

The Proposed C. P. Changes

Robert Minor
c/o Daily Worker:

What seems to bother so many people—as that 16-year-old boy, for instance—is not so much the nature of the changes proposed by the Communist Party, or the fact that Marxism countenances historical adjustments, but rather the bold, democratic, unconcealed manner with which the Communist Party announces its intentions.

This is especially trying for Americans long accustomed to the "swallowing" of changes undertaken by forces other than the Communist Party, without being offered a chance to discuss them in advance. There are too many contemporary instances of such changes being imposed upon us without our say-so, to cite them all. One can easily recall, for instance, the steam-rolling practiced by legislators contemptuous of the people's will, by the self-consulting Antoninis, Dubinsky, Roses, etc. No one ever expects a clear bill of lading from the Hoovers, the Deweys, the Spanglers—it's all COD in a blind package, no matter if the contents are just a dud or a delayed-action bomb.

Everyone who reads PM can get

what I mean. That paper is an excellent example of how to create the impression of "naturalness" and "changelessness" while doing a trapeze act. It doesn't announce it is going to land or build up, for example, Mikhailovitch or the Dubinsky-ALP slate—it just goes ahead and does so. Then, as happened, when both are fully exposed and trounced by later events, PM doesn't announce its error—if that's all it was—it just does a neat flip-flop and reveals some of the truth concerning what really happened. PM can thus palm off half a hundred changes per month and expect to be accepted as a paper with a changeless policy.

I believe that the so-called free enterprise tradition wherein you don't consult your customers but "hand it to 'em," has got a lot of innocents by the tail. You just don't ask questions. Because if you do, you might have to do a little modification, and if you modify, then, hell! who's the boss? And if there's anything anti-changers are more scared of than anything else it's the fact that by letting in people on your plans you're sharing that much of your power with the people. In other words, you are then REALLY PRACTICING DEMOCRACY—Heaven help us!

That's what's got some folks buffaloed. They haven't been much ac-

customed to a political party sharing its plans and its power with the public. They all make changes, adjustments, compromises—but, hell! they don't go talking about it out loud. And that's the only "trouble" with the Communist Party's proposed changes. It seems as if the Communist Party just ain't afraid of REALLY PRACTICING DEMOCRACY—out loud!

On the discussion of the changes, per se:

Haven't men with great social ideals throughout the ages dreamed of the day when instead of a "given" world that included the "inevitableness" of wars and violence, the opportunity would arrive when we could be the architects and show 'em that you can have a world where peace and plenty would be the "inevitables"—may we not say that Tehran is that blessed opportunity, and the proposed changes the Communist Party's recognition of it?

(Signed) SAMUEL T.

* * *

By Robert Minor

Yes.

* * *

The next to be answered will be a series of questions by an enquirer who thinks the proposals of changes are "desperately dangerous."

Answers
to
Questions