

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

The Motion by Eugene Dennis

Editor, Daily Worker:

In the Jan. 9 issue of the Daily Worker, in explaining his opposition to the National Committee Amendment on Name and Form, comrade Foster made reference to a substitute motion submitted by me. Since then there have been numerous requests that this motion be published.

The text of the motion which I submitted, and voted for together with three other N.C. members, as a substitute for the last two paragraphs of the N.C. Amendment is as follows:

"1. Regarding current proposals to change the name and form of our organization that our Party shall be maintained as the CPUSA and that the required changes in its structures and functioning, especially for effecting a vast expansion of inner-party democracy, shall be made substantially along the lines projected in the draft constitution.

"2. In this connection the N.C. believes that the adoption of a fundamental Party program, as proposed in the Draft Resolution, based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism as applied to American conditions and needs, and taking fully into account the profound changes that have taken place in the world—will provide the proper framework and foundations for a scientific resolution of the major controversial questions that the coming convention may decide to defer or otherwise may not be able to act upon."

Considering the controversy which still rages on the basic issues involved, I believe that the essence of the position set forth in the above motion is not only sound but also would help promote Party unity on the basis of principle.

EUGENE DENNIS

Urges "Bolder" Editorial Stand

PHILADELPHIA

Editor, Daily Worker:

I would like to see the Daily Worker prosper and increase its circulation because I love to read a newspaper which is not the mouthpiece of its rich adver-

tisers. In my opinion it would do the paper and its supporters a lot of good if it would take up an even bolder position on Hungary. I suggest that you urge the USSR to end its military occupation of Hungary now.

Of course the USSR should reserve the right to take whatever steps it, and it alone, mind you, considers necessary to guarantee its military security. The countries of the so-called and self-styled "free world" would do likewise were they in the USSR's place.

The Russians should declare before their troops pull out, that, if at any time in the future, whether it be a day or a decade, any Hungarian government begins to arm Hungary with a greater power than that government must have to maintain order within its own territory, then the USSR will automatically be in a state of war with Hungary. This should satisfy the Russian need for security.

R.B.

Relations Between Socialist Nations

Editor, Daily Worker:

I agree with Joe Clark. It would have been better had I quoted "two sentences rather than one." But, in my opinion, that one sentence to which Clark clings, does not basically alter the point. My article in the National Discussion Bulletin deals with our attitude to the Soviet Union. Joe has written many sentences, the general weight of which has contributed to a certain point of view which I consider harmful and which I took issue with. In saying this I do not want to detract from the many contributions Joe has made.

Let's take those two, or rather three, sentences. I quote from Joe's article:

"Another question Dennis 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?"

What is Joe doing here?

I. Instead of analyzing the concrete circumstances, the specific relationship of forces in Hungary as contrasted to Poland, he lumps the two together and reduces the issues to conclusions he has repeated in one form or another. I think Joe should give consideration to the added facts and analyses on Hungary since supplied, not

least of which are the statements of the Hungarian and Chinese parties.

2. He implies that the Soviet Union pursued a policy of military intervention in the internal affairs of a fellow socialist countries.

3. He implies the Soviet Union succeeded in implementing that policy with disastrous results in Hungary, because the Hungarian Communists, unlike the Polish, did not place reliance upon their workers and hence aided rather than thwarted the Soviet Union in its intervention. I do not think, therefore, the additional sentences basically alters my point that Clark implies that the S. U. is carrying out a policy of military interference in the affairs of socialist countries and that the necessary block to prevent the execution of such a policy is the firm resistance of the C.P. of that particular country.

What I omitted and what these omissions add is the stated reason as to why the Communists of Hungary invited Soviet intervention and why the Polish Communists energetically prevented it, as well as his implied explanation as to why the S.U. intervened. Joe attributed it to lack of confidence on the part of both the Hungarians and the S.U. in the Hungarian workers. One would gather that almost the entire international communist movement, which supported the Soviet action in Hungary as necessary to prevent counter-revolution and war, lacked Joe's confidence.

Joe places the discussion on false grounds when he says:

"Mike may differ with my belief that the key to defeating fascists and reactionaries is action by the workers of one's own country, whether in Poland, Hungary or the U.S."

That is not all my differences with Joe as he must certainly know in reading my article.

The main point in my article is that there is an attitude on the part of some, and Clark in my opinion reflects such thinking, that goes deeper than the question of the fraternal criticism. To hold to a concept that the Soviet Union pursues a policy of military interference contradicts the fundamental relations as equals that Marxists everywhere accept as the relationship governing all countries and most certainly socialist nations.

Joe, it seems to me, tends to confuse what the Chinese party in its recent statement warns against: the contradictions between our enemy and ourselves and the contradictions between socialist countries and Communist parties. As the Chinese state-

ment says, referring to the latter: "This type of contradiction is not basic, it is not the result of fundamental clash of interests between classes but conflicts between right and wrong opinions, of a partial contradiction of interests."

A policy of military interference goes beyond "right and wrong opinions." It is the settling of opinions by force. That describes not the contradictions between socialist countries but that governing the attitude of imperialism toward contradictions.

Finally, the eye-witness report of the London Daily Worker correspondent describes the tense situation in Poland at that time. I regret having hastily implied that the source of Joe Clark's information was the N. Y. Times or informed sources. However, the London DW description is

not an explanation. For that we all await a thorough analysis. But the description evidently seemed sufficient to Joe for his conclusions.

The fact is that the Soviet Union did not intervene in Poland, did recall Rokossovsky, did improve its relations with Poland despite the obvious differences. Joe attributes it to the "energetic" action of the Polish Communists that "prevented" the intervention. That it seems to me is the way not Socialist countries but imperialists are stopped.

Rather I would tend to view it as the Chinese Communists do, that with all the tension involved, the problems were resolved in a socialist manner because the fundamental relations between the socialist countries are on a vastly higher level than hitherto existed between nations.

MIKE D.

GRADUATES AGREE ON ONE NEED FOR FUTURE: PEACE

CHICAGO—Today's high school graduates are most concerned about the outlook for peace, according to what newsmen learned in quizzing Chicago young people who have just come through the midyear graduation exercises.

Here are samples of the answer to the question as to what these youths want to see accomplished in the next ten years:

James Burd, 17, Schurz High: "The cold war will still be with us, and the prospect of that frightens me. But there'd better not be actual war—the results would be fantastic."

Marlene Owens, 17, Hyde Park: "I'm planning on peace."

Perry Olsen, 17, Amundsen High: "I hope to see peace and more understanding."

Ronald Augustson, 17, Parker High: "I think we'll have ten more years of cold war. I hope there will be no war, because even if war did erase the Communist menace, it would be too destructive to better the world."

Cody Moore, 20, Crane High: "I think there'll be trouble in the world throughout the next ten years. Whenever there is war anywhere, I'll worry about it."

Judy Matthews, 17, South Shore High: "I'd like a family . . . and I'd like to be as good a parent as my own parents are. I hope very much that there will be complete peace by then, through the United Nations."

AUTO-TOWN ALLEY

DETROIT.

NEW feature in Ford Facts, union paper of UAW local 600. They have a column that answers questions about the signs you are born underneath. In another part of the column run by Andy Yesta you get advice on how to keep from losing your hair.

We didn't find any advice on what to do for those workers losing jobs through automation, speedup or those going into the labor pool where they are offered jobs at cheaper rates. The Dearborn Stamping Plant workers have the right to ask, is their building president Yesta running a union or a health and astrology column.

THE average auto worker will have to work the first 3½ weeks this month for nothing. That's what it will cost him or her in taxes for 1957.

THE CIO should watch for an ivory tower "hearing" by the Department of Agriculture in Detroit's Federal Building soon on minimum wages for sugar beet workers who come here under contract from Puerto Rico, Mexico, and from the South. Last year the minimum was around 70 some cents an hour, with many of the workers living in the usual pig sties, barns, tents—existing on rice.

Daily Worker

Published daily except Saturday and Sunday by the Publishers New Press, Inc., 35 E. 12th St., New York 3, N. Y. Telephone ALgonquin 4-7954.

Reentered as second class matter Oct. 22, 1947, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

3 mos. 6 mos. 1 year
Daily Worker only \$4.00 \$7.00 \$12.00

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

(Except Foreign)

Daily Worker & Worker 4.75 8.00 13.00
The Worker 2.00 3.50