

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

## Urges "Friendly But Not Slavish" Policy

NEWARK, N.J.

Editor, Daily Worker:

Ever since the 20th Congress, every serious minded, socialist thinking individual has been pondering the meaning of the revelations exposed by the Central Committee of the CPSU.

Whatever differences exist among us, I am sure that we all share the conviction that the brutal repressions, the stifling of freedom, the glorification of individuals as contrasted to the development of the collective, are distortions of socialism, and must be combatted resolutely by every Communist Party throughout the world. It is in the light of the 20th Congress that I wish to address myself to the recent tragic events in Hungary, and the responsibility of our Party in interpreting these events to the people of our own country.

I share the thinking of the Daily Worker and the National Committee statement that the source of the problems in Hungary is to be found primarily in the mistakes made by the government and the Party in Hungary in the building of socialism, growing out of rigidly following the path of the party in the Soviet Union, without taking into account the national characteristics of its own country.

Contributing to this was the unequal relations between the parties of the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Democracies, dramatized most sharply by the break with Yugoslavia, the Rajk trial, etc. If the working class, the peasants, the youth and the intellectuals in Hungary had been convinced that the party and the government were following a correct path, were learning the lessons of the 20th Congress, all the machinations of American imperialism could not have produced the situation that arose.

It is also my belief that what started out to be a revolutionary situation in the interests of socialism was also to be turned into a counter-revolutionary movement because of the failure of the Hungarian Party to meet the needs of its people resolutely and in time. It is within the context of this following of the party to heed and give leadership to the justified demands of the people, that fascist elements, imperialist agents, were able to operate effectively. My thinking is that once the situation reached the stage of deterioration where socialism in Hungary was threatened, the Red Army, acting in the interests of protecting the national borders of the Soviet Union, and to prevent the establishment of an anti-Soviet government, had little alternative but to move in.

At best, this is a sorry solution to a sorry state of affairs. If socialism is to be saved in Hungary, the program announced by the new provisional government must be put into effect immediately, and eventually the Soviet troops must be removed. Moreover, relations between the governments and parties of the Soviet Union and Hungary (or for that matter any other nation) must be established on the basis of true equality, and not of subjection.

I am convinced that our party statement, and the line of the DW editorials, in the main has been in the interests of international solidarity and not anti-Soviet, as some readers charge. If we are to learn the lessons of the 20th Congress, it seems to me that what we must defend is socialism, but not distortions of socialism. In our country, ever since its founding, the working class and its allies have been engaged in a constantly expanding battle for democracy. In the last few years, ever expanding num-

bers of people have participated in a struggle against McCarthyism. The Negro people are fighting like they never fought before for equality on all fronts; they are being joined in the fight by increasing numbers of white allies.

Can we win the American people for socialism, which we interpret as a higher form of democracy, unless we come out critically against policies which violate the civil rights and liberties of individuals, and the national independence of states? Can we convince the people of America that socialism will provide them with a better life by simply and uncritically defending every move, every position, every practice of the Soviet Union? I think not. In examining the history of our party must we not say that this has been our practice in the past which helped to isolate us from the American people?

If we are going to stand on our own feet as a party, it is not enough to review our past errors, but more important, that we present a current policy which corrects past mistakes. To my way of thinking, the critical analysis of the recent events in Hungary as expressed through the National Committee statement and the DW editorials, represents the kind of position which can cement our ties with the American people, and begin to win adherents for socialism, socialism which is liberating, democratic, and which will represent the flowering of the aspirations of our people for a better life.

I am convinced that the American people, in their desire for peace, can be won for American-Soviet friendship. It is my conviction that a policy towards the Soviet Union which is friendly, but not slavish, puts our party in a better position to convince the American people of this necessity. Our party, in presenting a policy which is based upon the interests of the American people for peace, economic security and democracy, which allies itself with the democratic aspirations of people throughout the world, can never be anti-Soviet.

A policy which attempts to correct distortions of socialist principles is not anti-Soviet—it is based upon the lessons of the 20th Congress as developed by the party of the Soviet Union, and is the best guarantee of winning new friends in our country towards friendship with the Soviet Union, and for socialism in the U.S.A.—J.M.B.

## Jackson Explains Qualifications on N.C. Vote

Editor, Daily Worker:

In reply to several inquiries as to the nature of my qualifications re the statement of the National Committee on the events in Hungary, I wish to state the following:

My reservations about the C.P. National Resident Board statement on the Hungary events was to register my concern that the statement did not adequately take into account the following considerations:

1. The statement leaves in doubt the integrity of the Soviet government's motivation in responding to the ill advises of the Gero or Nagy government to use Soviet troops to police the demonstrating crowds.

2. The statement's correct criticism and identification of the main roots of the tragic degeneration of Party and Government authority in Hungary was lacking in a sharply defined world working class partisanship in respect to the Socialist countries. Consequently, the just criticism of the error of the Soviet Government in permitting its troops to be used initially in the

Hungarian crisis takes on the hostile tone of a polemic against the CPSU and the leadership of the Soviet Union.

3. While correctly criticizing the decision taken by the Soviet Government to employ its troops in the first instance (as the action of the Soviet Government acknowledged by withdrawing its troops from Budapest and entering negotiations with the Nagy government to withdraw all troops from the country), the statement did not put forth at what precise level in the deteriorating picture, it might become proper for Soviet troops to perform a policing function in such a sovereign sister state as Hungary.

4. I did not associate myself with the blanket endorsement of the editorial commentaries of the Daily Worker on these events.

That my reservations about the issuance of such a statement at a moment when war raged against Egypt with two of the Big Four Geneva peace pledgees in the role of active aggressors has merit, is attested to by the fact that 18 nations representing the majority of the world's population abstained from voting to put the question of Soviet action in Hungary on the agenda of the United Nations.

I consider the bold positive and unequivocal stand of the Soviet Union for the defense of Egypt against aggression renders a powerful service to the cause of world peace and the independence of militarily weak countries and the cause of colonial liberation.

In the circumstances, I wish for the transitional Kadar government all success in fulfilling its program for reconstruction of the damage done and for creating the conditions for the people to move ahead with the restoration of social progress in Hungary.

James E. Jackson,  
Alternate-Member,  
National Comm. CPUSA

## Second Editorial and N.C. Statement on Hungary

Editor, Daily Worker:

I am writing to second the statement of the National Committee of the Communist Party in Monday's Worker supporting the popular demands of the Polish and Hungarian people and criticizing the Soviet Union for its intervention. I understand this statement was issued before the renewed Russian intervention in Budapest, but it is obvious that this can only only strengthen the Committee's statement.

It is not easy for a progressive or a CP member to condemn outright the action of the Soviet Union, which has led us all on the road to socialism. I realize that the events in Hungary have been confused, that many forces and groupings were in action there, that there has been brutality on both sides. Only the greatest patience and goodwill and skilled statesmanship could have brought Hungary to peace and democracy again. But it seems apparent that this was not tried. Socialist democracy is not to be imposed by tanks and phosphorus bombs.

It is also evident that the statements of the Moscow radio—that the Hungarian uprising was a fascist conspiracy and the Red Army was defending the Hungarian people—are not true. Undoubtedly, there were groups with fascist leanings, and admittedly there was savagery in the fighting. But in no statement that I saw from the rebels was there definite repudiation of the socialist trend of Hungary. There seemed to be no popular feeling against socialism—except in the cases of some unpopular measure like collectivized farming—which should probably not have been introduced at this

stage, anyway. The uprising seemed to be directed chiefly against the repressive security police and against the Soviet soldiers, who represented to the Hungarian workers a foreign force which protected or enforced repression.

Whether the Soviet troops were justified in putting down popular demonstrations at the Hungarian government's request is, as the N.C. statement says, doubtful. But there can be doubt that they were not justified in moving in, against the pleas of the government, attacking an open city, overthrowing that government, and establishing one of their—not the Hungarian people's—choosing.

I believe events have proved that Eugene Dennis was mistaken in opposing the NC statement. He mentions the responsibility of the Hungarian Party—which is correct. But obviously, the Hungarian Party was not to be allowed to correct its mistakes—the Soviets moved in. He also emphasizes the October 31 statement of the Soviet Union on relations with Socialist countries. We all welcomed that statement—but the Soviet Union has thrown it overboard.

It may be asked—Do I believe the Soviet Union should have played no role at all in these events. No, I don't believe that. The USSR had a right and duty to take a certain part. First, it had the right, and the duty to all working people, to see that a fascist regime did not come to power in Hungary. Second, it had the right, assumed by all powerful countries, to make sure no unfriendly government took office so near its borders. But to have taken this part correctly, it should have given all possible support to the Nagy government, even to the anti-socialist elements, so long as they maintained democratic government. It might correctly have used the Red Army to maintain order to prevent killing, to seal off the rebel strongholds—but only under the command of the Hungarian army and the Hungarian government—and strictly as a police force. Whether this could have been done without inflaming the Hungarian people still further. I don't know, but I think it would have been possible, had it been continuously emphasized that they would leave as soon as peace was restored.

And on the second point, full diplomatic pressure could have been put on the Hungarian government to affirm its ties with the Soviet Union and to make sure that no measures were taken which could threaten Soviet security. No one could have criticized the Soviet Union for demanding such assurances. President Eisenhower, in his statement last Wednesday, recognized its right to them, and offered to give them. Maybe the Soviets didn't trust that—but surely a friendly socialist government with the implied approval of the U.S. is a better guarantee of peace in Eastern Europe than a regime imposed by foreign tanks and guns over the censure of the United Nations.—A.S.

## Disagrees with Editorial And CP Statement

Detroit, Mich.

Editor, Daily Worker:

We are extremely disturbed by your over-eagerness to criticize fellow-Communists in other lands; by your overwhelmingly negative approach.

We disagree with your editorial stand and that of the National Committee statement, which place main stress on the mistakes made under Stalin and Rakosi, while playing down the role of the Horthy fascists, the Mindszenty Project X etc.

(though Dennis thought the stress was too little!)

You even play down news stories which don't fit into your scheme of things.

And then you play up news stories which suit your position, but which we consider a disgrace to working class internationalism. To wit: In Monday's paper, the five-column, page one head: Ike Wires Bulganin, Urges Soviet troops Quit Hungary."

In our opinion, the N.C. statement should not have started off with an explanation of events in Hungary. Certainly, in making that explanation, a large portion of the blame must be placed on errors by the Hungarian Communists who were unable to build socialism on a democratic basis. But there should be more recognition, too, that it takes more than 11 years—even given the best of leadership—to eradicate the centuries-old poison of anti-Semitism, to combat the reactionary hold of the Catholic hierarchy and to make human beings of former fascists. Moreover, the party leaders in the new democracies were faced with a terrific problem: How to develop heavy industry, how to maintain armaments in the face of dangerous hostility from the capitalist world—and still elevate living standards.

But to return to the N.C. statement. The explanation is secondary. What is most needed immediately is a pro-socialist consideration of the immediate situation. And that surely involves solidarity with those who are giving their lives to stop the re-birth of fascism.

Shall we say it isn't fascism—despite the brutal murders of communists, the desecration of anti-Nazi war monuments, the pogroms—simply because it has a mass basis?

Hitler had a mass following too. Perhaps the Red Army should have stopped its operations on the border of the Soviet Union, and resisted the temptation to drive on to Berlin! Are we now to say that the Allies should not have thought they were "liberating" the German people because the German people had no conscious desire to be so liberated? Should we have worried more about the fact that the Red Army's arrival in Germany—in the words of the N.C. statement on Hungary—was "not in accord with the wishes" of the German people?

—A group of Michigan Readers

## Says Nagy Aided Reactionaries

Editor, Daily Worker:

Nagy by giving in to the clerical fascists showed he was incompetent, a weakling and a collaborationist. The situation in Hungary arose when the proper Lenin-Marxist principles were not applied, or effectively applied. When this was recognized the party was too slow to rectify excesses.

The forces of clerical fascism encouraged by outside help took full advantage of the incorrect steps taken by the Nagy government to try to wrest power and turn the people away from the Soviet government.

Clerical forces in Hungary are controlled by the worst reactionaries who instill fear in the masses and keep them ignorant, namely Mindszenty. It has been well demonstrated that giving democracy to fascists is giving them license to destroy that democracy and where there is a true democracy there are not many fascists.

The Hungarian people should not allow the fascists to destroy them and should welcome the Soviets as their saviors instead of the fascists. The American newspapers call them rebels or freedom fighters but I have another name for them. It all depends on who does the name calling.—G.L.