. —B. C.