

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

On Criticism Of Soviet Union

Editor, Daily Worker:

I am impelled to write this, and offer my humble opinion in answer to James Allen's letter published in the DW Dec. 2. I do so, because I think this question is fundamental to our existence and important to our understanding of the tremendous events now taking place.

Allen in his letter alleges that Max Gordon uses "the method of deductive reasoning from false abstract premises."

Deductive reasoning to me is a method of reasoning from the general to particular. In evaluating the Hungarian events, Gordon stated that it is nonsense to think that subversion compelled a mass outburst without material factors. To his way of thinking, the material factors are primary.

Is this the abstract and false premise?

Further on, Allen declares that the ideological enemies of socialism single out for attack the weaknesses and mistakes of socialist countries. And it is particularly true of right socialists.

True enough, but this is not the whole story. Let Allen consult the N.Y. Times and The New Leader. When ideological enemies attack weaknesses under socialism, they explain these weaknesses not as departures from socialism, but as inherent in socialism,—a system which is evil, they say, and should be abolished.

Allen states that he considers defense of socialism indispensable to Marxism. But who proposes to abandon the defense of socialism?

Later on, he goes on to say

that he doesn't consider the SU to have reached at any time the state of Utopia, where it might be immune from criticism. If he thinks so, why does he complain, when it is criticized? Is it not a bit contradictory?

The question is: What kind of defense of socialism and other Marxist Parties should be pursued by the American Progressives? Shall it be at all times unconditional, unnecessary, blind defense? Or shall it be a defense, pointing out glorious achievements of socialist lands and the DW should do more of this, but at the same time offering criticism of actions, that we here, as a result of our independent analysis, think are wrong.

One can cite many instances of unquestioning acceptance in the past. When in 1948 an an-

nouncement reached as that the Cominform had expelled Yugoslavia the national committee of CPUSA three hours later approve and defended the expulsion. This is the kind of blind apologetics that never again should be repeated.

Our point of departure should be the welfare of the toiling people of this country, as well as the welfare of the common people throughout the world.

We cannot assume to be omniscient, ready to give explanations for everything, nor should we feel responsible for every move made by the countries of socialism: The American left faces the problem of gaining acceptance in the people's movements not in terms of winning popularity contests by giving up its principles. We should strive by a correct policy to convince

the working people, in terms of their needs, that we are true defenders of their interests, and in doing this we should try to deepen the understanding of their class interests. The adherents of socialism will grow in numbers, when they see that its advocates not only proclaim the wonderful accomplishments in the socialist lands, but do not hesitate to speak out against injustices or wrong actions that may be pursued by these countries.—F.R.

Automobile Accidents

Editor, Daily Worker:

Why do you write editorials on the cause and cure of auto accidents? It is apparent that you know no more about this subject than any Tom, Dick or Harry. Let's not be omniscient.

—S.S.S.