

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

World Peace Was at Stake

CHICAGO.

Editor, Daily Worker:

The geographic position of Hungary was such that the Soviet Union could not allow Hungary to become a base for imperialist intrigue and war activity by falling into the hands of Mindszenty and other counter-revolutionary forces. Errors were made by the Soviet and Hungarian Parties, but this is no reason to blink at pogroms, murder of Hungarian Communists, or the appeals of the only recognized government.

But it was not only a matter of allowing Hungary to become a capitalist state again. The Soviets, would not have, we believe, intervened if this had threatened Hungary alone—but what was at stake was the security of the USSR itself. Imperialism and world counter-revolutionary forces are as determined as ever to destroy the Soviet Union and world socialism.

The Hungarian workers, like the Polish workers, are solving their problems in their own way. The Soviet Union is helping this to happen. The military action in Hungary served to allow the workers to solve their problems without confusing honest grievances with counter-revolutionary activity.

Where was the Daily Worker's analysis of class forces at play in this struggle? There wasn't any. The DW ignored the reality of the interdependence of the working classes in Hungary, the Soviet Union, and the United States. The DW's stand has caused a weakening of working class support for the working class movement of other countries. Anti-Soviet feelings have been engendered without a real consideration of the Soviet Union's role in world socialist advancement.

We oppose this general trend as expressed by the editorials of the Daily Worker on the Hungarian situation and similar international issues. We continue, however, to support the working class press and include our money with our views.

—A Chicago Shop Club Member

Support Paper, But Differ on Hungary

Editor, Daily Worker:

It is not easy for me, a garment workers section organizer to write this letter. I am writing it in the name of a number of clubs in my section who have been the staunchest supporters of the paper since its very first issue and to this day still sell daily and weekly bundles in the shops and buildings, do not agree with the editorial policy of the DW on Hungary, with many headlines given to articles, and the articles themselves, such as Joseph Clark's of Nov. 7.

Why were you so hasty with your statements? Events at that same weekend proved how wrong you were with regard to Soviet troops in Hungary. We are very partial to what kind of system should prevail in Hungary. The fact that "just" grievances were turned into counter-revolution by the Horthy stooges in conjunction with Project X, which you hardly mention, proves again that the Soviet troops upon the request of the Hungarian Party and government, helped save the country from fascism. By being hasty in drawing conclusions, you helped to create confusion among many of our members and sympathizers.

It is indeed a sad state of affairs when the DW has to appeal to us for help "despite differences of opinion." We always were and will continue to be the staunchest supporters of our

workingclass paper even though at present you do not express the opinion of the majority of our members and readers.

Enclosed you will find \$65 with more to come.

—Shirley G.

Revitalized Movement

Editor, Daily Worker:

After seeing the large number of letters attacking the DW's position on Hungary, and Poland I feel compelled to write to you although I am in the midst of studying for midterms. Personally, I am in full accord with your policy on these events, and certainly are the overwhelming majority of the young progressives that I know. Despite our disheartenment with the recent events, the one brightest sign of encouragement has been the eloquent and positive thinking of the Left's major newspaper, the DW.

I think that the DW's position reflects the feelings of a vast majority of young and old progressives alike. Unity can only stem from clear and objective thinking, not old slogans and emotionalism.

If there is to be a forward road for the left, it will certainly be that of the Daily Worker. To John Gates, Alan Max, Joseph Clark, my warmest thanks for paving the way for a new, revitalized movement that can once again find support from many segments of American opinion.

—YOUNG PROGRESSIVE.

On Stalin's Pedestal

BOSTON

Editor, Daily Worker:

Once there was a DW, a good paper. Being run by human beings, nobody expected it to be infallible except, evidently, the present editorial staff. When Stalin's crimes behind the scenes were revealed, DW writers went berserk because they hadn't been mind-readers and clairvoyants all along.

Their wonderful thinking was so productive it soon brought a replacement for the empty Stalin pedestal. And who should it be but the boastful, strutting, flamboyant, egotistical dictator of Yugoslavia, Mr. Tito himself, the worst bureaucrat of them all. This man with his expensive uniforms (whom is he at war with now?), palaces, pet lions, and loud mouth became the new symbol of communism for the DW.

Granted, it was a mistake for Stalin to have broken relations with Yugoslavia. That is not the point. And any Marxist will grant that Yugoslavia, like all other countries, including the U. S., is taking its own path to socialism. The point is that some of these paths, including our own, are roundabout, to say the least.

As a matter of curiosity, I should like to break off and ask what exists in Yugoslavia today except Tito and his uniform factories? As a DW reader, I really don't know. Things can't be exactly a socialist utopia there with such a large element of western dollars involved. It ill behooves Tito to try to dictate the true path of socialism for the rest of the world.

With this new guy on their pedestal, the DW thinkers dreamed up the lowest example of reasoning ever produced in the name of Marxism on Nov. 5. The DW produced the idea that it is wrong to put down a fascist putsch and that Hungary's traitors and fascists should have a right to self-determination with armed might at the expense of world peace. Even with Budenz on the paper, the DW did not sanction corresponding fascist seizures of the past, Norway, Belgium, Holland, for instance. Along with Tito, the DW has

adopted the stubborn arrogance of this man. For all the times the Nov. 5 error has been pointed out, the DW still stands by it. Like Tito, who thinks everything he chooses to say should be carved in granite in Moscow, the DW challenges Pravda to reprint its Nov. 5 editorial! I certainly hope Pravda doesn't discredit our movement further with any such reprint. UNITY

"Best Friends of Soviet Union"

SAN FRANCISCO

Editor, Daily Worker:

Alan Max makes a smashing and irrefutable argument—a pivotal argument, I believe—in his piece on "Hungary, Oct. 24." He says that the Soviet Army intervened on the wrong side on that day; instead of coming behind the security police of the Rakosi - Gero bureaucracy, it should have intervened (if it had to intervene at all, which Max correctly challenges) on the side of the masses who were demonstrating for democratic reforms.

Alan Max brings out a profound and terrible truth when he says that the Soviet military repression of Oct. 24 was "only a tragic climax of an eight year policy of error which the 20th Congress began to but never managed to correct in Hungary."

To my mind, as a member of the CP and friend of the Soviet Union for over 30 years, the Oct. 24 intervention shows that Soviet correction of its Stalinist deviation, although proceeding (Yugoslav reconciliation, 20th Congress, Poland, etc.) is proceeding belatedly and contradictorily.

The best way to set back the eager-beaver cold warriors, to throw the fascist and imperialist forces off balance, is for the Soviet Union to unfold with maximum speed and depth, a policy of letting the Hungarian, Romanian, Bulgarian, Czechoslovak people follow, along with Poland, into a new fraternal and equal relationship.

People like Alan Max, Joe Clark, Max Gordon, are the best friends of the Soviet Union and proletarian internationalism when they lay the truth on the line, no matter how it hurts us right now, and call for "full speed ahead" and damn the reactionaries in our country who try to take advantage of our hard-hitting discussion.

—A Young Old-Timer

Language Of Polemics

Editor, Daily Worker:

The Bible tells us that seeing the beam in one's own eye is an optical feat that few manage successfully. In the controversy among left-wingers touched off by the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and greatly sharpened by the Hungarian events, the question of "tone" has become an important factor. A number of readers and Daily Worker writers have deplored the use of invective and personal characterizations in the current debate. There is no doubt that such methods don't help clarify the issues and make it more difficult to persuade the unpersuaded. What's worse: they have a disruptive effect on the Communist movement.

In his column, "On Fraternal Discussion," in the Dec. 5 issue Alan Max quotes approvingly from the recent open letter to Communist Party members by its National Committee. The quoted passage urges Party members to "discuss in a comradely fashion differing viewpoints."

Max then criticizes Eugene Dennis' letter (Nov. 12) and article (Nov. 29) on the Daily Worker and Hungary because of statements which seem "to impugn the socialist integrity of

Daily Worker editors and writers."

I happen to agree with Alan Max's general position and to disagree with Gene Dennis' on the Hungarian events. But it seems to me that on Dennis' article (as distinguished from his letter) Max strains hard to make a criticism which isn't justified. The passages Max quotes are mostly generalizations which are true, such as the statement that American Communists "never made the mistake of looking at" the Soviet Union "through the eyes of the American imperialists." According to Max, all these passages are directed at the Daily Worker editors in a context which adds up to hitting below the belt.

As for me, I found nothing offensive in Dennis' sharp formulation of his views, whereas his earlier letter did use expressions that have no place in comradely discussion.

Alan Max goes on to say that "Dennis is not the only offender," and he cites such invectives as "anti-Soviet" and "anti-socialist." I agree. But I wish he had said something about similar offenses on the part of some of those who disagree with Dennis. For example, Max Gordon, in the Nov. 23 issue repeatedly describes the position of those who justify the second Soviet intervention as "blind apologetics." Here again, I agree with Gordon's views on Hungary, but deplore his use of invective to bludgeon the reader into accepting them. Apart from everything else, this technique has the opposite effect.

Let me add that I think those of us who feel it necessary to be more critical of Soviet policy ought to stop using words like "apologetics" and "apologist" to characterize people who disagree with us. Such language ought not to be used against those who support the first country of socialism, even if uncritically. Regardless of the dictionary meaning of these words, they carry overtones of cravenness and conscious falsification. Let's reserve such terms for the enemy—who I hope is not forgotten.

Just to set the record straight, it seems to me that Benjamin J. Davis' letter in the Dec. 5 issue criticizing an earlier Alan Max column and a letter by Lillian Gates contains gratuitous personal characterizations that generate heat but little light (Or am I doing it too?)

—A. B. Magil.

Dues Status and Voting Rights

Editor, Daily Worker:

BUFFALO, N. Y.

This section intends to raise its dues status to the highest possible level prior to the National Convention in February. We do however want to take sharp issue with the plan approved by the National Committee whereby voting rights at the convention will be determined by dues status. Following are our reasons.

1. Representation will be reduced at exactly that time when the life of party may depend on maximum representation.

2. Had the call and fight for dues been made several months ago it would not have presented the same overwhelming problem that it does today. Responsibility for the lag in dues payments falls on all levels of leadership from the NC down to a club level. The solution to the problem, however, is being placed in the laps of section and club leadership.

3. If the policy of dues status determining voting privileges stems from a desire to abide by the 1950 constitution it should be noted that a good portion of the dues rate is itself unconstitutional in that the increase was never determined by a national

convention.

4. A dues collection campaign at this critical time can only detract from the discussions taking place and also from our day to day work which has already suffered considerably.

5. This policy of the National Committee has already seriously hurt the morale of many comrades and will continue, as it becomes known, cause a great deal of resentment.

We therefore urge that the NC reopen the question of voting strength in proportion to dues status and establish instead that delegations with full voting strength be determined by 1956 registration figures.

S for a Section Committee of the Erie Co. Communist Party

1948 Role of Progressive Party

Editor, Daily Worker:

CHICAGO

It is the collective opinion of our club that the report of Comrade Foster on the danger of right opportunism in our party at the present time is essentially correct. This danger is great primarily because our party is making a serious struggle to overcome the effects of left-sectarian mistakes made during the worst period of the cold war. In the context of this struggle we feel that it is necessary to restate the following theses from the science of Marxism-Leninism.

1. The principal and leading social form for the establishment of socialism in our country has been and remains the industrial working class.

2. The principal and leading ideological and political force for the establishment of socialism in our country has been and remains an organization of Marxist Leninists, capable of applying the general truths of Marxism-Leninism to the particular conditions of our country.

3. The possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism, supported by the majority of the American people, forms the basis of our strategy and tactics in the coming period.

It is also the collective opinion of our club that Comrade Foster is wrong in stating that one of the three worst mistakes made by the Party during the cold war was "the support given to the Progressive Party in 1948 as a third party." We believe that this judgment of Comrade Foster underestimates the significance of the decisive struggle of that period—the struggle for peace.

The unique historical contribution of the P. P. in 1948, at a time when the imperialists possessed a monopoly in atomic weapons was that it injected peace into the campaign in a decisive manner. A careful analysis reveals that the Truman Democrats captured and capitalized upon a mood that had been developed to a considerable degree by the efforts of the PP.

In addition, it is our impression that the campaign of 1948 brought advanced people into our ranks in greater numbers than in any other period of the cold war. Lastly Comrade Foster's judgment fails to assess the campaign period in its development. Who can forget the mood of the rank-and-file workers when Truman was nominated in June, 1948?

As regards our Party's relations with the major political parties, we consider that it is still possible for the Democratic Party by virtue of its ideological and organizational connections with the workers to become an instrument, in a period of crisis for the expression of the will of the people to curb the monopolies. However, we have no illusions whatever about the nature of the present leadership of the Democratic Party.

WILLIE MCGEE CLUB