

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

## Supports N. C. Position on Hungary

Editor, Daily Worker:

The Section Committee of the Greenwich Village Section of the Communist Party wishes to announce that a meeting this week it discussed at length the resolution of the National Committee on recent events in Hungary which was reprinted in the DW, Monday, Nov. 5th.

The Section Committee by a vote of 9 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstentions, voted to endorse fully the position of the National Committee—with the following addition:

That the National Committee immediately act to bring its resolution up-to-date in the light of subsequent events by condemning the new intervention of Soviet troops into the internal affairs of Hungary and the Soviet Union's violation of its own statement of October 31.

Section Committee of the Greenwich Village Section CPUSA

## Steve Nelson's 'New Thinking'

Editor, Daily Worker:

Alan Max and the other editors of the Worker must feel very sure of their position regarding events in Poland and Hungary to deem it necessary to balance views of "some readers" re those events, with "new thinking" by Steve Nelson in the Worker of Nov. 4.

It is not my intention here to discuss the line pursued by the D.W. The rapidity of events, lack of facts, the serious mistakes committed by Socialist governments, no doubt place a tremendous burden on the editors of the D.W. who must speak up daily.

Yet, I must say, that in my opinion, in their anxiety to correct a wrong, the editors of the D.W., at times go off the deep end. I suppose that is part of human nature. Whether it is Marxism and consistent with socialist principles of international class solidarity is another story.

According to Max, Nelson said:

"To insist, as they did, (meaning the Soviet leaders) that Marshall Rokossovsky must be a member of the political bureau of the Polish Communist Party, showed a terrible lack of understanding by the Soviet leaders of Polish national pride."

Leaving aside for the moment Nelson's and the Soviet leaders' understanding of the national question, I should like to ask:

Where did Nelson get the information except from speculations in the commercial press? Did he get the information from the Polish party? Did Gomulka accuse the Soviet leaders on this score? From the Polish press reprinted in this country?

Or is this part of Nelson's "new thinking"?

But Nelson has some "new thinking" on Hungary too.

Again, according to Max, Nelson said:

"While the Nagy government faces great difficulties in Hungary, it appears to have a correct policy."

Nelson hardly had time to reach the subway from his interview with Max when the press and radio announced that Nagy was asking the Big Four powers to "guarantee" the independence of Hungary. The big powers, including France, Britain and the U.S. I suppose the kind of independence that Britain offered the Greek people, following World War II. Or the kind of independence that Britain and France are offering today to the people of Egypt, North Africa, Algeria, etc. etc. Or the kind of independence that the U.S. is offering to the people of Puerto Rico.

Isn't it possible for a genuine people's movement to be di-

verted along anti-working class, anti-socialist lines?

Even Tito seems to be worried about the turn of events in Hungary.

Thus, a story from Belgrade in the N. Y. Times (Nov. 4) informs us that Yugoslav newspapers, noted gloomily that the Nagy government, "granted significant concessions to different political and other groups."

And, in the same story from Belgrade, a quote from "Ve-cernie Novosti" stated editorially:

"Legalization of the return to power in Hungary of destructive and anti-Communist elements could bring the country to a new catastrophe. Further concessions to those elements could threaten the positive accomplishments of the Hungarian people in recent years.—M.D.

## Khrushchev Blamed

Editor, Daily Worker:

It must now be obvious to all that Socialism has recently suffered catastrophic defeats. And the end is not in sight. And the cause of it all? I think, aside from errors in different places made later on each particular scene of action (Hungary, Poland, etc.) by a disoriented and confused leadership, one must go for it to its original source—Khrushchev's Stalin-assaulting speech at the 20th Congress.

My feeling persists that the man is a bungler. When he set out to expose the errors of Stalin be right then and there committed the most staggering and colossal blunder himself. For when, in the space of time that took to say it, he transformed Stalin from a God to a man meaner even than the devil, he tore the ground from under Communism across the world.

The earth-wide love and support that its friends bore the Soviet Union and the great respect that even those who disagreed with it had for that country were drowned together in the same pool, supposedly filled with clean, clear and healing water but actually churning with the most deadly and poisonous swill.

You cannot take a man who for years was consistently built up as successful Communism's symbol, as a beneficent giant toiling prodigiously in behalf of the human race, cause him to be adored; then in one sudden moment present him to these same admiring millions as a foul, a most fearful being, guilty of murder, frame-ups, etc.

What did Khrushchev think? He would tell the world's Left how bad Stalin was and how good he is going to be and everybody would cry: Down with Stalin! up with Khrushchev?

And that everything would immediately be at its best in the best of all possible worlds? You cannot do such mammoth violence to the human spirit and expect sunshine and roses, a peaceful and fruitful dawn to flow from it.

What should have been done? As I stated in a letter to this paper immediately after the 20th Congress: when it was recognized that the time was ripe, or overripe, for changes within the Soviet Union as well as in its relationship with its neighbor Socialist countries, it should have introduced such changes, step by step, testing them, consolidating after each step; and as regards changes affecting other countries, such changes should have been made in consultation and agreement with the countries concerned. And all this taking place while the prestige of Communism, as represented by the Soviet Union, stood high and had not suffered a catastrophic moral wound!

Stalin's errors, his greatness or his wickedness, could have been dealt with at a later period, gradually, when the new stage

of development in the Socialist sphere had sprung forward, enriched with new successes, stood firm and internally secure; when any revelations then made about Stalin would not pull the bottom out of the Communist ship and leave everybody floundering except the busily waiting and well-organized enemies of Socialism who everywhere would leap forward to take advantage of the situation.

Churchill once said: "He was not appointed the King's Prime Minister to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire."

Will Khrushchev preside over the dissolution of the Socialist Brotherhood?—A. S.

## Wants News of All Communist Parties

Editor, Daily Worker:

Just a brief note to express my reaction to what I see to be a trend in reportage of newspapers and which should be given serious consideration. I note today reaction of Norwegian CP on Hungarian situation. This is important to know. It is also, however, important to know reactions of all Marxist parties throughout the world as we so seriously deliberate the question in our CPUSA.

I have differences, but have not been in basic disagreement with the political line of the DW on Hungarian situation, although at present I think it calls for a second look and probably a re-estimation in the light of a changing historical situation. What disturbs me, however, is a reportage which is obviously slanted, by the process of omission, a reportage which gives only or mainly those estimates which coincide with the thinking of the editors.

This is neither a policy of integrity, nor is it one conducive to true independent Marxist thinking. It is not respectful of the readership of the paper. Is this in the spirit of a new democratic process in our organization and press?

—A Brooklyn Reader.

## Books for Holiday Gifts

Editor, Daily Worker:

Dropping in at the Workers' Bookshop, 50 East 13 St., New York City, the other day, I saw an array of new volumes to satisfy all tastes in Christmas and New Year giving. You can find a book there for anyone from Aunt Cora down to Johnny in kindergarten.

First to catch my eye was Sean O'Casey's great autobiography, all six books now bound together (and boxed) in two volumes entitled *Mirror in My House*. Agnes Smedley's *The Great Road: The Life and Times of Chu Teh* is there—a book to arouse those who may be pessimistic about the world.

Marian Anderson's *My Lord, What a Morning*; Emma Lazarus, by Eve Merriam; Elizabeth Gurley Flynn's *I Speak My Own Piece*; and Joe North's *Robert Minor* are among the fine biographies and autobiographies. *Labor's Untold Story* by Dick Boyer and Herbert Morais with its lively and inimitable profiles, shows the way labor history ought to be written.

Bargains are available, too—at reduced prices for some of the older books. Rose Baron, the able manager of the Bookshop, showed me also the prints by Hugo Gellert and by Mexican artists; *The People's Almanac*, compiled by Elizabeth Lawson and the Christmas and New Year cards from India and Latin America.

Whether you want Howard Fast's *Lola Gregg* or Bernard Shaw's *Life and Works* by St. John Ervine, or something quite different, you'll almost surely find it at this 13th St. Bookshop.

—GRACE HUTCHINS