

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Making Capital Of Anti-Cult

Editor, Daily Worker:

Among the many aspects of the study I have undertaken through the passing days, weeks and months, of the discussions on the "Struggle Against the Cult of Personality" in the Soviet Union, Britain, France, Italy, the Chinese People's Republic and the European People's Democracies since the 20th Congress, my attention has been drawn to some American-brand Cultists who are trying to make Big Capital out of Anti-Cultism.

Because I, like many self-searching Marxists, set out honestly and intensely to reassess events, programs, theories to comprehend the origin of Stalinist cultism, I commenced studying the articles and publications of the American Trotskyites, I. F. Stone's Weekly, magazines like Life and Look, for their views in this most vital discussion. I am also studying Monthly Review, The New York Post, The Guardian, and various Catholic newspapers featuring articles by Budenz. Simply to indicate the scope of study, designed specifically to avoid one-sidedness, I have finished Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. I, Parts 1 and 2 (Foreign Languages Publishing House 1952), Bernard Pares' Russia, and am reading Hindus' Mother Russia and Walling's Russia Message.

In the light of the enlightening riches of this concentrated study, I find little occasion for facetiousness or any attempt at clever irony and paradox. Moreover, I was geared to firm open-mindedness on the conviction that this kind of study and discussion provided an extraordinary opportunity for a meeting of minds of diverse political shades on the common ground of honest criticism and evaluation to establish truths and give impetus to progress!

I found, however, a tremendous contrast to such an approach and outlook in the materials issued by I. F. Stone and, especially, by the Trotskyites in The Militant. Even in this inspired mood of humanist striving for understanding and unity on the march for peaceful co-existence, these two bitter pills, Stone and The Militant, were too big for me to swallow. I found them, together, incorrigible Cultists frenziedly seeking capital in anti-cultism, Stone, like Stalin, but on a miniature scale, is an architect of the cult of Self. But unlike Stalin, Stone has no achievements of unifying and building a Socialist nation to balance his superegotistical disunity-drive. Herblock found humor in Pravda reprinting Daily Worker, but in The Militant

reprinting I. F. Stone it was confirmed the two pills were of a kind.

In The Militant, I found the "dialectical" opposite of the Cult of Stalin, the American-brand Cult of Trotsky. It was manifest to me, as I read each issue week after week, to what extent these two cults of individuals, Trotskyism and Stalinism, had contaminated Soviet Socialism and the world Socialist movement. And now, from the disinterred blunders and crimes of Stalinism the American Trotskyites are monstrously trying to build the Cult of Trotsky into a world counter-revolution against Socialism in the name of the Workers!

Before this hideous blindness we American Marxists should pause the better to comprehend the insidious nature of political blindness, from which we now are striving to emerge along the path of independent, honest thinking.

—JEFFER SONIAN.

Leaders' Differences Must Be Aired

Editor, Daily Worker:

Authors of letters to this section of the paper are asking the leadership of the Communist Party why it doesn't bring its political differences out into the open. And they are right. Concealing disagreements, unless for some good and valid reason, profits the enemies of the party.

And, if I may generalize from some recent international experiences or draw upon experiences going back some thirty years, enemies of the party and the working class and people's movement are using and have used differences among leaders of our party (and with more than average success) to undermine the workers' movement and the party's usefulness as a really Marxist party. As an old Bulgarian proverb goes, "a hungry pig dreams of corn." But there doesn't seem to be any valid reason why disagreements among the leadership of our Party should be concealed from the membership.

The leaders of state and national committees ought to be frank enough and honest enough to state their disagreements and seek the aid of the membership in solving them. On the whole, the membership is sound and wholesome and it should not be treated like children. Marxist-Leninist principle of leadership requires that the inner forces of the party be drawn closer to the leadership and not, as is too often the case, passed by like Cicero passed Christ nor attempt to befuddle them.

The statement of the Discussion Committee in The Worker July 29, for instance, is not

honest with those who are raising questions about differences. It is in fact trying to steamroller the furor over the New York Post and New York Times exposes by saying that the Speak Your Piece letters are airing the disagreements. Nor are feature articles by columnists and special writers on ideological and other questions frequently appearing in our magazines and papers sufficient. For more than often they create almost hopeless confusion.

What is being requested, and is required, is that national and state committee members write about their differences and state them concisely. Differences do exist on very serious matters, such as, on the Middle East situation, the Negro question, questions on Poland, etc., etc. The confusion is transparent enough to be seen in compromises and patched up statements.

Or take the Foley Square trial. There are a host of differing views here. The Daily Worker itself muddled this trial. One can only draw the conclusion that this trial is looked upon as an unhappy occurrence in the midst of "bigger" questions, and the less said about it the better.

To raise the question of undisclosed differences also raises the harmful effects inherent in it. For instance, thirty years ago the Negro question was a factional football of differences on the trade union and other important political questions.

As one looks back, it is amazing how the Negro question, despite being kicked around, succeeded in making our party a really American Party and spreading its influence far and wide. Our party should profit from its experiences on this question.

It is the opinion of this writer that, after thirty—and the experiences of more recent years, there is sufficient political maturity among Negro Marxists and the Negro people themselves to make the Negro question the basis of indestructible unity of the Communist Party, providing it is handled properly and not permitted to become another factional football.

"Hungry pigs who dream of corn" are already having hard sledding.

JAMES W. FORD.

So How About Panama Canal?

Editor, Daily Worker:

The United States Government and President Eisenhower are demanding, together with the British and French governments, the internationalization of the Suez Canal.

It is not a bad idea provided that United States internationalize the Panama Canal where

the condition of the people is no better in any sense than what prevailed in the Suez Canal under British dominion for many years.

It will be also a good thing if Britain, with the support of the United States and France returned Gibraltar to the Spanish people . . . and everybody will be happy. —J. McC.

Liked Fast's Reply to Lyons

Editor, Daily Worker:

Howard Fast deserves high commendation for his forthrightly honest reply to the open letter addressed to him by Eugene Lyons who tried a sort of satanic temptation to Fast to commit the horrendous crime of dishonoring his incorruptible conscience and sincerely held political convictions.

Fast is too fine a human being to succumb to the base lures abundant in the prevailing infected atmosphere, lures that easily have attracted numerous fickle intellectuals to become propagandists of anti-social, anti-democratic poison and bunk as their way to receive cash and plaudits from enemies of social progress.—G. N.

Where Is The Women's Page?

Editor, Daily Worker:

In the July 30th National Guardian Cedric Belgrave comments from Moscow that one of the now open criticisms of the Russians to whom he has talked is "the domination of males in leadership." I don't know about the Communist Party in the U. S., but I do know about our paper. Sports Pages we get—no Women's Pages. There is no way of knowing proportionally how many of your readers are

women but obviously these women you do have are all involved in some capacity as wives, mother, home-makers, workers, club women, or consumers. We love our paper and we want some part in it.

Sincerely, —E. M.

Deeply Moved By Fast's Reply

Editor, Daily Worker:

I was deeply moved by Howard Fast's reply to Eugene Lyons' attack on socialism and American liberalism. I just had to sit down and have my say. We are living through an era of great world changes; yes, and serious errors too, especially those made in the Soviet Union.

But to ignore or belittle the advances made, and also the admission that never again shall injustices occur doesn't seem to touch Lyons.

Howard Fast's reply should be matched in sincerity and honesty by Lyons, if he can cleanse away the dirt accumulated throughout the years with consistent attacks against the Communists and other left thinkers.

Fast's reply to Lyons' description of a Communist is heartening. He says he is a most selfless and sincere human being working in interest of this generation and future ones. How true when he says the Communist's lot is not easy, but he goes on in his convinced path with vision and hope for a happy world.

Lyons should answer Fast's letter with a friendly reply and a sincere and honest consideration of his errors and his declarations, and also make public his statement that he too will not repeat these errors again. Will Lyons learning something from Fast's letter? Maybe, maybe, maybe. —ROSE.

Key Provisions of Social Security Law

WASHINGTON, Aug. 5.—Following are the chief provisions of the new social security law.

TAXES: Payroll taxes, on earnings up to \$4,200 annually, will be increased Jan. 1 for all workers, their employers and self-employed persons covered by social security.

Workers and their employers will contribute 2¼ percent each instead of the 2 percent. The increase will amount to \$5 a year for a worker earning \$2,000 annually, \$7.50 for a worker earning \$3,000 and \$10.50 for all workers earning \$4,200 or more.

For self-employed persons, the tax rate will be 3½ percent instead of the present 3 percent.

collecting their full benefit at 62 or taking permanently reduced benefit at 62, 63, or 64.

Wives are entitled—at 65—to a supplemental benefit equal to half their husband's benefit. If a wife collects at 62, her monthly benefit will be cut 25 percent, with lesser reductions if she retires at 63 or 64.

Working women, who have their own social security accounts, would get a 20 percent cut in monthly benefits if they retire at 62. As in the case of wives, the reduction would be less if they retire at 63