

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

## Workingclass Weapons

Editor, Daily Worker:

This matter of a peaceful transition to socialism through Constitutional means is one which has caused some understandable anguish and concern to many honest Marxists. The disturbing thought seems to be that advocacy of a peaceful transition through Constitutional connotes abandonment of the class struggle, denotes the danger of a shift back to the right-opportunism of Browder wherein benevolent capitalists were to be depended upon to concede graciously to the worker his rightful due.

Comrades, fellow-workers, and fellow students of Marxism-Leninism, don't worry. No responsible Communist leader is advocating abandonment of the class struggle. And if he would, he couldn't because the class struggle doesn't abandon him for a minute.

Within the framework of this capitalist society every worker and every working-class leader is forced by the needs of the people to struggle every day for peace, jobs, and democracy. And to the extent that we struggle, for them. Nor could anybody in our ranks or out succeed in turning back the clock to the right opportunism of Browder. Witness how hard the right-social-democratic union leaders have tried to do so and could not, and how well our paper and our leaders have brought this point out.

Glass collaboration cannot replace class struggle because the ruling class isn't in the habit of collaborating with the workers. They're in the habit of ruling them—by force.

So we're gonna fight the bosses tooth and nail for every little gain, every little concession, every little advance (and big ones too), right up to and including the transition to socialism, and yet we're gonna have a peaceful transition through Constitutional means. Is that possible? Sure is!

In San Francisco in the 1943 and '36 general and longshore strikes, the newspapers proclaimed the Bay Area to be virtually in a state of civil war. But was it a civil war? Of course not. It was merely a peaceful demonstration by the workers for certain just demands.

There was considerable violence done against the workers with lethal weapons. The workers used no weapons and no violence, and yet they won their

just demands and defeated all of their mighty enemies. But it is not quite accurate to say that the workers used no weapons: they used one, working-class solidarity.—R.N.

## Disappointed In Dennis Article

BUFFALO, N.Y.

Editor, Daily Worker:

We're in the middle of a steel contract struggle, and so it's hard to find time for the many hours of thought needed to make a contribution to the worldwide and partywide discussion touched off by the 20th Congress, and especially by the Khrushchev report.

We workers in basic industry have a lot to offer to the discussion, and are certainly gaining a lot from it. But the issues are so big and deep that many of us, myself included, have not wanted to speak out too hastily. This is by way of apology for staying quiet so long, while the discussion has raged in the Worker. I think the Daily Worker has, in the past few months, made perhaps its best contribution to the cause of Socialism in the U.S.

But last night I finally got the June 18 issue of D.W. (we don't get the Worker so easily) and sat down at 11:30 last night to read the Dennis article with much anticipation. Surely, I thought, after the publication of the special Khrushchev report, he has realized that his report to the National Conference was superficial in its characterization of our work as 'left sectarian,' and dealt in effects, not causes of errors. Surely, by now Dennis and the other members of the National Committee realize that our history since the Russian Revolution is what must be studied and the history of the world Socialist and Communist movement, not just our last ten years of work. Surely, Dennis will no longer gloss over the key nature of our relationship to and attitude toward the Soviet Union and its leadership.

Well, instead of a contribution to our discussion, I think that the Dennis article was an apology for the present leadership of the Soviet Union. What comes out of the article is that the Soviet leadership has a new line and that it's up to us to apply it.

"Fearless" Khrushchev, indeed! How fearless were Khrushchev and the others when many of the best Communists in the Soviet Union

were being murdered? Or were they part of the terror apparatus? Did they have a secret trial and murder of Beria because they needed a scapegoat, and because a public trial would have implicated them as part of the terror? Was Beria an "imperialist agent," or was that a phony trial, too?

And just when did "the highest form of self-criticism" become self-correction? Why must Dennis gloss over the fact, recognized by millions of people, that Khrushchev, speaking for the present Soviet leadership, at no time had one word of self-criticism for himself personally or for the group!

Americans won't accept the kind of position taken by Dennis, and won't respect us as long as they think that's our position.—Steelworker.

## More Unity Actions

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Editor, Daily Worker:

It is inconceivable that the Communist Party of the United States can be reconstituted and rehabilitated on its present basis. If we must gladly abandon practices and policies that didn't work, so equally must we have no regrets about boarding up a structure that was too tight and too bare for the America of Gene Debs and John Brown.

The first tentative steps are being taken toward the establishment of a mass socialist party in our nation. A new and authentically American Left is in the offing. Everything that can contribute to its quick formation must be undertaken without delay, in order that the sentiment of our people for peace and for an economy of plenty can find a core and a pivot of action.

Forums featuring speakers of different Left and progressive groups, such as the one held recently at Carnegie Hall, should be arranged at frequent intervals. A joint defense organization to represent all victims of political persecution, whatever their identification, might be another common and unifying cause.

A combined program of mass socialist education, to be conducted by a united front committee of all groups, could be something else in which we might all find a way of working together. Perhaps the present discussion about the American road to socialism, now being conducted in the Daily Worker, might be extended to all the

Left press with members of any group being welcome to present their views in the journals of other factions.

Imagination and initiative must be substituted for canned "directives" and embalmed dogma to accomplish these tasks. Intramural jargon must be replaced by language which our countrymen can understand without carrying portable dictionaries.

Lastly the comfy clannishness of sectarianism must be superseded by a broad recognition of non-Communist progressives and left-wingers as our friends and comrades who also seek that American road.

For too long have all of us, Communists and Independents, trodden little paths that were dim and grubby—which could hardly contain us, few, let alone the people of America.

—Hal Harper.

## Suggests Changes In Leadership

Asbury Park, N. J.

Editor, Daily Worker:

I should like to deal with two questions: Communist Party leadership and international criticism and self-criticism.

From what I have observed there is a deep-rooted feeling among many Communists that there has to be a change in the style and content of leadership and in its personnel. These range from the anarchist and dangerous proposal that the entire leadership should resign immediately to the more reasonable proposal that refreshing and changing leadership is necessary wherever possible.

Such change is necessary to train new people. It is necessary so that we should not become an organization led by a kind of dynasty. It is necessary so that our leadership should have closer contact with the rank-and-file and so that leaders should not act in a vacuum.

New people for such leadership are present in the clubs, in the trade union movement and among Negro personnel. I think such changes should take place in an orderly manner, within the next 5 or 6 months and with proper democratic elections and with an atmosphere that will encourage nominations from the floor.

On the role of international criticism up till Monday the American CP was sadly lagging. The statement by the National Committee critical of the Soviet leaders was long overdue. The occasional editorial criticism of

the Daily Worker or an occasional article by Gene Dennis or Mac Weiss is not in my opinion the same as official criticism by the CP.

The statement of the National Committee which finally came out was very good. Another official document by the Party is necessary in my opinion on the injustices against the Jewish people and Yiddish culture. The failure of the Soviet leaders to deal with this up to now is a slap to millions of people who want to know what happened and what is being done to guarantee that it does not happen again.

Having said all this I would like to say I agree with the general positive perspective and bright future that the 20th congress opened up.

—L. K.

## Clubs Comment On Dennis Article

Editor, Daily Worker:

Our clubs discussed the article by Eugene Dennis which published in the Daily Worker of June 18, dealing with Khrushchev's report on Stalin. The following opinions were expressed by these clubs.

1. In the article Dennis still asks us to have blind confidence in the Soviet Union. He makes confidence in the building of socialism with confidence in the leadership of Khrushchev and Bulganin, one and the same thing. We feel that these are two different concepts, although obviously they are related.

2. Dennis stated that he did not agree with approaches that minimize the errors made in the Soviet Union. However, he went to considerable length in his article to voice disagreement with ideas expressed in some of letters, articles and editorials appearing in the Daily Worker. He did not, however, tell us what ideas, articles and editorials that he disagreed with and why.

Our clubs feel that he has a responsibility to write an article specifically dealing with disagreements he has with these letters, articles, editorials, etc. This would enable us not only to have a chance to get his thinking but, also, to be able to judge for ourselves whether we agree with his position.

—PROSPECT CLUBS,  
BRONX COUNTY