

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Project X and Peaceful Transition

Editor, Daily Worker:

A damn shame that the Horthy fascists and the "well-equipped, well-trained, anti-socialist underground in Hungary" didn't read the Max Weiss' article on the "Peaceful Transition to Socialism"!!!

Counter-revolution is old-hat, boys. . . .

Everybody knows that Profs. Gates and Clark, et al have called off the class struggle. Everybody, that is, except the State Department lags who are running Project X, that \$100,000,000 a year graft-melon which Congress voted to "democratize" the "captive" nations of Eastern Europe will "well-equipped, well-trained anti-socialist underground."

It seems the Project X boys and the Horthy fascists just aren't taking part in our discussion, as they should be.

One thing though, you have to say for them; they're a lot smarter than we are. **THEY READ LENINISM, NOT GATEISM.**

STAN.

Reforms and Socialism

Editor, Daily Worker:

Max Gordon's articles on Socialism and Elections brought some needed clarity on one of the most crucial topics of the moment. But I feel that one of the reasons that many on the Left fail to go along with us in this analysis stem from an inadequate formulation of the relations of reform movements to socialism.

It is not enough to say, as Gordon does, that "at a particular stage in the struggle for reform, the victims, primarily on the basis of their own experience, arrive at the conclusion that those advocating revolutionary change are right, that such change is necessary."

Nor does Gordon's support for socialist agitation and education solve the problem. He is perfectly correct to note that such agitation is sterile if isolated from the political battles in which the workingclass is engaged. But it seems to me that the "stage" at which the workingclass will learn from its own experiences is left so vague as to cause legitimate feeling on the Left that we do not have any concrete program for bringing the masses to such a moment in history. In my opinion, we do not, in fact, have such a program.

The difficulty, it seems to me, stems from an inadequate definition of reforms. The immediate demands of the workingclass are

not necessarily reforms, in the sense that they are aimed at "reforming" the ills of capitalism so that capitalism will work. This is the classic aim of the reformists. But the immediate demands of the workers can also be made in the framework of a step by step elimination of capitalist exploitation itself. This, in the past, we have also and erroneously called reformism. But unless the struggle for immediate demands are made in such a framework, the workers' experience will never bring them to the realization of the need to change the system itself. To think otherwise is to rely on an idealist spontaneity that is alien to Marxism.

More specifically, it is not enough to fight against rent increases or for slum clearance without also raising the question of large-scale public housing. It is not enough to fight against rate increases for utilities without the same time fighting for public ownership of all utilities. It is not enough to fight for wage increases and shorter hours without raising the question of nationalization of industry, particularly in the basic industries or in industries such as textile where management constantly says it "can't afford" to pay more. It is not enough to fight for high parity without showing that nationalization of the land is the only real solution to the farm question.

We constantly say that socialism is not the issue. But in an economy as advanced as ours, socialism ought to be the issue. Not divorced from the immediate problems of the workers, but directly stemming from those problems. As far back as before the first World War and afterward such proposals as the nationalization of the banks, the railroads and public utilities were very much the issue. The Leftists of that time called this reformism. Revolution or nothing, they said. We've learned a lot since then about the need for mass struggle in the transition to socialism. What we have never learned, however, is how to propose concrete steps which constitute such a transition short of a proletarian government. Much can be learned in this respect from the "Labor Plan" proposed by Togliatti some two years ago for Italy. The time has come for some serious thinking on how to bridge the gap between the struggle for immediate demands—already on a very high level in this country—and the struggle for socialism—which, practically speaking, is non-existent in this country.—A. G.

Asks About Role of Russians in Hungary

Editor, Daily Worker:

I'm sending you a dollar for your fund drive. I want to express my appreciation for your newspaper, which I buy every day, not because of its quality but because it is the only Marxist daily which exists in America.

As everyone knows, there is much for which the Daily Worker can be criticized, but probably many of its faults could be eliminated if it had the necessary funds which make possible thorough and extensive reporting. Therefore I urged all readers to support our newspaper's financial state and its requests for money.

I must say that in the past week, I was somewhat disappointed by your coverage of events in Poland and Hungary. Aside from the fact that I tended to disagree with your editorials and was more in agreement with such views as were expressed in the letter by A.S. Oct. 25, still I am very critical of the fact that you failed to give a fair report of Russia's role in last week's events, and to mention that there was considerable action by Soviet troops in the quelling of Hungarian revolts. This omission persisted in today's paper despite Friday's NY Times' special mention of this evasion on your part. Why was there even no answer to the Times comment?—D.Z.

Charges DW With Pseudo-Theory

Editor, Daily Worker:

There is not a shred of doubt left that the Daily Worker no longer speaks for American Communists. The tactic of playing nip and tuck with pseudo theory and half truths has finally revealed itself shamelessly as the crudest and oldest form of renegacy.

The confusion which the Daily Worker has sown since it jumped on the Khrushchev-Tito band wagon, and joyfully set about to refashion the American Left, has been a bigger blow than Brownell could even have dealt us. It is not too late to rally around Comrade Foster and rid our party of all the manifestations of this vicious sell-out, and get back to serious business.—T. F.

Praises Honest Interpretation

Editor, Daily Worker:

At a time when the news from abroad is not only grievous, but confusing, the DW is to be commended for its sane, principled, honest interpretation of

these momentous events. I herewith enclose \$10 in the hopes that such sound Marxist reporting will continue.

The correctness of the DW's editorial stand is made all the more clear not only by comparison to the inflammatory wishful-thinking of the capitalist press that daily prays for an end to socialism everywhere, but also by comparison to the narrow dogmatic approach implicit in the letter by A. Unger. The printing of this letter in full was a wise stroke, for it exposed to public ridicule the absurdity of those blind souls whose religious attitude to the workingclass movement makes them long for the good old days when creative thinking was branded as provocation and the word of Stalin was substituted for scientific evidence.

Unger proceeds not from a scientific, objective analysis of what were the real relationships between the various socialist states, but from the dogma that the mere existence of countries oriented toward socialism would ipso facto produce such ideal relations. Unfortunately, the workers of Poznan, Budapest, and, yes, East Berlin before them, could not eat such dogma.

Unger tells us that the "socialist collaboration" between the Soviet Union and Poland placed severe burdens upon the Polish leaders. They were called upon, he tells us, to fulfill quota tasks in which they failed, with their failure resulting in suffering among the people. What rot! The burdens were not on the leaders, but on the masses. The quotas stemmed not from socialist collaboration, but from an imposition from without, which fulfilled or not, would not have satisfied the needs of the people.

And then he tells us that "there is not the slightest evidence of Russian interference with Polish sovereignty." Does Unger think that Khrushchev & Co. dropped in on the meeting of the Polish Central Committee merely on a social call? What would he call Bulganin's earlier advice to the Poles to curb their press? What, if not interference, was Stalin's appointment of a Soviet marshall, albeit Polish-born, to head the Polish Army? How, in fact, would he term Stalin's dissolution of the Polish C. P. before the war?

If the Soviet Union, rather belatedly and apparently incompletely, has learned the lessons of the tragic break with Tito, quite obviously Unger has not.

Finally, if Yugoslavia's economic recovery has been so dismal, one would need not only some data to back up this charge, but some explanation of why the Yugoslavs do not find circumstances so intolerable that they are ready, like the Hungarians, to lay down their lives to change the regime.

We are indeed fortunate that the lessons to be learned from these tragic days are being interpreted by such real Marxists as the editors of the DW and not left to those like Unger who only know how to repeat the catechisms from bygone days. Lenin wrote in "Left-Wing Communism" that after the victory of the proletarian revolution in at least one of the advanced countries, "Russia will soon after cease to be the model country and once again become a backward country (in the Socialist sense)." Perhaps the recent events may be proving the validity of this prediction of Lenin's.

—HANK

Rayburn Sees Demop Gains in Congress

WASHINGTON, Oct. 31—Speaker Sam Rayburn, told a news conference today that "every indication" points to continued Democratic control of both the House and Senate and by "a bigger majority vote than we control them now."

The Presidential contest, he said, will depend on "whether the people get off their chairs and vote."

NIXON IN HARLEM

Vice-president Richard M. Nixon spoke in Harlem last night in a major bid for the Negro vote.

Nixon said more progress has been made during the four years of President Eisenhower's Administration to end racial discrimination than since Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation.

Lehman Backs Proposal to Seek H-Test Curb

POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y., Oct. 31.—Sen. Herbert H. Lehman (D-NY) last night supported Adlai Stevenson's proposal to seek a halt of H-bomb tests.

Lehman said at a rally he agreed with Stevenson that "hiding our heads in the sand like ostriches while radio-active fall-out continues to contaminate the atmosphere of the earth is dangerous and senseless."

He said the U. S. must continue to experiment and conduct atomic research as well as seek an agreement with Russia and all other nations to stop H-bomb tests.

"The two are not consistent," he said. "The absolutely worst thing we can do is to do nothing, while continuing the H-bomb tests. . . ."