

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Ways to Help Daily Worker

Editor, Daily Worker:

Your front page fund appeal should quicken even the luke warm sympathizers—I am not lukewarm — without the Daily Worker I would feel as if I'm in a dark prison cell. Of course, I like the weekend paper too, but if I had to give up one of the papers it would not be the Daily Worker. If you cannot raise funds enough to publish both, I would suggest that the weekend paper be discontinued and concentrate on the daily paper.

Recently a dinner was given by the Sobell Committee at \$100 a plate—110 persons attended. Why can't our paper give such a dinner? I'm sure there must be 500 sympathizers in our New York boroughs, and in nearby Jersey, who would come to such a dinner and entertainment (no collections). Does this seem too ambitious? I don't think so. With the right kind of publicity, and given enough of time to publicize such a dinner it could be accomplished.

Also let every club give a party at some one's home and raise at least \$100. In the meantime, here's my check for \$25 to keep the presses rolling for "Freedom of the Press."—IDA.

Says Daily Too Great a Burden

Editor, Daily Worker:

BRONX.

The Daily Worker has a long and honorable record. It has nevertheless lost circulation seriously as the Communist Party itself has lost influence.

The CP and the paper may recover lost ground and win more, if conditions are properly utilized. This will at best require several years.

Meanwhile the dollars and cents cost of maintaining a daily paper must be weighed realistically. In my opinion it is a burden which has finally become too heavy to be justified by the benefits. To let the strand of heroic tradition snap is very sad indeed; but it seems to me necessary.

A daily paper is expected to furnish news. It is obvious, however, that our overworked team cannot begin to compete with the bourgeois press; does anyone depend on the Daily alone for news? No one we know of. A weekly paper is not expected to furnish news as such, primarily. Its job is interpretation of the events that should not wait on profound theoretical contributions. That is a very important function, and I can afford to pay for it.

I therefore propose that the Daily Worker be abandoned. I further propose that the editors submit a budget based on plans for a period of years. These plans should embrace the contributions. That is a very im-

portant function, and I can afford to pay for it.

I therefore propose that the Daily Worker be abandoned. I further propose that the editors submit a budget based on plans for a period of years. These plans should embrace the contributions of the professional staff, the best journalists, and those which can be enlisted on a volunteer basis from the grass roots.

—STANLEY ARCHER.

Action During Discussion

Editor, Daily Worker:

I read the Draft Resolution of the National Committee of the Communist Party. While there are some things I agree with, and others that I don't, I disagree with one thing and that is that the Draft Resolution says nothing, while we are discussing the Resolution, about how to test it in life.

Here are fundamental principles we all agree on:

1. We are all for Socialism in our country.

2. That without fundamental bourgeois democracy it is hard, especially in the U.S.A., to bring to the people, and to the workingclass, the message of Socialism. I have trust in the American workingclass, once they learn what it is all about. They have little love for American capitalism and the Cadillac Cabinet.

When they did not understand about Social Security and Unemployment Insurance, they were opposed to it. Then our Party championed these measures and brought them to the American workingclass they fought for them. Try to take these measures away from them now!

Our Party has a task before it to bring the ideas of Socialism before the American people. As I said without Democracy it is hard, and the capitalist class knows it well. That is why they try so hard to put us underground and make our Party illegal.

But the American people are a democratic people and have a belief that everybody has a right to say their piece. They are willing to fight to preserve democracy.

Why doesn't the resolution specify that our membership help these good people to achieve their aim.

For example:

The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee organized a meeting in the Bronx, at Hunts Point Palace for Oct. 19. At this time when the U.S. Supreme Court is reviewing the Smith Act membership clause and other laws. Then why is it that our people don't take the fight seriously, when other decent people, who are opposed to our Party, are willing to fight for democracy?

The Resolution should specify how to fight for freedom, and

give something for the people to do, not talk and demoralize themselves and others.

We all agree we need our press. We should begin to take assignments to sell and bring our press to the people. Let's begin with this little work while we are discussing our Resolution.

—BELLA.

Educational League Proposed

Editor, Daily Worker:

To conduct business as usual in the Communist Party is the surest way to liquidation of the party. It seems to me that under the guise of fighting against liquidation some of the same old bureaucracy is being maintained.

This revolutionary party seems to have very un-revolutionary ideas when the ideas pertain to the party organization itself. The Communist Party of the U.S.A. is not a political party as the people understand political parties. We have a two-party system. When a third party emerges, one of the two former parties disintegrates.

In many European countries many small parties function, but not in the U.S.A. We vote for and register as Democrats and Republicans and to most Americans it seems dishonest to vote for one party and belong to another.

We are not a labor party. We don't have the backing of organized labor. Nor would it be right to set up a labor party outside of labor organizations.

The National Committee's draft resolution says the proposal that the CP become a political action association is not justified by circumstances today even though it recognizes that it is not a "liquidationist" proposal. Just what has the CP U.S.A. been functioning as, if not as "political action association?" At least as Americans know a political action association to be?

Of course the American Communist Party should not and must not be dissolved with its membership scattered to the four winds. But is a Marxist Educational League a bad idea? We need to study the American road to socialism. Is this liquidationism, or a backward step? The party is dissolving itself due to dogmatic forms we use that cannot house creative American Marxist developments.

We need an organization, I think, built on American tradition and Marxist science to lead the American people toward socialism.—D.M.

No Pyrrhic Victories

Editor, Daily Worker:

I have just read the news story containing extended quotations from William Z. Foster's forthcoming article stating his

reasons for opposing the Draft Resolution of the Communist Party's national committee. Both the lack of opportunity as yet to read the full article and the lack of space make it impossible to discuss the article in substance.

But enough of Foster's views appear in the form of quotation to afford, at least for myself, a keen sense of disappointment.

What are the members of the Communist Party and the people, far greater in number than their own ranks, who support them looking for in this present crisis? What do they seek and what do they have a right to expect?

In my opinion, they seek and are entitled to a realistic estimate of both the failings and achievements of the movement, taking into account what the party itself has been and has done, and the historical conditions the party has faced.

They seek a leadership which unites the movement and which acts.

I regret that I find Foster's views wholly foreign to this spirit. Using the classic language of ideological combat, he finds groups and factions which he labels as "Right," "Browderist," etc., etc. He sets the tone for a bitter and protracted doctrinal struggle which, when the smoke of battle might eventually lift, would presumably find the victor present, and the vanquished fleeing from the scene.

This, in my opinion, is exactly what the majority of members and friends of the Party do not want. They would not want it from any source—be it from Foster or from some one whose views are exactly opposed to his.

Furthermore, it is this rigid, name-calling war for 1,000 percent doctrinal purity that has been one of the major reasons why Americans who would be our friends have been repelled by our movement.

No, I do not propose a namby-pamby refusal to argue out basic questions of policy. No, I do not propose a catch-all organization that has no direction, no program, no standards for membership.

But in my memory and in those of many others is, all too fresh the knowledge that yesterday's doctrinal opponent, virtually driven from our ranks by the fury of the attack upon him, is today's desired ally and tomorrow—maybe—the man who was right all along.

I think Foster's tone, if adopted as the style for the coming discussion around the Draft Resolution, would have a disastrous effect. The Communist Party leadership, whether we like it or not, is on trial before the men and women of the Left who have no stomach now for the old style, slambang, frenzied type of ideological debate, which divides rather than unites,

and which leaves bitterness in its wake.

There can be no victor in this kind of warfare, which would leave an already weakened movement prostrate. Let us, instead proceed to a sober discussion, free of recriminations and labels, that will strengthen the Party and hearten its friends.

—R.M.

Offer Courses On Science and Philosophy

Several courses in science and philosophy are among those still open for enrollment this week at the Jefferson School of Social Science.

B. Martin and several guest lecturers offer a comprehensive introductory survey course on the "Nature of the Physical World" on Tuesdays at 6:45 p.m.; Bernard Friedman teaches "Philosophy of Science" on Mondays at 8:30; and Harry K. Wells teaches "Psychology" on Wednesdays at 8:30 p.m.

Among the philosophy course are "What Is Philosophy?" with Howard Selsam on Mondays at 6:45 p.m.; "Dialectical and Historical Materialism," with Dr. Wells on Wednesdays at 6:45 p.m.; "Materialism and Idealism," with Dr. Selsam on Thursdays at 8:30; and "Philosophy of History," with Dr. Herbert Aptheker on Tuesdays at 8:30 p.m.

There is also a full-year Advanced Institute in Philosophy taught by Joseph Nahem on Wednesdays 6:45 to 10 p.m.

Many fall term courses are still open in the fields of American Society, History, Political Economy, Spanish, Literature, Music and Art. Class admission cards may be obtained at the Jefferson School, Sixth Avenue at 16th St.

Hollander

(Continued from Page 3) considerations. He added:

"I think Jacob Javits should be branded as one who has forfeited his liberalism. He should be exposed as much as possible. Unless you do, he will parade as a liberal."

Hollander said that Javits is apparently feeling himself weakened by his association with Nixon and that he ran to "papa" in Washington to seek some help from the President.

"I believe the people in New York will not elect a coat-tail candidate," he added.

The council heard a report of extensive preparations for the final month of the campaign of Stevenson, Kefauver and Wagner, and other labor-endorsed candidates. Five state-wide TV broadcasts and distribution of millions of pieces of literature were projected. Strong emphasis was put on all-out registration campaign this week.