

TODAY ABROAD

by Joseph Clark

About a Recent Letter and Article

IN A LETTER to the Daily Worker (Nov. 12) and in an article on Hungary (Nov. 29-30) Eugene Dennis is sharply critical of the position taken by the National Committee of the Communist Party in its Open Letter and and of the Daily Worker. He also takes exception to a column I wrote (Nov. 7) about the struggle against fascism in four countries—Hungary, West Germany, Finland and Japan.

Here I'm dealing with the least important of his differences, those he expresses with my column. Re-reading both what Dennis wrote and my column, the issue, as I see it, is between confidence that the working people can bar the way to fascism within each country and Dennis' view that the Red Army had to be called in to prevent fascism and war, at least in Hungary.

It was difficult for me to recognize any part of my column in either the letter or article Dennis wrote, since he did not choose to quote any of it. And where he did put quotes around something I was supposed to have written, I could not find it in my column. At any rate, Dennis writes:

"And when American big business is the main enemy of peace, national liberation, democracy and progress everywhere—how can the Daily's foreign editor hail the 'democratic advance' in Bonn Germany, Japan and Finland? Did not his typewriter write off the danger of the military revanchists and the neo-fascist movement in Adenauer's section of Germany—at the same time it wrote off the danger of a fascist putsch in Hungary?"

MY COLUMN wrote off none of the dangers Dennis mentions. What I argued was that the working people of Hungary are just as capable as those of West Germany, Japan and Finland in preventing fascism from coming to power. My column stressed the role of "U. S. occupation forces in West Germany in sponsoring the rebirth of reaction." The only thing I "hailed" was the successful struggle of the West German workers against Adenauer and the "military revanchists." My column noted that the Social Democrats (with the support of the Communists) have become the leading party of West Germany and they have fought the military draft as well as the move to incorporate a new Wehrmacht in NATO.

Similarly about Japan, I stressed the intervention of U. S. occupation forces on the side of reaction, whereas the Japanese people, led by the Socialists and Communists, prevented a return to fascism. And the same success was registered in Finland. Each of these instances of successful struggle against fascism has been hailed and recorded on innumerable occasions by Pravda and other Communist newspapers the world over.

In view of these experiences I asked: "Why then was it considered inevitable that the Hungarian working class—after 11 years of a socialist regime—would not be able to bar the way to fascism?"

I wish Dennis had addressed himself to that question.

DENNIS accuses my typewriter of writing off the danger of fascist attempts in Hungary.

But the sole specific "fact" about such fascist danger which Dennis cites came from my typewriter. Dennis names forces of Horthyites and "60,000 diverse other fascist agents and bands which infiltrated Hungary via the Austrian border."

Now, the story of the 60,000 appeared in the DW via my typewriter and it was picked up from the London Daily Worker. The dispatch in question did not come from Hungary because at that time the Budapest correspondent of the London Daily Daily couldn't get his on-the-spot reports into his paper. It was based on dispatches from Prague, which mentioned 60,000 as the total number of persons who crossed the Austrian-Hungarian border over a period of months. These included all tourists, delegations, and persons whose politics ranged from Communist to Fascist.

To cite this as evidence that the 800,000 members of the Hungarian Communist Party and the millions of organized Hungarian workers and the Hungarian army of 250,000 could not prevent fascism is to deny facts and the class struggle.

My Nov. 7 column emphasized the fascist threats in Hungary, declaring: "What started as a popular upheaval against Stalinist repressions in Hungary was transformed by the end of last week into a situation bordering on anarchy. Rightist extremists were trying to turn the clock back to Horthyism."

Then it cited the evidence of Horthyites crossing the border, of anti-Jewish outbreaks and of book-burning "as in Hitler Germany."

But the column concluded: "It is nevertheless a misreading of postwar history, in my opinion."
(Continued on Page 7)

Joe Clark

(Continued from Page 5)

ion, to say that only the Soviet army could have successfully barred the way to fascism in Hungary. That was true in World War II, and its immediate aftermath. It was not true after the defeat of the fascist axis and people's democratic victories throughout the world.

INSTEAD of accusing me of offering Adenauer Germany and Hatoyama Japan as examples of "democratic advances" Dennis should, it seems to me, discuss what I actually wrote, that the struggle of the working people in those countries, and others, successfully barred the path to fascism. If the reverse happened in Hungary it was because of the mistakes made by the Stalinists of the Soviet Union and in Hungary, so candidly conceded in the Oct. 30 statement of the Soviet government.

ANOTHER question Dennis has left unanswered is why the Polish workers were so successful in defeating reaction and fascism as contrasted with Hungary. Was it not that the Polish Communists placed reliance on their own workers? And that they moved energetically, and in time, to prevent the intervention of Soviet troops commanded by Marshal Rokossovsky? Was it not this type of reliance on their working class which successfully routed the reactionaries and enabled the Polish Communists to win Poland for friendship with the Soviet Union on the basis of a free and equal relationship?

Where does the Soviet Union have greater security—on its borders with Poland or with Hungary? Just as the menace of reaction was defeated by reliance on the workers of their own country just so was greater security for the Soviet Union created where intervention by Soviet troops was prevented.

In his letter Dennis says I have reached "a new low" in my Nov. 7 column. Neither in his letter nor his article does he indicate what the previous lows were. Can this method of debating serve to clarify the issues?

Where Dennis refers to previous "lows" does he have in mind these instances where he disagreed with my views and with the D. W.?

There was for example my column about a phrase from an article by Dennis on the snuffing out of Jewish culture in the Soviet Union which Pravda had deleted when republishing Dennis. It seemed to me highly improper for Pravda to suppress this small but significant portion of the Dennis article. But Dennis did not protest the deletion. Did he consider it a "low" on my part for doing so?

Prior to that there was the DW editorial on the Rakosi regime in Hungary and the Rajk frame-up. Dennis objected to the DW's criticism, even though subsequently the Soviet and Hungarian Communists, and the American Communists, condemned the Rakosi regime and its crimes far more sharply than we did.

Dennis evidently does not object to the DW criticizing anything said or done by Soviet Communists, but only after the Soviet Communists have themselves made such criticism. This, it seems to me, is contrary to the type of relationship that should exist between workers' parties as even the Draft Resolution of the C. P. declares.

For example, there was the wrong policy of Soviet Communists in relation to the People's Democracies, so roundly criti-

WITH THE OLYMPICS

Zatopek, Through, Gets Takers on Advice Offer

MELBOURNE, Dec. 3. — Emil Zatopek, a triple-crown Olympic champion in 1952 but just an also-ran in 1956, said today he is quitting track competition because he is "just too old" at 34 to be a champ any longer.

"With people around like Vladimir Kuts of Russia, who can run one minute faster than I at 10,000 meters, it would be silly for me to kid myself," said the balding Czech ace who earned the nickname "running machine" with his 1952 exploits.

Zatopek didn't bother to defend his 5,000 meter and 10,000 meter titles, both of which went to Kuts in record time, and finished sixth in defense of his marathon championship.

Grinning and absolutely refusing to alibi his last defeat, the man who once held almost all major distance records said he realized he was licked about halfway home in the 26-mile, 385-yard grind on Saturday. He had started out confident he could "make it a good race," but he suddenly realized about all that was left for him was to go out like a champion.

"That was when I decided it was no use breaking me neck with any more speed and risk collapse," he explained. "I was determined to get back into the stadium. This was my last race, and the last thing I wanted to happen was to collapse."

Zatopek made it back to the

Stadium. He waved his white cap gaily and the crowd of 110,000 which gave him an ovation. He even scored one point in the unofficial team race with a sixth place—a far cry from his one-man haul of 30 points just four years ago—and then he wobbled onto the infield grass.

It was a warm day, but Zatopek refused to use that as an alibi, saying:

"There are probably 20 runners better than I in the world today. If it hadn't been so hot, I would probably have finished 15th or 16th."

He had a hernia operation early this year but said that had nothing to do with it.

Was he sorry he decided to let his 5,000 and 10,000 meter crowns go by default to compete only in the marathon?

"If I came in sixth in the marathon, I probably would have been ninth or 10th in the 10,000 meters," he said. "I ran just too old and too lazy and too slow in training."

Zatopek said while he will run no more, he will always be glad to help long distance runners—no matter what country they belong to.

He had two quick "clients"—5,000 meter runner Al Thomas of Australia and marathon runner Nick Costes of Boston, who wanted his ideas on training. There figured to be many more.

cized by the Soviet leaders on Oct. 30. But the errors they described go back for more than a decade. Would it not have been correct to criticize these wrong attitudes on say, Oct. 29? Are some of the previous "lows" to which Dennis refers instances where criticism was made before the Soviet Communists did the same?

ANOTHER example comes to mind. Dennis differed strongly with my view that Yugoslavia was building socialism, that it had not entered the camp of imperialism, and that the Soviet leaders had shown by their trip to Belgrade that they recognized it was they who had been guilty of the nationalist-chauvinist errors. Later when the Soviet Communists themselves admitted this, Dennis was ready to go along. But he was very critical of the Daily Worker for drawing those conclusions earlier and for suggesting that Marxists would have to begin a big review of policy because of what was revealed by the Soviet-Yugoslav reconciliation.

There was also the DW editorial on the Poznan events. Dennis opposed the DW's view that the main responsibility lay in the poor conditions of the Polish workers which Project X agents could try to utilize. Subsequently the Polish Communists said that the most dangerous obstacle to their fight for the socialist regime was the attempt to label the Poznan events as a provocation of Project X. Gomulka and the other Polish Communist leaders placed themselves at the head of the Polish workers' struggle for democratization and thus saved socialism in their country in marked contrast to what happened in Hungary.

In summary, it seems to me, our eyes must remain fixed on that principle of class struggle, which Marx and Engels explained so well in the Communist

Manifesto, and which prompted Lenin, a long time ago, and in reference to Poland, to say that Red Army bayonets could not become a substitute for that class struggle.

By its peace policy the Soviet Union has given enormous assistance to working people everywhere, fighting for peace, democracy and socialism. But it seems to me that Dennis is in error when he assigns to the Soviet armed forces in Hungary, the role which Marx considered fell to the working class.

Says Dorsey Had Enough Pills To Pass Out

HARTFORD, Conn., Dec. 3.—A toxicologist reported today that band leader Tommy Dorsey took enough sleeping pills to "knock him unconscious" before he choked to death on food particles a week ago.

Dr. Abraham Stolman, chief toxicologist of the State Health Department, declined to say whether the band leader had swallowed a sufficient quantity of nembutal to kill him. "That's for the coroner to decide," he said.

Dorsey and his wife had been scheduled to appear in Bridgeport superior court last week on a hearing of a divorce complaint she filed, charging intolerable cruelty.

What's On?

Tonight Manhattan

TUESDAY, DEC. 4TH—Jefferson Round Table: Do U.S. Marxists Need a Communist "Party"? Immediate and long range questions of organizational form. Panelists: Esther Cantor, Fred Fine Lillian Gates. Jefferson School, 575 Sixth Ave., 8:15 p.m. Adm. \$1.

Classified Ads

FOR SALE

ADMIRAL PORTABLE TV—Rated "Best Buy." SPEC. \$84.95.—Ideal second or even first set. Standard Brand Dist. 143 Fourth Ave. (13th & 14th Sts.) GR 3-7819. One hour free parking.