

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

What About Right Revisionism?

Editor, Daily Worker:

In "The Communists Take a New Look" Dennis asks "Was it inevitable, in view of the post war growth of monopoly reaction in the country, that the party should be isolated?" After giving the broad aspects of the situation he goes on to attribute the absence of inner-party democracy to the dispersal of the party leadership.

But what was said in this pamphlet about the days of right revisionism? And where at that time were rank and file voices of criticism? Their voices weren't heard until such criticism became fashionable. In the years 1945 to 1950, before the dispersal of the leadership, many who criticized faulty policies were labeled chronic complainers and "super" rank and filers.

Not mentioned by Dennis were the hundreds of such militant rank and filers who are no longer members of the party, many grass roots organizers and active members of unions, neighborhood organizations, colleges and veteran's groups, the myriad "mass organizations." Did they all leave because of the degree of reaction in the country?

I am referring to people who faced death in World War II, had their heads cracked on picket lines and recruited to the party on a mass scale; those that spent days (if not years as Dennis at al) in jail on occasions, day-to-day and year-to-year "leg" workers. Were all these people frightened by reaction?

In cases of opportunism in lefted unions, numbers who opposed these policies were subjected to character defamation and suspension. When the show-down came and the "ja" voters and their leadership were shown to be in the wrong, there was no criticism or evaluation. Why aren't these actions re-evaluated?

In neighborhood groups the price of disagreement was often being accused of chauvinism, Trotskyism, disruptionism and the like. Those who raised questions in a disciplined manner were brushed off at best, and at worst held up to ridicule, in a travesty of "democratic centralism!"

I speak as a non-party Marxist trying to re-establish old ties when a basis for re-joining is shown in action. I realize that we can never have peace, democracy or socialism in the United States without the vanguard, a

Communist Party. But it must be one capable of mass contact, ridded of sectarianism and one able to encompass differences of opinion within it. Only this type of organization can hold in it the many tried and true party people who are not this day drifting from its ranks. We will accept criticism, but we want the right to differ. We want the past discussed with honor and comradeship.—MICHAEL.

Urges Support For Democrats

Editor, Daily Worker:

I would like to see Alan Max's election piece (THAT "ROPE" AGAIN!) in the July 24 DW become an incentive for others also to explain their position on the coming election—just a few short months off. Here's mine:

1. Because labor is convinced that it can now best advance its interests through the Democratic Party, the Communist Party should urge its members and friends to pitch into the campaign to bring about a Democratic victory.

2. In order to make it easier for Communists to work with others in the election campaign, we should state why and what we are doing—simply, completely, without any doubletalk.

About this "rope" business—why deny it? But let's get it straight. Yes, there are some in the Democratic Party that we will be working for—the Eastlands, the Walters, etc.—whom we will want politically hanged just as soon as possible. But in this respect, we are no different, except possibly in degree, from millions of other workers, liberals, Negroes who are likewise supporting the Democratic Party.

As for the labor and other democratic-minded candidates, our being Communists does not set us against them. It is true they believe in capitalism and we believe in socialism. But this same difference existed between us when we worked together so harmoniously during the Roosevelt period to build the CIO.

3. Let's stop being afraid to state our position. No matter what we say, there will be some (perhaps most) of the Republican Party leadership who will accuse the Democrats of being Communist, treasonable, etc. And there will also be some in the Democratic Party leadership who, either because they fear the Republican accusation or because they would rather lose the elec-

tion than have their party become oriented too much toward labor and civil rights, will disown and attack us for our support.

But the people will understand, some sooner, some later.

By all means let's use whatever influence we have to liberalize the Democratic Party before the nominations take place. But let us NOW join with the mass of people who are NOW committed to work for a Democratic victory and are NOW moving to accomplish that.

Once we isolated ourselves through our "superior" understanding of the need for a third party. We fall into the same isolation when we decide to keep out of the rough and tumble of politics while we contemplate whether the game the workers are playing is clean and pure enough for us (as Alan Max seems to me to do.)

—JOSEPH POSNER

"To Our Sorrow"

Los Angeles.

Editor, Daily Worker:

Some friends and I recently got together over a little pamphlet by Eugene Dennis, "Report to the National Committee." . . . and, to our great sorrow, we found it an absolute waste of time, paper and print! From a Eugene Dennis we expected a relinquishment of the old, sectarian terminology. It was anything but a "New Look" as the title claimed. Many of the sentences were so long and involved as to end up conveying a lot of confusion.

Because your newspaper space is so valuable, I will quote just one paragraph from page 22: "It should be stated here that those who argued in the past, or on the basis of the new and changed world situation now unfolding, that there never was nor is a war danger—are wrong. Their view that peace is 'inevitable' was and is no less harmful than the view that war is inevitable. In both cases the Party and the people are lulled in passivity and fatalism, instead of facing up to the realities of the situation, to organizing and mobilizing the broadest sectors of the people in the struggle for peace."

On the other hand, we found much enlightenment in the report by Max Weiss on the "Meaning of the 20th Congress."

—L. K., Housewife.