

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Charges DW With Straddling Issue

WESTFIELD, Mass.
Editor, Daily Worker:

Well! I never thought I'd see the day I'd turn down a request by the Daily Worker for funds, but it looks like that day has come—unfortunately. Why?

Mainly because of the events in Hungary. The DW is straddling the issue and has not openly come out and condemned the Un-Marxian leadership of the Soviet Union.

It has not called for the return of Imre Nagy and the withdrawal of Soviet troops. Let the Hungarian workers decide the fate of Hungary.

What is wrong is wrong, gentlemen—90 percent of the Hungarian workers, I'm sure, are not fascists, although of course I realize there were fascist elements capitalizing on the Hungarian workers' beef against gross bureaucracy.

You still insist on defending the Soviet Union right or wrong—like it was still five days after the Soviet revolution. You're behind history. Whatever happened to that old international workers' spirit. Debs did not envision (nether did Lenin) secret police stuff in a socialist country, did he?

I also think the CPUSA also has its iron-handed dogmatists and bureaucrats.

Thank God for men like Gomulka or like Nagy who still have the love and respect of the workers.

I remain a young Communist—and still have faith in the American workers as well as the clear-headedness of the Soviet people.

What's wrong is wrong, so admit it. Save the name of socialism, get the stagnant out-moded leadership moving, or put young blood in the CPUSA leadership so we can go places.

A MILL WORKER.

"Ideological Corruption"

Editor, Daily Worker:

I wish to vehemently protest against the CP National Board "Statement on Poland and Hungary" which is published in the Nov. 5 Daily Worker. I wish it to be made clear that such a "Statement" does not and cannot speak for me as a member of the Communist Party.

It seems to me that the main lesson our Party should learn from the events in Hungary is:

First: That the main mass of the Party and non-Party workers in Hungary wanted to correct the past errors of the Hungarian Party and government because they were the victims of these errors.

Second: That the healthy mass core of Party members and leaders were slowed down—yes, sabotaged—from correcting these errors by a degenerate, ideologically corrupt, power-mad faction of office seekers in the Party. Nagy is a clear example of this faction.

Third: The recent events in Hungary show the heavy price the workers must pay for permitting this faction to rise and exist in the Party.

Fourth: These rotten bureaucrats legalized their faction and their betrayal of Socialism and peace by capitalizing on the mass sincere desire to correct errors as well as on the existing economic hardships and nationalism.

These corrupt people based their outlook for power on Project X, Mindszenty, the long standing sabotage of the nation's economy by their own faction and the Horthyites as well as their swindle to misdirect the Party away from the real errors into a swing to Nationalism and

against the Soviet Union, against Socialism and consequently against the best interests of Hungary and world peace.

To Nagy and his cohorts the question was not which class should rule but that they should rule. To use this rule for revenge against the healthy mass of Party members, leaders and against the Soviet Union. They slaughtered hundreds of the best Party members in the most brutal, fascist manner. They even murdered Gero who had compromised with Nagy.

Are not the lives of these Communists just as important as the life of Rajk? Why are there no tears in the columns of the Daily Worker for the bestial murder of these comrades?

Why does not our National Committee, which is so quick to join "Ike" in "deploring" the use of Soviet troops in Hungary, speak out against the fascist reign of terror instituted by Nagy and his cohorts against the best sons and daughters of the Hungarian working class?

The articles and editorials by the Daily Worker staff make it quite clear to me that we are not faced with confusion or differences of opinions as to how to correct past errors in order to better serve peace and socialism—on the contrary, what we see expressed in the Daily Worker is a clear example of ideological corruption.

The National Committee statement by its endorsement of the position of the Daily Worker not only proves the inability of the National Committee to stand up and fight this betrayal of international working-class solidarity, socialism and peace, but also demonstrates that ideological corruption has penetrated to an overwhelming degree, our National Committee.

As for myself, I have decided that to remain silent, and not condemn your statement, would make me an accomplice to this Nagy-like "putsch" to head our Party down the road to a betrayal of Socialism and a reliance on the "intelligence" of the imperialists to maintain world peace and to condemn all who do not have such faith in finance capital.

I am confident that our Party rank and file will eventually see this ideological corruption for what it is.

AL LANNON

PS: My opinion is the same with regard to the Open Letter.

Lack of Confidence In Rank and File

DENVER
Editor, Daily Worker:

I agree with Joe Clark's estimate of the Hungarian situation. Isn't lack of confidence in the rank and file at the bottom of all bureaucratic mistakes, Soviet as well as American?

Eugene Dennis recognizes that in 1951 we underestimated the ability (or willingness) of the American working class to rebuff fascism. Shouldn't Hungarian workers, after all their experience, at least be given credit for the ability and willingness to find a democratic solution to their own problems?

Enclosed is \$5 for the Daily with three cheers that we are at last openly discussing conflicting opinions. And a red rose for Jesus Colon.—PAT BLAU.

Polish Party's Election Program

CHICAGO
Editor, Daily Worker:

For some time now, some writers for the Daily Worker have demanded the fullest democratization in the socialist countries, without regard to the relationship of class forces, the external danger of imperialist

threats, etc. These writers have held up Gomulka and Tito as shining examples of their views of unlimited democratization.

That is why I am surprised that Joe Clark did not even take note of Gomulka's statement of the Polish C. P.'s program for the coming national elections, even though this question is one in which he seems to have become something of a specialist.

May I therefore bring to your readers the gist of the Polish Party's election program which unfortunately I had to get exclusively from stories datelined Nov. 29 and Dec. 1, Warsaw, New York Times?

1. According to the Times, Gomulka stated flatly "that the Communist program could not include freedom for all parties because this would include bourgeois parties." He made it clear there was no room in Polish democracy for the followers of Mikolajczyk who were against socialism. While the Communists were ready to cooperate with non-Marxist pro-Socialist Parties, nevertheless, "anyone who opposes the Communist program of Socialism is 'on the other side of the barricades'." He warned against this Mikolajczyk camp of "reactionaries who are trying to ride the wave of democratization" but never utter a "word about the necessity of increasing agricultural and industrial production."

2. According to the Polish Communist Party, candidates should be selected from the Communist, Peasants and Democratic parties and from the mass organizations, trade unions, youth movement and progressive Catholic organizations. But they should be nominated, not on separate party slates, but "local branches of the National Front, in which political parties and mass organizations are all branded."

In this way, Gomulka and the C.P. seek to guarantee that only candidates committed to socialism run for office.

The proposal is that there be eight candidates for each five offices.

3. In the Dec. 1, Times article, the Polish Minister of Internal Affairs states, "The limits of freedom are still necessary because of internal and external class relations with which we are surrounded. . . . Democratic freedom is determined by the conditions accompanying the construction of socialism in our country. . . ."

"The party leaders declared that freedom would expand as socialism grew in Poland. But by the same token, he warned, freedom would contract if socialism were threatened." This in my opinion, is a Leninist class approach to the question of democratization rather than a muddle-headed, abstract, non-class approach.

It is also a bit surprising to me that Joe had nothing to say about "democratization" as exemplified in Tito's arrest of Djilas.

I think it would be a good thing if Joe discarded his dreamboat view of democratization under socialism and endorse the views of Gomulka and the Polish Party, which it seems, are quite different from what he imagined they were.

Socialism calls for and makes possible, but it calls for the greatest care and vigilance on their part to defend their socialist ownership of the land and factories and their socialist power. It is within this framework that the question of democratization seems to be viewed by Gomulka and the Polish C. P. and, I believe, by Tito as well.

—EMANUEL BLUM

Solidarity And Criticism

Editor, Daily Worker:

The Executive Press Committee of L'Unita', Italian Progressive monthly, sends \$50 as a symbol of solidarity for the continued existence of the Daily Worker.

Despite the "band-wagon" kind of editorial policy the Daily Worker follows, we see a great harm in the withholding of funds on the part of whole groups opposed to such policy, at a time when the greatest single issue for the movement is to guarantee the existence of the paper.

We oppose the sudden liberalization of the Daily Worker following the 20th Congress, not because it is too extreme in its objectivity, but because the unity in our ranks comes before dogmatic correctness. The appeal by Foster, Dennis, Davis and yourself proves this, and has been the step which has prompted our small token of solidarity.

We of L'Unita' have been lucky enough not only to open our paper to the readers since June, 1955, the time of the Tito rapprochement, but to have been able to have an editorial policy which puts meeting our commitments in this new situation, both financially and organizationally.

Your treatment of the Middle East situation has been ambiguous, while the Hungarian break has seen on your part a total condemnation of the Soviets. We cannot bring in all the examples, but a bit less confidence in the capitalist press would have let you see that, for instance, while the first intervention should have been avoided, the second one was motivated by a White Terror this same press never spoke of.

The climax of the situation in Eastern Europe is but the present "breaking point." We shall have many others. But we feel that without a press we would not be able to meet them and arrive at their solution.

—EXECUTIVE PRESS COMMITTEE, L'UNITA'

Suggestions for Broadening DW

Editor, Daily Worker:

The salvation of the Daily does not lie primarily in constant appeal to an ever diminishing following, but in transforming the paper into becoming once more the paper "of the Left." Hence the primary responsibility and initiative lie with the editors, not with the readers. We suggest that:

a. The editorial staff be broadened to include representatives of non-Communist Marxist groups.

b. The paper discuss forthrightly all questions facing the American Left particularly and the American people in general.

c. The contents of both the SW and DW be changed to include more material of immediate interest to socialist-minded readers, and that the paper not attempt to compete in news with the commercial press.

d. The decision to drop the discussion supplement from the SW to assuage some of the readers in New York was a mistake, since it weakened the vital socialist content of the paper, sacrificing the interest of many for the benefit of a few. To many, the only link with this press is the SW.

It is our opinion that the Daily will survive only if it is able to win back the tens of thousands of socialist-minded Americans who once looked to it, and no amount of crusading will substitute for a bold, creative, and truthful approach to the problems of American socialism and to the implications of events abroad. It is also our

opinion that no socialist paper can lay claim to any moral standing if it does not protest against the martyrdom to which the Hungarian people are being subjected by an incredible Soviet policy of naked repression.

—Group of Italian-Americans

Gordon's Article Called Masterful

Editor, Daily Worker:

I would like to express wholehearted approval of the article by Max Gordon, "Platform for Blind Apologetics" that appeared in the DW on Nov. 23.

Gordon really hits the nail on the head when he condemns the emotional and excessive concern in our Party (either pro or con) with the Hungarian developments and other events outside our country. Gordon shows he has a cool head and he applies the Marxist weapons of thought in a masterful way.

The large-scale defections from the Parties in European countries, precipitated by the Russian invasion of Hungary, would never have taken place if these people had understood, in the dialectical way that Gordon does, that Russia has "inevitably made vast mistakes and will continue to make them. It has not yet elected the appropriate superstructure to conform to the socialist material base."

This writer in a letter to the DW dated Aug. 2, stressed the need for developing a truly indigenous CP. Gordon's article is a shot-in-the-arm for the large number of us who must be thinking along this line and who at the same time realize that the way to build a real American CP is not to abandon or downgrade Marxism-Leninism (as some seem to think) but rather to apply (as Foster shows so ably in his article "On the Party Situation" in Oct. P. A.) the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism to the American scene.

—STEELWORKER

No Longer a Smug House Organ

Editor, Daily Worker:

The Daily Worker has rounded a new and better turn in its history. It is no longer a smug house organ but a genuine and democratic organ of progressive Americans. I read it now as a must instead of an obligation and feel deprived when the postman misses delivery for a day.

To all of which, I should like to express my appreciation of a courageous, self-sacrificing staff which is giving us such an excellent paper under conditions that are both individually and collectively trying.

It is unpardonable sabotage for some within the progressive ranks to withhold support because every editorial and every news story is not shaped within the old narrow mold which was insufficient to contain a newspaper in particular or the American Left in general. This very attitude shows how remote these mistaken individuals are from the American people who have always welcomed the play of diverse ideas and incorporated it, through many struggles, into their whole structure of living.

Equally it was unforgivable for Eugene Dennis to make such an all-out criticism of the paper in yesterday's issue (Nov. 29) without, as general secretary, also making a renewed appeal to keep it alive. This polemic was more than a criticism of a paper. Indeed it was a thinly-veiled attack on those of us who wish to see the emergence of an American Left which will be based upon the long and enduring democratic institutions of our country.—R.C.