

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Agrees With Readers Who Criticize Clark

Editor, Daily Worker:

I have been reading "Speak Your Piece" pieces and finally Herbert Aptheker the other day and Sam Kushner on Friday 11/16 told Joe Clark what was on my mind all the time. Joe Clark in one of his "Masterpieces" compared the Hungary situation with Finland, etc., etc. It seems that Joe Clark did not know about Horthy in Hungary. Does Joe Clark know that the Russian people shed their blood and plenty of it to clear Hungary of the fascists at the end of World War II.

I assure you that I am in full agreement with many, about Stalin's "doings" in the last years of his life. I say in the last years, because Stalin and the workers, not the Joe Clark's established Socialism in Russia. However, to save a country from turning to fascism, if there is no alternative (and there was not) the rebels had to be crushed.

I regret that our comrades are too slow in supporting our (and this the only one) paper. I am enclosing \$50.—S.H.

Support and Criticism

Editor, Daily Worker:

It is with deep concern for the fate of our paper and appreciation for the role the DW has played for the last 25 years that we are sending you this letter.

We cannot help but to reemphasize the need for this workingclass newspaper in America today and the fact that the trial the DW has blazed over the last 25 years is indeed a glorious one. Those amongst us who talk of dropping the paper, consciously, under the guise of the so-called "freedom of speech" or "freedom to criticize constructively" just "found" by some of our people are doing a disservice to the workingclass and our nation. THE DW IS STILL TODAY THE MOST CLEAR VOICE FOR THE BEST INTEREST OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. It is in this sense that we are sending you 25 dollars and expect to send more soon.

But if we only said that we wouldn't be saying the whole story. Now that we are writing you we also want to take some time out to express our dissatisfaction at some of your recent writing. Not wanting to beat a dead horse, we feel however that your Hungary editorial did strike a sad note. We are very concerned at the harsh way that some of our people are arriving at conclusions nowadays. How could you have arrived at the conclusion that the Soviet Union was wrong, equate their role to that of England and France at a time when there wasn't enough facts? To make a serious evaluation, are we now to follow the lead of the N. Y. Times? We feel such a serious mistake can be further avoided if we should only be modest enough and disciplined enough to wait for more facts. After all printing a workingclass newspaper is a very important responsibility. It couldn't be said that you were short of news for the day, for if you look back at that same day, your editorial and the party statement took half of the paper. A real invasion and intervention was taking place in Egypt. While three quarters of the world demonstrated (one way or another) against the imperialist invasion of Egypt we were busy characterizing the Soviet Union as the invader. A pretty serious mistake for a Marxist paper to make, don't you think so?

We think that it is this serious departure of what the DW always stood for, that is adding to confusion and disgust among progressive circles, and finding

itself in the lack of support of our paper. But we don't agree with those who are holding back support because they disagree with certain positions of the paper. In this case it isn't the question of what position the paper advocated but the question of confidence that the party and the supporters of the paper will always see wrong for what it is, even though we make mistakes like everybody else.

—From a Group of Waterfront Workers.

P.S. We like to bring to your attention the fact that what these struggles in Egypt and Hungary bring to the fore is a question that many of us are beginning to forget namely, that American, British and French imperialism haven't given up their objective of a world war to maintain their system of exploitation. It is only the utmost consciousness on part of mankind to their provocations, that can maintain world peace.

Stand Up and Be Counted

DETROIT

Editor, Daily Worker:

Lester Rodney's article on Hungary very well expressed my opinions on the subject. I hereby nominate him for the National Committee of the C. P.—U. S. A. (not only because of that article but also because of the splendid way he has conducted the sports section these many years).

I particularly liked the way he reaffirmed his belief in such things as ethics, morality, right and humanity which are strongly related to class politics, but while related, nevertheless exist in themselves and in history as powerful goals for all progressive humanity.

I also thought his point well taken that it is not enough to smoothly agree that mistakes were made by the Soviet Union and Hungary in the past and then proceed to forget about those mistakes, their meaning, correction and effects in one's analysis of the present.

When, on the one hand, our main tactics is unity with as many people as possible for peace, prosperity and liberty and, on the other hand, something like Hungary occurs which causes our most progressive and best friends to point at us and ask us to stand up and be counted on the side of liberty—we had better do some mighty tall thinking before thumbing our noses at our critics.

We had better stand up and be counted, resting on our own two feet. Otherwise we will be incapable of solving the many problems involved in our own U. S. path to socialism.

—MICHIGANDER

Critical of N.C. Statement

BOSTON

Editor, Daily Worker:

The National Committee Open Letter on Hungary started off bravely enough and then foundered. I don't know why, with the evidence before its nose, it was unable to see that the Red Army had no business interfering in Hungary on the twenty third of October, Fourth of November or on any other date. Some good meaning friends use the word deplorable, tragic and what not. But then they shrug their shoulders. They are perfectly willing to accept a Hungary that will build no socialism or anything else, but will remain a dead weight and a running sore in the socialist world.

But somehow the people who have no solution now are very ready to link the whole Hungarian people with Horthy fascists, and set them against the Communist Party which "had made some errors" but was willing to

make restitution.

They forget that Hungarian Communists were in the streets fighting the tanks. That Communists took a leading part in the preparations for the general strike that predated the street demonstrations. That Communists fought the foreign invasion. Communists helped form the Revolutionary councils of workers and youth that were given legal status by the Kadar government. Communists were part of that "mob" upon which Erno Gero sent the tanks.

Sure the fascists, and their buddies came pouring in. They were bound to do that, and the way this was answered showed the utter contempt that the Soviet leaders felt not only for all things Hungarian but for the Soviet people and the Soviet Communist Party as well. Instead of handing the Hungarian workers arms to help them police their land together with Hungarian Army, it so lacked confidence in the workers that all Hungary was treated to a blood bath. Instead of getting out, the Red Army, rushed in reinforcements and treated Hungary as an enemy in war.

What they failed to do then they can do any day of the week now. Help arm the masses of trade union members, and then get out of Budapest and out of Hungary. The Revolutionary Councils would meet in Budapest and set up a new regime. I doubt that Kadar will be the new premier, he is too compromised, but neither will Hungary be a fascist state. Hungary would then go on to new democratic achievements.

—BOSTON WORKINGMAN

Says N.C. Statement Evades Issues

PITTSBURGH, Pa.

Editor, Daily Worker:

I read with great care the NC statement on Hungary. It is neither fish nor fowl nor good red herring; it has no guts. In an effort obviously to please everyone it comes out about as flat as it could be. On this question I think Tito's speech is almost correct, this despite the fact that he internally in Yugoslavia is about as bad an example of bureaucracy and old-line operation as there is. On this question though he is about right, harrising his bragging and egotism.

Why didn't the NC spell things out clearly and let the chips fall where they may. If there are those who are still arguing that Hungary should have been permitted to go its own way, they should fall out on this issue. They are wrong in that they don't begin to grasp the class struggle. They are falling for a liberal, humanitarian position. But to get back to the kind of outline the NC should have used:

They should have spelled out the Rakosi errors without going into detail. These caused the tenseness and demonstrations in the first place. Instead of mobilizing the people and giving leadership to their demands at this point Rakosi was pulled out, Gero went into office and he made the terrible error of calling for the use of Soviet troops. At this point it becomes clear that the understanding of the Soviet leadership is limited; they should have read Lenin on this issue. The demonstrations, then became outright rebellion assisted and pushed forward by every Horthy, Gehlen, CIA, Church element in and around Hungary. It was correct to withdraw Soviet troops at that point in the hope that the progressives could handle the situation. But it got progressively worse and Nagy was a weakling if not worse.

Was it then correct, as obviously even some NC members

are contending, that the Hungarian plus the fascists should have been allowed to go their own sweet way? What of the gains of ten years of progressive leadership even if only in a narrow sense? What about the creation of a new place d'arms for the Nazis? What about the class struggle itself? Was it to the benefit of the Hungarian workers to have a fascist regime imposed on them again? Was it to the benefit of peace?

The Soviets, on the breakdown of Nagy's authority and the indiscriminate murder of all Left-wingers, were faced with an evil choice: (1) they could let it go and be confronted with the threat of war later and the suppression of the Hungarian working class or (2) they could intervene militarily and be confronted with enmity because they had incorrectly supported the first call by hardshell bureaucrats for the use of troops—they made the correct decisions as history will prove and as any one who understands the class struggle and historical materialism will agree. Not that they are not responsible for the opening up of the entire Pandora's box. Their sensitivity to Tito's statement shows that they are aware of this. And they must learn to make the adjustments internally and externally that this Hungarian fiasco has indicated are needed. They must democratize all fronts.

ALLAN

Warns of Redbaiting

Editor, Daily Worker:

"An Old Party Member" writes that he no longer buys the Daily regularly, because he doesn't agree with you on Hungary and other matters. I share his view that it was necessary and right for the Soviet Union to intervene in Hungary, but I should like to ask him in which daily newspaper in this country would he be able to find one tenth of the support which his position finds in the Daily. His letter, numerous others, views of Dennis and Allen and Foster, have all found expression in our new Daily. This is a departure from the days when the only dissenting opinion which appeared in the paper was ridiculed and distorted into unreality.

This is a fine change; it improves the paper and makes it much more interesting. This was equally true during the recent election campaign, when views which differed substantially with those of the Editor, and the Communist Party, received unbiased coverage and treatment. . . . Nevertheless, I would wish that the editor shared my views, while fairly reporting those of the opposition.

With respect to the elections, my view differed with editor's mine being that the Democratic Party, and Robert Wagner locally, were unworthy of progressive support—as were the Republicans—and that the Democrats' superiority with regard to domestic policy was overwhelmingly negated by their horrible war budget program.

Regarding the debate about Soviet intervention in Hungary, I regret those articles which suggest that those who support the Soviet Union today do so because they "are unable to break clean from Soviet leaders." That, for example, is how Sid Resnick put it in yesterday's issue. . . . This is redbaiting. Dennis, Foster, Gates, et al, fully agree about the necessity of being independent in our views. Must we oppose a summit meeting, therefore, since the Soviet favor it? Must we favor H-bomb testing, because the Soviets oppose? Since Resnick, I'm quite sure, favors a summit meeting and an H-bomb testing ban, why hasn't he broken clean? Or, does break-

ing clean mean differing with Soviet ideas when Nehru, or U Nu, or Resnick differ?

—AARON KATZ

Disagrees With Allen On Project X Importance

Editor, Daily Worker:

I dutifully read James Allen's article on the DW position on Hungary and can only say that Allen is wrong and that you were right.

The main fact to remember is that the ruckus in Hungary began as a protest against the poverty and lack of freedom probably not very much different than the Hungarians had under Horthy. It was only afterwards that the Project X boys stepped in and tried to turn it into counter-revolution, and not the other way around as Allen suggests. That is the central corner stone upon which to base an appraisal of the events in Hungary. The Soviet Union, instead of investigating the truth of Rakosi's or Gero's frantic appeals that an uprising was taking place, sent in troops and from then on what happened was inevitable.

Therefore, the blame must be laid first and foremost on the Hungarian Communists who for ten years were unable to give the people a life even just a trifle better than they had previously, despite the fact that they were in power and were operating under the most favorable conditions. They were unable to win the confidence of the people, so that at the first sign of protest, Rakosi in panic ran to the army of the Soviet Union for help. Instead of facing up to the demands of the people (who after all are not cattle) and realizing that he was all wrong, he fled to the SU.

Secondly, the blame must be laid at the doorstep of the SU. For ten years and more it has believed the propaganda of the West about fomenting counter-revolution and starting a new world war without, at the same time, believing some of its own propaganda which it was shouting from the roof tops: that Socialist countries have a mass base among the people; that it is deeply rooted in the working masses. And, that this is stronger than all the dagger-and-cloak plots of the Project X boys. And because it didn't believe its own words, the SU proved the Project X boys right. At the first sign of protest in Hungary, instead of waiting a day or two, to find out, if, perhaps, Rakosi wasn't just a panicked bureaucrat, it, the SU, rushed in the troops, realized it made a mistake, and then withdrew them. Of course by then it was too late.

The point is, that you cannot say that the Project X boys STARTED a counter-revolution. No one can start anything unless there are a large number of discontented people. And since the Communists were in absolute power and not the Project X boys, the Communists were primarily responsible and the SU secondly for falling for the ineptitude of the Hungarian Communists. It was the prime duty of the Hungarian Communists to see to it that life was a little better than under Horthy. In failing to do this, they laid the basis for what happened.

I want to compliment editor Gates for correctly appraising the Hungarian situation and having the courage and fortitude to come out against the Hungarian Communists and the Soviet Union.—D.L.

Calls Rodney Article A 'Home Run'

Editor, Daily Worker:

Lester Rodney hit a base-loaded home run. I nominate him for the new National Committee.

—AMERICAN COMMUNIST