

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Alternatives To Intervention

Editor, Daily Worker:

We are moved and disturbed by the events in Hungary because these events are almost unique and unprecedented. It is natural that people who regard us as friends of the Soviet Union should seek an explanation from us and we must be ready to answer their questions. None of us can render a final judgment. Nor are we in possession of complete information.

It is my opinion that the analysis given in the D.W. editorials, in the articles by the staff writers and by Max Gordon and George Blake Charney is correct and the interpretation by James Allen and Ben Davis is not.

In line with the policy of the various Communist parties to seek united action of workers organizations and socialist parties immediately after the outbreak of hostilities in Hungary, I feel that the CPSU and the Hungarian C.P. should have appealed to the World Federation of Trade Unions, to the labor and socialist parties, for joint efforts to forestall the fascist danger in Hungary. If these organizations didn't respond, then the people would know who sought unity to defeat fascism.

James Allen states in his article that if Soviet military forces remained passive it is undeniable that fascism would emerge victorious in Hungary. Establishing this premise he then shows that this would threaten the security of the socialist countries and lead to world war.

But why is it undeniable? It is true that the Western imperialists would try to transform Hungary into an outpost against the Soviet Union, that Horthyites penetrated and that Communists were murdered and that Nagy pulled two provocative acts: unilaterally withdrawing Hungary from the Warsaw pact and appealing to the UN to get rid of Soviet military forces. But as of Nov. 3, the day Soviet military representatives entered into negotiations with rebel leaders, there is no evidence the fascists were in control of the mass movement and that the workers of Hungary were ready to submit themselves to the fascists. Outside of Nagy the majority of the government were still Communists.

We do not know what transpired in the negotiations. Were there no alternatives short of military intervention? Was it not possible for the Hungarian leaders, with the support of the Soviet leaders to rally the Hungarian working people to isolate and defeat the Hungarian fascists?—R.R.

DW Editors Called Anti-Soviet

Editor, Daily Worker:

Congratulations to Eugene Dennis on his condemnation of the Daily's anti-Soviet stand on the current events in Hungary. I was beginning to worry that it was only the rank and file of the Party that was able to think clearly in these terrible troubled times.

The increase of the number of letter in "Speak Your Piece" violently condemning the editorial policy of the Daily and the sudden let down in contributions from Communists and Progressive generally prove beyond doubt the disgust so many of our rank and file have to the anti-Soviet editorials and articles which have appeared in the last period of time.

For all practical purposes it appears that the anti-Marxist-Leninist sector of our Party has captured the DW. From the editor, to the city editor, to the foreign editor, to the sports editor, we have nothing but one

opinion: an anti-Soviet position more proper in the New York Post than in a Communist paper.

It looked for a while that it was only Bill Foster and a large section of the rank and file who fought it. But now we have Dennis, Weinstone, Allen, Shields, et al, and thank goodness a good portion of the rank and file who in spite of the lack of a pro-Soviet outlook in the Daily have kept their balance and are more vocally condemning the editorial policy.

At a time as vital as this, when pre-convention discussion and analysis is taking place it is of the utmost importance that our Party discuss all possible opinions.

—DAN

P. S. I am enclosing \$5 towards the drive.

Dennis, Foster and The N. C. Statement

Editor, Daily Worker:

It is most disturbing to see that the National Chairman of our Party, William Z. Foster and the general secretary, Eugene Dennis, both disagree with the open letter of the National Committee on the situation in Hungary. This should not be too surprising for those who have followed the Party discussion of the Draft Resolution and the 20th Party Congress since last February. Both were slow to speak out or to attempt to really evaluate the significance of the Stalin revelations coming out of the 20th Congress. Both, it appeared to me, were extremely cautious not to permit or write any criticism of the Soviet Union which the Soviet Party did not itself first make.

And if there were differences in the National Committee for six months, they were locked up in that committee, headed by Foster and Dennis.

The general impression that one gets from reading Foster's article is that he is the most anti-Stalinist spokesman we have in the Party. Some of his criticisms are sharper than those that even appeared in the DW. But lo and behold at the end of his article he winds up with a disagreement with the N. C. and concludes it was the revolutionary duty of the Soviet Union to intervene in Hungary.

But it is Dennis' remarks that I want to comment on mostly. His remarks to my way of thinking are not sound.

After paying tribute to the DW's initiative, he proceeds to denounce that initiative, which he claims is not partisan enough and is lacking in workingclass outlook.

I should think that the unheard of precedent that the DW performed in opening up its pages to different opinions would be hailed as revolutionary and a major contribution by him, since under his leadership this was not done. For example the P. A. until the party discussion opened up in November was not opened up for different opinions. On the contrary, P. A. was often used to squelch those with contrary views. I recall for example, the Gannett and Jerome article criticizing the Montgomery article in P. V. on patriotism.

Secondly, He fails completely to attempt to analyze or to draw the necessary conclusions of events leading up to Nov. 4 in Hungary. Why not?

In this respect George Blake Charney in his article makes a real contribution. Dennis doesn't make this deeper analysis because he would have to come to the conclusion that the Oct. 30 declaration of the Soviet Union came too late. It came eight months after the 20th Congress—almost a year and a half after Yugoslav declaration. This itself was an admission that the

20th Congress decisions were not fully absorbed by the leadership of the CPSU.

Thirdly, many who disagree with the N. C. statement, Dennis makes the statement that "all Marxists would agree that if Hungary went fascist, world peace and progress would be imperilled, etc. . . ."

It is true the advance of fascism any place in the world is a danger to world peace. But first we must establish the fact that fascism would have come to power in Hungary.

I find it difficult to believe that the Nagy-Tildy—the Social Democrats, the Communist Party, the Hungarian workers, etc., after 11 years of socialism, as distorted as it was, would not have prevented the imperialists from bringing fascism to power in Hungary.

Despite Dennis' obvious misquoting or misinterpretation of Joe Clark, in the post-war period, fascism has been unable to establish itself as a state power in Japan, Finland, Western Germany or Italy. Of course, it was obvious that the Soviet Union did have this estimate. But it is obvious also they had this estimate before Nov. 4. That is, at the time of the first intervention.

—D. R.

A Reply to Lillian Gates

Editor, Daily Worker:

I should like to take issue with some of the points made by Lillian Gates in her letter of Nov. 29, 1956.

1. There is no "new surge of feeling that it is our role at all times to defend the Soviet Union above all else." There is a distinct difference between an independent analysis and "making a fetish of criticism of the Soviet Union."

2. Lillian Gates maintains that "our basic position on Hungary should not attempt to analyze the various stages but to recognize the overall outcome of the developments there—which certainly must be characterized as a tragic setback to Socialism." No Marxist can reject an analysis of stages because nothing is static but everything is in constant motion. Events certainly moved in Hungary. Apparently only Lillian Gates and the DW do not move. Can it be that they are more intent on delivering "an unanswerable blow to the 'foreign agent' charge" (as indicated by one of your contributors (DW Nov. 8) than in making a Marxist analysis?

3. Lillian Gates says that the "starting point of our policy must be the conditions and needs of the American workers and people." But a correct policy can emerge only from a correct evaluation of objective conditions. A correct analysis can be interpreted in whatever terms are best suited to the level of understanding and the experience of the workers and the people as a whole; but the analysis itself does not originate at that level.

As I see it, the analysis still insisted on by the DW and Lillian Gates leads to this conclusion: transform Hungary into another Korea. Would that be to the interest of the American working class, or to any other segment of the population except monopoly capital?

4. As to the National Draft Resolution, I should like to remind Lillian Gates and the DW that it is only a DRAFT. It hasn't yet been adopted by the membership. If what has been appearing in the DW is an accurate interpretation of the Draft (which I do not believe) then the resolution will require serious correction. I believe that the DW's interpretation will not meet with the approval of the membership.

Yes, I agree, it is too bad that the DW has embroiled us all in the Hungarian situation. It has

thereby diverted our attention from the situation in the Middle East where a critical nodal point in world history is being enacted before our eyes, if we would but open them, not to mention our responsibility to influence the course of events taking place there!

PROFESSIONAL

The Spirit of Open Polemic

Editor, Daily Worker:

A democratic, healthy spirit of polemic must have long been absent in our party. For, ever since the inception of Speak Your Piece, many writers have voiced a feeling of distrust and even moral indignation at the very idea of a free interchange of ideas. These writers, who do not seem to be the majority by any means, rationalize this lack of confidence in the rank and file by intimating that arguments they are in disagreement with breed disunity and doubts. Therefore, they go on, let's not bring up such embarrassing issues, or, if we must, let's talk about them in whispers.

It can only harm the party either to ignore our problems and inner disagreements or to suppress and intimidate those people who express themselves openly . . . however correct or incorrect they might be. Suppress? Intimidate? Strong words you say? Well, a day after a letter of mine appeared in Speak Your Piece I received a phone call from a man whose voice I did not recognize and who refused to identify himself other than saying that he was a friend of people I knew . . . whose names he did mention.

This "voice" attacked me in the most offensive, violent and intimidating manner because of what I had written in my letter. This self-appointed grand inquisitor hung up when I refused to discuss his objections over the phone but offered to meet his criticisms at a club or section meeting, open to all the membership.

I am bringing this particular experience up, because, although it's obviously the work of a disturbed personality, it does reflect, in its own lunatic way the "don't-raise-your-voice-the-neighbors-might-hear" forces in the party today. For those forces, I have news: "the neighbors" have been listening for years and what's more, they've got a right to hear and to speak up if they so choose. And something else: For more than 10 years I've put my ideas on the line with my name and address clearly printed—petitions, membership, letters, soap boxes, door-knocking and what have you. And there have been times when, with others, I've been threatened, fired, slugged and cursed for my pains. And brother, if Hitler and McCarthy could not make us knuckle under, let us hope that no self-elected vigilantes from within our ranks can, anonymously or otherwise, succeed in name-calling us into silence.

Here's my \$10 . . . you've been doing a wonderful job!

DAVE S.

One Good Turn Deserves Another

Editor, Daily Worker:

In 1945 Jacques Duclos, on behalf of the French CP wrote his famous article or letter which precipitated the campaign here against Browderism. Would it not be a timely act of fraternal reciprocity for an American Communist leader to now write a piece about the need for the French Party to take up the struggle against Stalinism in which Comrades Duclos and Thorez seem to so deeply mired? In politics also, one good turn deserves another.

—A West Coast Reader.

Yorkville Resolution

Editor, Daily Worker:

In tried and true Old Marcan-tonio territory, the Yorkville Community Club has UNANIMOUSLY voted the following resolution.

We request that you print it. RESOLVED that the theory of Marxism-Leninism has not failed us; but that we of the CPUSA have failed to put into practice the theory of Marxism-Leninism. We have practiced a one-sided, dogmatic, shallow shadow of Marxism-Leninism.

That instead of discarding Marxism-Leninism we should study and strengthen it; we should be less hysterical, and more historical.

That the tendency to blame scapegoats, to curse strawmen (that is, Stalin, the Soviet Union) for our errors and weaknesses should be honestly seen for what it is, an evading of responsible, mature judgment.

That our own inability, and our ignorance of Marxist-Leninist theory and American life are the MAIN CAUSES of our bureaucratic ways and lack of creative thought. As is shown by the CP's in China, and elsewhere, where a CP is a part of its nation's life, absorbs its national traditions and culture, it was strengthened by the 20th Congress, not weakened.

That we of the CPUSA should found ourselves deeply in American traditions and culture; found ourselves on Jefferson, Madison, Andrew Jackson, Lincoln, and others of equal stature; found ourselves on Freneau, Emerson, Melville, Twain, and others. We should be the inheritors and protectors of the American traditions, of freedom.

That the CPUSA should promptly and directly apply these democratic traditions to its own structure.

That the National Board of the CPUSA be replaced by a representative and democratic body on which PAID OFFICIALDOM WILL BE A MINORITY, and on which shopworkers, intellectuals, community people, Negro and Puerto Rican representatives will be a MAJORITY.

That the major policy statements of the CPUSA Convention and all draft resolution and all constitutional changes be submitted to a direct, secret referendum vote of the members; AND THAT NO MAJOR CONVENTION DECISION BE BINDING WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE MEMBERS.

That the CPUSA is but beginning its life. To arbitrarily and abstractly change it into a debating society, a non-Party group, is to deny the possibility of Parliamentary, peaceful transition to socialism; is to underestimate and condemn the American people out of hand; is to invent a catch-phrase, an easy-out, instead of coming to grips with our problems, our ignorance, and our lack of activity.

That the CPUSA should be reconstituted as a true American political party, based on the workingclass, guided by Marxism-Leninism, and dedicated to the preservation of the best of America's heritage, and to the achievement of socialism in America.

—Yorkville Community Club.

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 3.00