

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Says It's Good To Use Facts

Editor, Daily Worker:

I wish to comment on a letter by Harry Mann as published in the DW on Dec. 19. I have been in the labor movement for 30 years. Working people made me particularly sensitive to dogmatism and sectarianism. It seems to me Mann's letter is an example of a wrong way of discussion.

He states that any time someone offers a "sane and dissenting article" almost every columnist and editor on the DW springs to the attack. He accuses the editors of the DW of a new dogmatism, presumably based on the idea that the Daily will criticize anything the Soviet Union does. He further accuses the DW writers of "perversion of Marxist principles" and of "accommodation to imperialism." To illustrate his point he cites the DW denial of the charge by the Soviet magazine Kommunist that the DW equates Hungary with Egypt.

I have been carefully reading the editorials and articles in the Daily and nowhere did I see any equation of Hungary with Egypt.

Mann also takes on George Charney, and those who write like him, and says their position merges with the position of those who demand that the Soviet Union should submit to the unilateral break-up of the Warsaw pact. Nowhere in the DW editorials did I see any demands that the Soviet Union should withdraw its forces unilaterally. Quite the contrary. In all its editorials the DW pointed out the necessity both for the Soviet and Western forces, particularly U. S. forces, to withdraw from foreign territories.

Mann uses the type of characterization that was often used in the past and that helped us to lose some friends. It was based on sweeping exaggerations and at worst on distortion of facts, or no facts at all. The users sometimes trained their guns on those who slightly disagreed with them and made accusations without bothering to prove their point by presenting substantial facts.

Can anyone doubt that the DW is the only paper in the USA which is a real friend of the Soviet Union? Can anyone dispute the fact that the Daily reserves the sharp edge for the capitalists, imperialists, racists, and not the Soviet Union and socialist countries?

The only thing new that one can perceive in its pages is that it no longer accepts uncritically everything that emanates from socialist countries. We will only be helpful to the American working class and to socialism everywhere if the Left removes the barriers between itself and the workers. And that is exactly what the DW began to do.

R. R. F.

Explains Donation To Red Cross

Sir:

Several comrades have expressed disagreement with the action of the Bronx County Board of the CPUSA in offering a \$100 contribution to the American Red Cross for aid to Hungary.

As a member of the Bronx Board and the original sponsor of that motion in the Board I feel called upon to answer some of the criticisms.

Everyone in and out of this movement knows that our Party is divided in its attitude towards the actions of the Soviet Union in Hungary. Some people charge us with the philosophy of "the end justifies the means." It is stated that we are not concerned with the welfare of the Hun-

garian people—only with a blind defense of Soviet power. We may not accept the accuracy of these charges but we cannot ignore them when they are raised by means of people. We cannot say, either, that it just isn't so unless we don't aim to convince people. Nor, in my opinion, is it an answer to state that we must await the verdict of history. Because history has proven us wrong on some questions also.

It may be true, as comrades have told me, that the Red Cross is not pure. But we accepted this organization as the vehicle for aid to the New England flood victims—with all of its impurities. Did anyone mention the chauvinism of the Red Cross at that time? Furthermore, the Soviet and Kadar governments, through the Hungarian Red Cross, has welcomed such aid. I must ask the question: Are these comrades challenging the Red Cross or the issue of the aid itself?

I have also been told that the Board should not have given the money without consulting the membership. I readily concede that this point has validity. But the action of the Board is consistent with the rules of democratic centralism which govern all our Board's actions. Again, are we facing up to the real challenge or ducking it?

Lastly, some comrades tell me the money should have gone to worthier causes and some name the press, Smith Act victims etc. Why should one be posed against the other? Are they mutually exclusive? In my opinion this is one more attempt at evasion.—Gene Perlstein.

Disappointed By Editorial

Editor, Daily Worker:

The Daily Worker editorial of Dec. 18 on Hungary will be a disappointment to non-Communist socialists as well as to many Communists. On the matter of troops, is it sufficient to call for a withdrawal of all military forces from all foreign lands, when there is an immediate problem in Hungary that cannot wait for this general withdrawal?

The Worker certainly has the duty to consider the views of those of its readers who believe, as I do not, that anti-imperialist troops are needed in that country to prevent it from becoming an anti-Soviet bridgehead. But the Soviet Union admits that its troops are not welcome in Hungary, by its offer to negotiate their withdrawal as soon as order is restored. Yet their presence tends to prevent order from being restored, due to bitterness stirred by the warfare of the past two months, during which 25,000 Hungarians were killed, according to Nehru's statement on information from his Ambassador to Budapest.

The Worker would do better to support the solution proposed by the steel workers of Poznan, and supported by posters in Budapest. This is that Polish troops replace those of the USSR in Hungary. Poland is a Warsaw Pact country, and its government has the expressed approval of the leaders of the Soviet Union. Poland, which lost six million people under the Nazis, and now holds former German territory, is bitterly opposed to re-opening East Europe to imperialist reconquest, and to any leniency toward fascism.

The editorial position I suggest would give support to a move that would end Hungary's immediate travail, without changing the balance of military strength in Europe.

—William Mandel

Too Much About Hungary

Editor, Daily Worker:

We have had too much discussion about Hungary and the Soviet Union and not enough on the future of the CPUSA . . . and the convention will soon be with us.

I agree with Johnny Gates that the CP must change its name as well as democratize itself completely; not only because the name Communist has been compromised politically, morally and legally, both here and abroad, but also for another equally important reason.

In my 22 years in the CP, I know that hundreds of thousands of members have passed through our ranks — in many years we had a 100 percent turnover — as many recruits as drop outs or expulsions. These people are around and still believe in Socialism. We must win them back into a new type of organization, show them that we really mean business, that we will start out afresh with a true American scientific approach in an organization democratized from top to bottom.

What form it should take I don't know. A political action association sounds correct, but I should like more details on just what is meant by that, how it would operate, its structure, etc.

If we don't change our name and type of organization, despite all the proud achievements of the CPUSA since its inception, I am afraid we will be doomed to become a small sect even more isolated from the American people than we now are. We ought to be courageous enough and realistic enough to recognize that the CP has struck out and we need a new scientific socialist team for America.

DEE.

P.S. Congratulations and \$5 to the paper and its editors and staff.

Says Gordon Didn't Reply

Editor, Daily Worker:

Invective is a relative term, depending upon your point of view in the controversy, and a certain amount of it is to be expected. If Max Gordon chooses to call my view of the Hungarian events "Soviet apologetics," he merely reveals to the reader his own state of mind, but offers no serious reply to the criticism I have made of the editors of the Daily Worker in my article of Nov. 23. On the other hand, I thought he was well answered by Eugene Dennis in his article of Nov. 29, as regards substance, and by A. B. Magil in his letter of Dec. 10, as regards method.

If I were to accept Gordon's method of deductive reasoning from false abstract premises and from limping analogies, I could just as easily have called him an "apologist for capitalism" since the ideological enemies of socialism have always singled out for attack the weaknesses and mistakes of the socialist countries. This has been particularly true of the Right Socialists. But I do not think Gordon is an apologist for capitalism. He is only profoundly and tragically wrong.

In his letter of Dec. 17, Gordon reiterates his own peculiar theory of history, according to which the defense of socialism, despite its mistakes and blunders, became "blind apologetics." It is instructive to learn that Gordon considers himself among the "blind apologists" of yesterday. He puts "most of us" in the same category. This will be

news to many. I have always considered the defense of socialism, the permanent gains of the great enlightening revolution of our century, indispensable to Marxism. I still do, together with many in our country much beyond the narrow confines of Communist Party. We have ourselves to blame, in the first place, for our weaknesses and insufficiencies in developing the power of independent critical analysis. But the latter was never to be measured by the extremes of criticism of the Soviet Union, which I by no means consider to have reached at any time the state of perfect utopia where it might be immune from criticism. But as Gordon again shows, you can have critical pyrotechnics, without critical analysis.

It seems to me that most of us who believe in socialism (not some "pie-in-the-sky" socialism or some form of "isolationist socialism") hardly consider ourselves blind followers of anyone or anything, neither a foreign power nor foreign party. That is the prosecutor's picture, and it grieves me to see that Gordon, even inadvertently, concedes it. We have to be Marxists on our own right, without subservience to Moscow, Peking, Warsaw or Belgrade, or even Washington. Of course that requires really independent, really objective, really critical analysis of home and world politics. It is lack of that, and not our isolation, as Gordon claims, that accounts for the fact that the editors have been unable "to wage effective struggle against reactionary efforts to exploit the Hungarian situation for anti-Soviet purposes."

As to my theory of history, I have only one: historical materialism. If Gordon and others with his line of thinking would only use it they might again see that the central reality of our time is the historic struggle between capitalism and socialism.

JAMES S. ALLEN

Fascists and Democracy

Editor, Daily Worker:

A major factor in the Hungarian disorders was the fascist segment of the Hungarian Catholic Church.

The Fascist Cardinal Mindszenty, this writer of anti-Semitic literature, the friend of Hitler, the aide of Horthy, (the Hungarian fascist dictator) as the head of the Catholic Church in Hungary had his hand in the planning of, and instigating the masses of Catholics to uprising and rebellion, with the subsequent murder of entire Communist families, men, women and children, the killings of progressive labor leaders, and true liberals, the hangings of anti-fascists. Hundreds of these leftists were murdered: and that was the blood bath.

Book burnings and anti-Semitic putschs were part of the fascist acts of terrorism.

Clerical-fascism has for many years been a powerful force in Hungary. This force of reaction discouraged thinking, period, and punished progressive thought as a threat to their position.

The cleric fascists from the very beginning had been in close contact with outside conspirators to destroy socialism, and, if not succeeding in that to disable and weaken socialism, politically and economically.

According to a writer for the New York World Telegram, (Tues., Nov. 27, 1956, page 26) relative to an article on Hungary, "the Catholic Church has been less successful in Czechoslovakia in retaining the loyalty of the people."

The clear inference is that

the cleric fascists were more successful in Hungary at subverting minds and masses.

They fanned the fires of ultra-nationalism, an issue was made over a military uniform, and they also made an issue over the 1848 Holiday. The people were played against the red troops; all this was schemed out long before any outbreak. The forces of reaction took advantage of every possible chance to incite the people to demand and demand whether possible or impossible, whether just or not. Their object was to harass the government; to soften up the government to open the way for realization of their nefarious plots.

Sure, the fascists want to see democracy, they want democracy so they can roll in, take over, entrench themselves within democracy, then destroy it.

When Mindszenty spoke on the radio his speech was a call to reaction to take over; and Nagy's ready inclusion of Mindszenty into the government was another act to precede a fascist government.

In contrast to the Hungarian situation, the Polish Catholic Church apparently is settling down to work within the framework of Polish Socialism. It is good to see some sanity and reason setting in.—R.B.

Disagrees With Al Lannon

BALTIMORE, Md.

Editor, Daily Worker:

I should like to comment on Al Lannon's letter in the Dec. 12 issue.

It seems in the first place that he has a number of facts at his fingertips which I have never seen in print. However, granting that they are all of them true, what kind of an attitude can an American working man take toward the Soviet invasion of Hungary?

We know that some of the biggest business giants in the United States are behind the Project X, Radio Free Europe, and are openly claiming to have started the whole thing. We also know that they are doing it for the same reason that they break strikes and lobby for laws to put unions out of business. They are trying to protect their profits, part of which come from overseas investment. It would be foolish then to support any of the Hungarian aid committees or the Red Cross fund for Hungary, since they are obviously all working together as a part of this plan.

But under what circumstances does one nation have a right to invade another? Only, I think, to prevent an immediate invasion. The world knows it was wrong for the United States to invade Korea and for England to invade Egypt. Granted that the Soviet motives were entirely different, no one is going to approve of a "sucker punch" unless the puncher himself stands in danger. Clearly, the Soviet Union was not in danger from Hungary.

The enemies of Socialism have often talked about it being brought in on Russian bayonets, but the answer is now the same as always. It can never be brought in that way.

ROY WOOD.

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.

Registered as second class matter Oct. 23, 1947, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

5 mos. 9 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