

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Javits and Charney

Editor, Daily Worker:

It is possible for the UnAmerican Committee to conduct a "smear" campaign against Mr. Javits only because the idea is carried over from the heyday of McCarthyism that to associate with, or be supported by, communists make one a Communist. About this the Daily Worker on Sept. 6 page 5 says editorially:

"The next non-communist who answers such rumors, not by playing the witch-hunters game, but by condemning Red smears and red-baiting, will be performing a long overdue service to democracy and national sanity."

Mr. Javits, of course, played the witchhunters game; he is one of them. But read the same issue of the DW on page 3 where it is reported how George Charney (a Communist leader) also denied everything. Javits denied all to the Committee and Charney denied all to the Times.

McCarthy destroyed his own position when he accused the Democratic party of treason. Manning Johnson and Leonard Patterson ended their careers as stoolies when they accused Ralph Bunche. Perhaps the Un-American committee will choke on its accusations against Javits. But these things boomerang because they bring into opposition to the witch-hunters the powerful groups that are allied with the victims, and not at all because the Communist Party gives the victim a clean bill of health.

It is the duty of Communists to point out that all Americans should have the right to associate with and to accept the support of communists without themselves becoming communists. Charney did just the opposite and his action was wrong.

-W. B.

Calls for Defense of 'Speak Your Piece'

Editor, Daily Worker:

The continued existence of the "Speak Your Piece" is in great danger! This great breakthrough toward the real beginning and development of Marxist criticism and self-criticism is in serious danger of being wiped out overnight!

I have spoken to some members of the Daily Worker staff and they assure me that this, much against their wishes, is definitely a possibility (perhaps a stronger word is needed here.)

This situation derives from

one thing: the loss of financial support from readers in sufficient quantity and/or from a sufficient number of contributors so that the continued life of the Daily (which contains the "Speak Your Piece" page) is in the great danger of its existence.

Danger to the paper is at its greatest. Give, so that you may get for years to come!

SAUL GROSS

Urge Airing of Leaders Debates

Editor, Daily Worker:

At a recent meeting of our club, the members present decided to make the following request. The brevity of this letter is in no way to be construed as meaning that our discussions have been meager. On the contrary, we have discussed the three major reports - Dennis, Weiss and Lightfoot-as well as delving into a few basic theoretical works in an effort to do some constructive thinking and proposing.

The major thorn in our sides is that we have to read in the Post and Times that there are a number of varying "lines" being projected in the National Committee discussions. What we are asking (and this is the principle point of this letter) is that such differences be given a thorough airing via Party publications and Party ranks. To pursue any other path only deepens the poisonous pessimism which one hears all over, i. e., that the bureaucracy which riddled the Party is still very much with us, that the thinking of the lower ranks is not sought out, and the solutions are far away.

Our club consists of real stalwarts. We might add that we had raised real differences which apparently never got "passed on." We're not habitual gripers; we're habitual "do-ers" and are aching to help in solving the Party's present problems.

But the atmosphere of secrecy surrounding the National Committee's discussions must be removed, the differences thoroughly aired and discussed, if the coming National Convention and registration are to have any meaning in the Party's "closing ranks" and joining with the American people in the struggles facing all of us in the years to come.

We earnestly urge that the National Committee take the necessary vigorous steps to demonstrate that we're not only talking of democratizing the Party,

but actually moving rapidly in that direction.

-UPPER FORDHAM CLUB, BRONX COUNTY, C. P.

A Newspaper Collector

OWENSBORO, KY.

Dear Sirs:

I am 14½-year-old boy and have a hobby of collecting newspapers from all over the world.

Papers in 34 states, D. C., and 16 countries have sent me copies of their publications.

I would be very grateful if you would send me a copy of the Red Daily Worker to add to my collection.

Thankfull yours,

-PERRY POWELL

P. S.-Am interested in getting some iron-curtain papers. Could you inform me as to how to obtain some, such as Izvestia and Pravda.

New Leadership Held Main Need

Editor, Daily Worker:

Bill Norman (8/19) complains about our having taken over the Russian kind of party, lock, stock and barrel. He and others hold that the special kind of party was suited to Russian conditions but not to ours. The fact is that it was designed to do a job which other kinds of parties failed to do. Because of objective conditions we have failed with both kinds, the Debs S.P. and our own C.P. Poor leaders are now blaming their instruments. When we have U.S. Marxists who can out-Lenin Lenin they may come up with a better form of organization.

What our leaders are now taking over are the implications of the personality cult, and tying it to Foster where it assuredly does not belong. G. P. (8/30), having given up his job and held himself unavailable, returns to find he accomplished little and won no praise. He is bitter and his petulant attack against Foster tells us more about G.P. than about Foster. Specifically, who prohibited G.P. or anyone from discussing Foster's Marxist contributions to the U.S. scene?

After the self-confessed and self-evident bankruptcy of our sad leaders, after the U. S. revisionism, opportunism and gradualism of Hillquit, Jewish Daily Forward, Thomas, Lovestone, Browder, Dennis, Weiss and the rest, what we need are new leaders. The coming convention must be organized and con-

ducted to permit our incomparable rank and file to elect leaders who will establish collective leadership, and in the U. S. tradition of Debs, Ruthenberg and Foster, incorruptible leaders schooled in the class struggle, who do not whine when the job becomes tough, and who follow no mirage beyond the confines of the class struggle.

Let us hope we can find a way to retire the present incompetent incumbents without their finding the need to justify themselves by organizing splinter sects. But retire them we must. This requires a convention not for the press but one which comrades in industry can attend.

-J. W.

Objective Conditions

NEW JERSEY.

Editor, Daily Worker:

While apparently there are some differences of opinion among the leaders of the Party on questions of policy, on one question at least there appears to be unanimity. Beginning with the Dennis report to the National Committee, continuing with the state leaders that I have heard in New Jersey, and now the ultimate of this concept in the article written by William Z. Foster in the Worker of 8/26, they all sing one tune, "Objective Conditions are either largely or entirely responsible for our isolation."

Since the most important question that we face today is "HOW TO OVERCOME OUR ISOLATION"?, the first step to determine is what is primarily responsible for it.

Objective conditions determine the ebb and flow of mass movements; but to mechanically state that it determines whether the Party of the working-class is an intrinsic part of these movements, whether on the ebb or flow, is to deny the active role both of ideas and the political party of the workingclass, in society. It is therefore not Marxism, not historical materialism, but mechanical materialism.

Furthermore if the concept that objective conditions are responsible for our isolation is true, then why all the fuss and fury of the present discussion. Let us all give our pencils, pens and typewriters a rest and simply wait for more favorable objective conditions.

Now to some concrete questions in relation to our own policies and methods of work in this past period. It is undeniable that because of the persecutions we went through some people left the Party. However it is deniable that all of them, especially those

that had the best mass connections, left because of this.

Many of them left because they felt that the sectarian policies of the Party and its methods of work would isolate them; they felt that our methods did not provide the necessary security for the continuation of their mass work.

Furthermore they felt that there were no avenues open within the Party where they could frankly express their opinions and have them given due consideration. Instead they were vilified by the Party leaders and where they persisted in their opposition to wrong policies and especially where they were critical of the leadership, many were expelled. Actually many felt that with the situation that existed in the Party they could do much better outside the Party on their own.

Can Foster, and these other comrades deny that in relation to our policy on the Progressive Party we broke a basic principle of mass work by in effect taking the more advanced people and workers out of the mainstream of the political movement and thus isolating them?

Can Foster and these other leading comrades deny that the same thing was true in relation to our Trade Union policy and tactics, our sectarian and expedient (pragmatic) methods of work both mass and inner party, bureaucracy of the leaders, refusal to allow differences of opinion, etc.

Furthermore what is the explanation of these comrades of the developments in the area in which I work in the same objective condition, where given a change in Party leadership, a change in policies and methods of work, we have in the past four years moved in a direction away from isolation, increased our forces in the key shops in the area, participated in and in many cases shared leadership of the mass movement, such as strike struggles, struggles within the plants and the Unions, struggles for civil rights and the rights of the Negro people, etc.

Furthermore we increased the circulation of the Daily and Sunday Worker, recruited some people into the Party, etc. I understand that in some other areas there were similar movements of such a nature.

It seems to me that such leaders living in their own particular dream worlds either cannot or do not want to see that the things mentioned above plus many more shortcomings and weakness of the Party and in the first place the Party leaders are responsible for our isolation.

-George Samson.

The Lot of the Negro School Teacher

ST. LOUIS, Sept. 9 (FP).-The lot of the Negro school teacher in certain parts