

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

On Ford's Proposal

Editor, Daily Worker:

It was gratifying, after reading James Ford's appeal to have leaders voice their opinions and differences, to see him lead the way with a concrete proposal reflecting his own thinking.

All this is to the good, and I hope other leaders will follow Ford's example and let the membership know concretely how they propose to improve our Party. Having said this, however, I must go on to say that I find Ford's specific proposal, namely, that there should be a Deputy Secretaryship set aside for a Negro member, to be completely un-Marxist.

I fail to see how the Soviet Union can be criticized for having a quota system toward Jews in leading positions—certainly a vestige of Czarist anti-Semitism—while a "reverse" quota system is advocated here. Ford makes his proposal to answer those who say that Negroes have no voice in formulating the general policies of the CP. The fact that there are many capable Negro comrades in leading positions—and that no bars exist in our Party because of color—ought to be answer enough to such false critics.

But how about answering those who criticize the Party for racism on the grounds that we ask, on our registration forms, the color and national background of our members—which is contrary to the FEPC legislation we all advocate? Has not our policy of concentration on occasion led to the arbitrary advancement of some comrades because of race or national background, rather than on merit, and the exclusion of others from leadership for the same reasons? Would not a truly democratic attitude be to advance comrades to positions of leadership based on their proven abilities as leaders—and for no other reason?

Ford apparently has less confidence in the abilities of our Negro comrades to attain key positions on their own merits than many of the rest of us do, otherwise he would not have to propose a built-in guarantee. If, as a hypothetical example, he were complaining that a capable leader like a Jim Jackson had been kept from the general secretaryship because he is a Negro, though more capable for this post than, say, Dennis,

one could agree or disagree with the charge, but at least recognize that, if true, the issue raised would be a valid one. But to set aside a post in our Party for a Negro (or a Jew, or a "blond, Nordic type") not because a Jim Jackson or an Ed Strong is the best comrade available for it—which might well be the case—but because a Negro, any Negro, should have that post, is both irrational and undemocratic, if not actually a form of racism.

I hope that Ford's proposal is not adopted. —A.G.

Who Is Keeping Germany Divided?

Editor, Daily Worker:

Your editorial Aug. 9 on the unjustified accusation President Eisenhower made in his letter to Premier Bulganin that the Soviet government has failed to fulfill agreement reached at Geneva in July, 1955, regarding the unification of Germany, put the matter under sharp focus by stating that the Big Four adopted directives to their foreign ministers to consider "European Security and Germany" in that order.

But Secretary Dulles in his opening speech on the first day of the conference of foreign ministers outlined its three tasks as German unity, disarmament and East-West contacts. Intentionally or not he omitted saying anything about European security, the very thing the directives specifically listed for first consideration.

Washington correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, Joseph C. Harsh, in his piece, Further Thoughts on Geneva, Nov. 17, 1955, wrote: "... the outcome of this second Geneva conference is as Secretary of State John Foster Dulles planned it. . . . The purpose was to expose the full unwillingness, or inability, of the Soviets to accept the terms which the West proposes for the reunification of Germany. . . . The West presented proposals on Germany which every Western diplomat present at the conference knew in advance would be rejected. The Soviets were intentionally put on the spot."

And in the N. Y. Herald-Tribune, Oct. 24, 1955 the Alsop brothers expressed moral indignation with these words: "Hypocrisy is an ugly word. Yet, this is the only word that properly describes the Western Governments' approach to the Geneva

Meeting of Foreign Ministers."

Plainly enough, responsibility for a continued divided Germany is entirely theirs, for instead of a united Germany outside sectional military alliances and participating in a collective European security they insist on a remilitarized Western Germany in the anti-Soviet military organization called NATO.

TRUTH LOVER

A Backward Procedure

BUFFALO, N. Y.

Editor, Daily Worker:

I have recently heard some talk about having our Communist Party's national convention first, and then having our state, district, county, region, and section conventions. Can this be true? I can hardly believe it! But responsible people tell me that some of our leaders are considering this procedure, and that it's a real possibility.

That procedure would be dead wrong! It's backwards. Any organization in our country, and certainly our party, should hold its local conventions first, and national convention last. We should have our section conventions first, and every section should have a convention. Every section—should directly elect delegates to region, county, district (which ever division applies), and state. If possible, delegates should also be elected directly from sections to the national convention. If this would make too big a convention, then county, etc. conventions should elect national convention delegates. This way we will ensure a democratic convention—and one which will reflect the demand of the great majority of our members for big basic changes.

If you have the national convention first, who would elect the delegates? Who would instruct the delegates on how to vote on different issues? On who to vote for in different elections to national offices? It would result in a convention loaded with full time party functionaries, many of whom would not be elected in free section or county elections, though some would be, and who would simply not be representing the party membership. Such a convention would make a mockery of inner-party democracy, and result in a line being 'handed down' from the national leadership to the rest of us!

I think our national commit-

tee should immediately state their point of view or differing views on what should be the order of party conventions, and what party convention procedures should be. And if there are serious thoughts about reversing the democratic process by having the national convention first, let there be a national referendum in the party on that question.

I see where Fred Blair and other letter-writers want to get rid of shop clubs. Well, we have found industrial sections and shop clubs necessary forms for organizing our work in the shops and in the trade union movement. I think the main attention of Communists working in shops and unions should continue to be directed to those shops and unions, with few exceptions. Whether you call it industrial section or committee is unimportant. To pursue day to day coalition policies needs close and maximum attention—organized attention.

Fraternally,
STEELWORKER.

Criticizes Clark On Czechoslovakia

Editor, Daily Worker:

I am just wondering whether the Daily Worker should print what appears to me inane tirades against the Peoples' Democracies, which Joe Clark seems to be specializing in of late. I am sure many readers will find Sulzberger's column in the New York Times breezier on this score.

On Aug. 8 Clark devotes a good third of a page to a rather dull mish-mash concerning the Slansky trial, of which I am sure he knows less than of astrophysics. He was a correspondent in the Soviet Union, yet claims ignorance of what took place there, so what actually is his knowledge about Czechoslovakia? What does he know about the Field-Slansky frame-ups? Who perpetrated them and what role Project X played in this? How can he blame the Czech government for things of which he is utterly ignorant?

How sure is he that there were no Zionist-State Department plots and conspiracies against the People's Democracies? Didn't the State Department openly acknowledge that Zionists and Israeli government circles furnished valuable services in "helping us penetrate the Iron Curtain?"

His misgivings about truth

and justice and freedom in Czechoslovakia have the ring of the little boy who finally gains the courage to speak up. I would rather leave this question to our Czechoslovak comrades who, steeled in the struggle against fascism and war, should at least be as competent and as sensitive in defending the cause of justice and socialism as is Joe Clark.

In conclusion, let me note that Clark utterly misrepresented Arthur London's statement after his release, by a grave omission. Clark writes that "when asked why he made a false confession London said that he was tortured." But London said more than that. He stated explicitly to the press as he stated to Andre Wurmser, correspondent of Humanite, that the main reason he confessed was that he did not want to harm the party by exposing it in the eyes of the people as being guilty of lies and fabrications. I wish our progressives here possessed such loyalty to the cause of Socialism.

—MANNY M.

Nasser and Anthony Eden

PHILADELPHIA.

Editor, Daily Worker:

Sir Anthony Eden says that Nasser is a fascist. But it seems to me that Nasser has refused to be controlled by the dollar or the pound. He has allied himself with international socialism. This is the greatest force for righteousness in the world today. It is the force which Hitler deprecated as "the international Jewish, Communist conspiracy." Our Senator McCarthy also thinks of international socialism in such terms.

Furthermore, Nasser is a Semite. He is a native-born African.

As for Eden, he's an advocate of white supremacy, something like Hitler was. —F.H., Jr.

Daily Worker

Published daily except Saturday and Sunday by the Publishers New Press, Inc., 25 E. 12th St., New York 3, N. Y. Telephone ALgonquin 4-7954.

Reentered as second class matter Oct. 22, 1947, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

	3 mos.	6 mos.	1 year
Daily Worker only	\$4.00	\$7.00	\$12.00
SUBSCRIPTION RATES			
(Except Foreign)			
Daily Worker & Worker	4.75	8.00	13.00
The Worker	2.00	3.50	