

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Industrial Concentration

Brooklyn, N. Y.

Editor, Daily Worker:

I want to thank George Samson for his article "We Must Blame Ourselves for Our Own Isolation" in the Sunday Worker.

In the article which seemed very important to me was his statement that "in the reports made at the National Committee meeting there is not a single mention of the key question of concentration."

I appreciated Mr. Samson's thinking and writing about this. I would like to mention here that this was no news to many of us. We have been looking in vain for even passing mention of this for some time. This point, along with certain others, has been troubling many, many people. By the practices of the Party they have been lead to believe that this industrial concentration policy has either been completely abandoned or only very weakly supported.

I cannot conceive of this policy on the part of leadership stemming from an abandonment of the working class since we still believe that the working class is the class which will lead the American people to Socialism. I can only conclude that the Party is looking for new paths to reach masses of people and that until they find them they will not give support to old policies, whether they are still valid or not.

However, complete lack of mention of this important question points to leadership's lack of contact even with its own members. I've heard this question discussed so often, especially since the 20th Congress, by rank and filers that I am convinced by the quantity and quality of these discussions that it is not simply the rank and filer's lack of distinction between what is or is not important at this time but the leader's failure to listen and perhaps learn from us and our experiences.

I might add here that we feel no particular strength from our leadership on this important question; in fact leadership is serving to confuse and even to cause many good people to depart from perhaps very good directions by their completely hands off policy on this question.

Even if we are thinking in terms of a mass socialist party in the near future this policy of industrial concentration can only

help to make this more achievable.

If we are abandoning the policy of industrial concentration we must know why. To abandon it on the basis of omission is not a principled nor fruitful way of doing it. Therefore, we would like to see some discussion on it.

-J. E.

Article Held Not Based on Reality

CHICAGO.

Editor, Daily Worker:

In the Daily Worker for July 10, William L. Patterson discusses the effect by a government agency to deprive Communist leaders of Social Security benefits. He calls this effort a major attack on popular rights which, if successful, would have developed into fascism.

Mr. Patterson then attributes defeat of this effort to direct intervention of the people. He writes that "Hundreds of letters to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare came from Americans awakening to the menace of this national hysteria."

Alone among socialist groupings the Communist Party has tried seriously and consistently over the years to reach the average person with careful analysis presented in clear, popular language. But sometimes the goal of convincing a reader and stirring up his emotions is put ahead of everything else. Agitation takes a degenerate form. It becomes a string of cliches. Scholarly analysis, such as we usually find in the writings of Herbert Aptheker or George Morris, is replaced by "salesmanship." Irresponsible huckster methods, learned from the ruling class are used.

I think that Mr. Patterson's article is an example of huckstering. In order to make a dramatic impression, he carelessly advances an utterly false evaluation of the Social Security issue. He presents a hysterical picture of the national scene and dangerously confuses reaction in general with fascism. He evokes fictitious mass pressure ("hundreds of letters") to stave off a supposed immediate danger of fascism.

My main point is that huckstering, directed exclusively toward immediate results, is a creation of the ruling class. It is an example of the pragmatic method and not the scientific method.—H.K.

Ideological Weaknesses

Editor, Daily Worker:

A study of the experiences of the CPSU is clearly helpful to us. Nevertheless, the basic explanation for our errors does not lie in those made by the Soviet Union; ours were the errors of U. S. Marxists, flowing mainly from conditions here. Khrushchev's reports have accelerated the rectification of our shortcomings, discussions on which have been in progress for some time, particularly since the Draft Program.

One weakness which has an important bearing on our errors is our ideological level. Many of us would be hard-put, after years of activity, to define "ideology." Even when we give it consideration, it often ranks after politics and organization. Many a "Party Voice" or P. A. article lists program, organization and ideology as problems, but too often deals with the first two while paying lip-service to the "idea" of the latter.

An instance of our backwardness is the fact that one of the few recent contributions produced by our movement in this sphere—"Pragmatism," by Wells, published two years ago—has not yet been reviewed in P. A.

In raising our ideological level, self-study is important. Group study and self-study are a

reciprocal process. But self-study (assisted by party guidance) must be viewed as the main form of study, a key part of our long-range ideological remodeling.

—I. and E.

Japanese Elections

Ohio

Editor, Daily Worker:

I am sure your error in reporting the Japanese elections was due to a little bad figuring, but nonetheless you short-changed both the Communists and the Socialists in your report.

I quote, "The Communist Party doubled its vote over 1955, receiving 2,138,228 votes or 4 percent of the total. The Socialists, who received the support of the Communists in most districts, got 11,154,735 votes of the total 29,713,426 cast, or 37.5 percent."

Now, if you will just get out your pencil and paper, you'll find if you make no mistakes that the Communists got 7.19 percent; the Socialists, 38.21 percent and that the combined Socialist-Communist vote was 45.4 percent of the total, which is such a formidable figure it should have headlined the article.

—J. M.

Marcellino's Reactions

Editor, Daily Worker:

Two small but important experiences in the past week move me to write my first letter to the DW.

Jesus Colon's column, "Marcellino," conveyed to me a profound human-political message. Marcellino, the Puerto Rican Communist seaman, whose entire life is an intimate part of our workingclass movement, ponders the present-day problems facing our Marxist movement in the U.S.A.

In this period of thoroughgoing evaluation of past achievements and mistakes, Marcellino symbolizes the American Communist. He does not have the answers yet; he is deeply troubled by past mistakes; he is also confused in the face of a host of practical and theoretical problems which our life has posed for us—BUT—as a Communist worker, he is determined to overcome all obstacles to building the workingclass movement.

Each period poses its own historical problems. Ours is no different. On the contrary, today's horizons loom infinitely brighter than those of the past—because today, the reality of achieving Socialism through peaceful means is more possible than ever before! —I. L.

A NEW READER WRITES TO US

Among several letters received by the Daily Worker business office in recent days, this one is typical:

"I have been an interested spectator for approximately eight years of the Socialist movement in America, and am most interested in the views of the Communist Party, in the light of recent changes in policy.

"For that reason I feel that your newspaper would be of great interest in this period of my social development.

"My interest in left wing politics has been much helped in the past through an active participation in the union movement as rank and file organizer and first elected official of a United Auto Workers local in Flint.

"Four dollars is enclosed. I understand this will cover a 3-months subscription."

The letter reveals one facet of the Daily Worker's part in the vast re-thinking process among America's, and the world's, Marxists, one which is necessarily having an

impact among many non-Marxists. As the process develops, we believe many progressive, militant workers will join in.

It is not too much to say that this would be far harder to achieve, and the process itself would suffer, if there were no Daily Worker.

And yet, at this critical moment in our history, the Daily Worker is financially on the ropes and its ability to remain in the ring is questionable. For the past three months, the Emergency Committee for a Free Press has been engaged, in our behalf, in trying to raise \$100,000. This we figured was the very minimum needed to keep us going until Labor Day. Actually, in the light of the need to meet past obligations, it is about \$15,000 less than we need for the period.

But to date, only about \$75,000 has been raised, and we seem to be stuck on that figure. We're now at the point where every cent has been exhausted and we have only that final \$25,000 to count on to keep going. Unfortunately, the

seven lean years have so used up every resource that we have not an ounce of fat, not one bit of further credit upon which we can count.

That is our situation. We know that if all our devoted readers are fully conscious of it, and truly recognize that it is only their sacrifice and generosity that can save us, they will each and everyone come through with at least a \$10 contribution to the Emergency Committee regardless of whatever contributions they have made elsewhere or earlier—and will get others to do likewise. This, from every reader devoted to our paper, would get us out of the present spot.

We were struck by a statement of a reader in the west coast progressive daily, the People's World, who told what that paper has meant to him, and ended by saying: "I shall not rest until I personally outdo all my previous efforts in raising money for the P.W."

Will all our D. W. readers come to our rescue in this spirit?