

THE N.Y. POST AND THE DOGMA

By ALAN MAX

"DEATH OF A DOGMA" is how the N. Y. Post titled its comment on the recent events in Hungary. The Post asserts that the Communist Manifesto is now a lost cause. Moreover, says the Post, the Soviet action in Hungary "create" a great vacuum. In all the satellites—as in other realms—the fugitives from communism's dogmas seek new leadership and new hope. The test of our time is whether the free world can give them such leadership and such hope.

The question that arises is what "new leadership and new hope" is provided by the Post itself—let alone by what it calls the "free world"? If anyone, as a result of the events in Hungary—on which this column has had its say—were to turn away from the Communist Manifesto and look to the Post, what would he find? He would find the most



dreary apologetics for the infamous actions of the British and French imperialists, aided by the Ben-Gurion government of Israel, against the people and sovereignty of Egypt. The invasion of Egypt bears out the basic premises of capitalism described by Marx and Engels more than a hundred years ago. This explains why, although I often agree with the liberal position of the Post, I have little doubt that the future of the world will be shaped more by the authors of the Manifesto than by the publisher of our contemporary on West Street.

FURTHERMORE, when the Post sheds its tears for what it calls "the fugitives from communism's dogmas," it is painting a false picture of the situation—either deliberately or because it does not understand what is actually going on. What we have is not a "vacuum," as the Post calls it. On the contrary we have something very real, very substantial—a struggle for a correct policy.

This struggle is being carried on in the Communist parties of the countries of socialism, as well as in the other Communist move-

ments of the world. Since many of the Communist parties today are the leaders of their countries, this is no inner-party debate but a struggle in which whole nations are swept up and in which the entire workingclass of a nation plays its part.

Basically, it is a struggle against policies which have been harmful for the development of socialism and for policies which will truly promote socialism and achieve the fondest dreams of mankind. While "Stalinist" is not a scientific term, until a great deal more scientific thinking has been devoted to the subject, the easiest way to describe the struggle is that it is against the Stalinist policies of repression and unequal treatment of nations and for a policy of democratization of socialism and for national sovereignty.

THIS titanic struggle began in 1948 when one country of socialism—because of a special set of circumstances—was in a position to stand up against the Stalinist method of dealing with small countries. Under the leadership of Tito, Yugoslavia waged a heroic battle—with no help, let it be sadly recorded, from the

Daily Worker which for seven years in its ignorance and "without waiting for the facts," cheered on the Stalinist persecution through torture, frame-up and death for the true Communists in the People's Democracies.

A new stage in the struggle occurred in June of 1955 with the apology by the new Soviet leaders, led by Khrushchev, to Yugoslavia. Its eyes at last opened to some extent, the Daily Worker said in an editorial on June 6, 1955, eight months before the 20th Congress: "... undoubtedly these events will touch off a great and difficult process of study and self-critical review in Marxist and workingclass organizations everywhere. Much more remains to be said and will be said as time and events and study evolve and as the full implications of the joint statement unfold."

FOR myself, I have never doubted—at least since the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in February—what was the responsibility of a Marxist. This, in my opinion, was to throw oneself wholeheartedly on the side of the struggle against Stalinist methods and concepts. This

has meant to support, for example, the stand of the Yugoslav, Polish and Hungarian workingclasses for a democratic socialism and for the national rights of their countries. It has meant to support those tendencies and forces in the Soviet Union who want to carry on the process of de-Stalinization faster rather than slower, more deeply rather than superficially. Such an outlook does not by any means determine that a Marxist will be right at all times. But without such an outlook, in my opinion, it is impossible to move forward.

And the major responsibility of a Marxist here is to keep up the fight against the intervention in the lands of socialism by those reactionary and counter-revolutionary forces whom the Post attacks at home but to whom it often wishes a bon voyage for their adventures overseas.

There is nothing automatically self-correcting about socialism or the Communist movement. But the errors and set-backs do inevitably give rise to the forces which will fight for the correction. In this lies the hope and confidence for the future and the refutation of the note of doom sounded by the Post.