

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

## Wants All Printed

Editor, Daily Worker:

I have written several letters to the DW that have not been printed. I go to a great deal of trouble to collect my material and draft a letter. My approach is serious, not cranky. I therefore expect you to print my letters. When I say "my letters" I mean also the many letters of other correspondents which you admit remain unprinted.

It does not matter if the letters are repetitious. No two people express the same idea the same way.

It is not for you to judge if the letter is a gem of philosophy, logic, politics, history or grammar. It is not your job to censor it no matter how critical it may be or how far-fetched it may seem to you. It is your job to publish it merely because a serious reader of our paper sent it in. . . . In a real sense, the DW belongs to its readers and it should therefore be responsive to its readers—all of them.

TONY

(Ed. Note—We refer reader Tony whose letter was slightly cut in size and all others to our comment on this subject elsewhere on this page).

## Time to Get Down to Cases

Editor, Daily Worker:

Frankly, I've reached the point in our present discussion where I'm getting bored to death. Not with the discussion—but with its irresolute wandering character. We are discussing everything and anything (fine!)—but we don't even seem to be trying to resolve anything at all.

This kind of free-wheeling discussion was inevitable right after the 20th Congress—but three months have since gone by. When are we getting down to cases? Where is the leadership of the Communist Party? Why are they not leading? Is a draft resolution being prepared—that will focus the discussion by proposing specific changes in line, program, structure, methods? If so, why has no public announcement been made? Is it true that the leadership has set up committees on the draft resolution, constitutional changes, election program, etc.? If so, why has this not been publicly announced?

Why haven't members and friends been asked to submit their specific proposals to the respective committees now? Why don't these committees call open hearings where members can present their views personally—and in advance—or submit them in writing, at least? Doesn't the leadership see that the old methods of work, whereby everything is done first and only then

submitted for discussion—don't they see that this is no longer adequate today, if it ever was satisfactory at all? That it's sapping the party's vitality by forcing the rank and file to stew in its own juice?

Is the leadership too separated by internal differences to take a collective position and make it known? But this is no excuse for failure to lead. Let the differences be aired publicly—and now. (Everyone knows they exist. What we don't know is just what the exact differences are).

Will this cause confusion, and a possible split? Nonsense. Confusion has been caused by the concealing of differences and the failure to submit diverse views to decisive debate.

And if we agree to stand on majority rule, with full right of dissent for the minority, why need a split come about at all? Fear of a split tomorrow is only producing attrition today.

So let the leadership lead—submit one view, or two or three, as the case may be—so we can all be discussing the same thing and move to a resolution of differences through organized give and take. M. S.

with all of its fine features, still is essentially a paper for members of the Communist Party and a few close friends. Is this the kind of Marxist press that's needed? I doubt it.

In my opinion, we need a Marxist press with the following outlook:

1—To be written for the average American—not the already convinced Communist or Socialist—to raise socialist understanding among the masses, not an elite group.

2—To reflect all major currents among the major socialist groups and parties, not only the C.P. and to express their broad united program on immediate needs while debating in its pages longer range problems.

3—To defend without fear the historic advances of the new socialist world while vigorously criticizing all short-comings and injustices.

We should strive for a re-grouping of the socialist press in our country, for a new socialist paper. Such a move need not wait until there be an organizational re-grouping of Marxist parties. On the contrary, a new socialist paper could help develop a united socialist movement in our country.

A CEMENT WORKER.

**"No Answer At All"**  
Editor, Daily Worker:  
It is misleading to entitle William Z. Foster's article in last Wednesday's paper "An Answer to the N. Y. Post." It

is not an answer at all—only a defense of Foster's position on one point.

Although I believe it would be better if our readers knew from our own paper, all the differences that exist among our leaders, I do not think it harmful that they read about it in the N. Y. Post. Why should Foster label quotations that Lash took from articles in the Daily Worker (and not out of context), as "misleading and incorrect"? I, too, got the same impressions about these differences which do exist—from the editorials and the Dennis and Foster articles. What's wrong about a debate

and examination of all the aspects? This is discussion and re-evaluation time!

There is room for the N. Y. Post and the D. W. Why shouldn't the party be discussed outside our publications? Whenever it is, however, there is always distrust. I think it is healthy and normal for liberals outside the party to raise issues such as these. I also think it is healthy and normal for the D. W. to publish all the facts in the discussion and really let our readers know what the leadership is thinking and saying at this time!

Brooklyn Reader.

## TO OUR READERS

Each day's mail brings us a new batch of letters for "Speak Your Piece." We're glad it does, and we want the volume to continue and to grow. Every now and then, some letter writer complains that we aren't printing all the letters. Sometimes there is the suggestion that we aren't printing those letters that are critical. As for the latter, we suspect that "Speak Your Piece" is the best refutation. As for the first complaint, we plead guilty. We just don't have the room to print every letter we get, but we try to print as many as we can.

In cutting letters of excessive size, we attempt to remain faithful to the writer's point of view, eliminating not his critical comments or his arguments but only

submitted for discussion—don't they see that this is no longer adequate today, if it ever was satisfactory at all? That it's sapping the party's vitality by forcing the rank and file to stew in its own juice?

Is the leadership too separated by internal differences to take a collective position and make it known? But this is no excuse for failure to lead. Let the differences be aired publicly—and now. (Everyone knows they exist. What we don't know is just what the exact differences are).

Will this cause confusion, and a possible split? Nonsense. Confusion has been caused by the concealing of differences and the failure to submit diverse views to decisive debate.

And if we agree to stand on majority rule, with full right of dissent for the minority, why need a split come about at all? Fear of a split tomorrow is only producing attrition today.

So let the leadership lead—submit one view, or two or three, as the case may be—so we can all be discussing the same thing and move to a resolution of differences through organized give and take. M. S.

with all of its fine features, still is essentially a paper for members of the Communist Party and a few close friends. Is this the kind of Marxist press that's needed? I doubt it.

In my opinion, we need a Marxist press with the following outlook:

1—To be written for the average American—not the already convinced Communist or Socialist—to raise socialist understanding among the masses, not an elite group.

2—To reflect all major currents among the major socialist groups and parties, not only the C.P. and to express their broad united program on immediate needs while debating in its pages longer range problems.

3—To defend without fear the historic advances of the new socialist world while vigorously criticizing all short-comings and injustices.

We should strive for a re-grouping of the socialist press in our country, for a new socialist paper. Such a move need not wait until there be an organizational re-grouping of Marxist parties. On the contrary, a new socialist paper could help develop a united socialist movement in our country.

A CEMENT WORKER.

**"No Answer At All"**  
Editor, Daily Worker:  
It is misleading to entitle William Z. Foster's article in last Wednesday's paper "An Answer to the N. Y. Post." It

is not an answer at all—only a defense of Foster's position on one point.

Although I believe it would be better if our readers knew from our own paper, all the differences that exist among our leaders, I do not think it harmful that they read about it in the N. Y. Post. Why should Foster label quotations that Lash took from articles in the Daily Worker (and not out of context), as "misleading and incorrect"? I, too, got the same impressions about these differences which do exist—from the editorials and the Dennis and Foster articles. What's wrong about a debate

and examination of all the aspects? This is discussion and re-evaluation time!

There is room for the N. Y. Post and the D. W. Why shouldn't the party be discussed outside our publications? Whenever it is, however, there is always distrust. I think it is healthy and normal for liberals outside the party to raise issues such as these. I also think it is healthy and normal for the D. W. to publish all the facts in the discussion and really let our readers know what the leadership is thinking and saying at this time!

Brooklyn Reader.

# QUOTES FROM THE LABOR PRESS

By Federated Press

## LET'S INVESTIGATE THEM ALL:

"After reading Vic Reisel's recent series on crime in labor, what really struck were the headlines and the implications that the labor movement is rotten through. Racketeers are news, clean unionism like so many other everyday forces for good isn't. . . . Thirty-five—that's the number, and that's all so far—have been indicated out of 480,000 AFL-CIO officials in the U.S. . . . What may result is an investigation of crime in labor. We believe good union men welcome this. . . . But since the question has been raised, we wonder if officials in business and industry would so readily do the same. Nobody's investigated them since the 30's."—Colorado Labor Advocate.

## TO CONFUSE THE PUBLIC:

"Forecasts have it that 1957 model automobiles will have 14 inch tires . . . not the usual 15 inch that have been used for years. . . which is one way to confuse the public, cause distributors and servicing outlets to carry bigger stocks—and build up bigger profits for the manufacturers."—The Union Register.

## IS THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM REALLY WORKING?

"Capitalists are gloating these days over the figures showing the average American family with an income of \$5,520—before taxes! This, they say, is proof positive that the free enterprise system is working. We don't know about the system, but American mothers are working! . . . Yep, capitalism is working the women—they've found another field of exploitation to provide purchasing power to keep the wheels turning for a few more years."—Reading Labor Advocate.

## SILENCE IS NOT ENOUGH:

"In a statement about the Southern Congressional Manifesto, the Industrial Union Department (AFL-CIO) criticized the 96 congressmen who signed it as demonstrating "their contempt for equal rights for all Americans." And of those who did not sign, it . . . demanded that the great majority in Congress "stand up and say so, in order that all of America and the rest of the world will know our country and its people overwhelmingly support the Supreme Court decision on desegregation. Vigorous as the statement is, it would have been stronger and more effective, not to say more honest, if it had mentioned by name those signers who had been supported by labor in the past, like Sparkman and Hill of Alabama."—Labor Action.

## SECURITY AND FREEDOM:

"The simple truth about the federal government 'security risk' program is that it has been imposed from above, that its standards are arbitrary and that its application has resulted in gross abuses against individual citizens. . . . Free unions are interested not only in the application of "security" procedures against workers in private industry, who are involved in work related to the national defense and security, but in the whole atmosphere of liberty. That atmosphere is poisoned, to some extent, by any federal program that is pretentiously offered as a safeguard of our security but is actually inequitable and unreasonable, allowing a victim no fair chance to defend himself. There are many signs that the people are awakening to these facts. But in the top levels of the federal government there has as yet been no move to correct the procedures. . . ."—AFL-CIO News.

## HOT WEATHER ALIBI:

"Anybody can be excused for getting confused in mid-summer Washington. So perhaps House GOP leader Joe Martin has a hot-weather alibi when he told Congress that his views on foreign aid are based on the "judgment of the President and General Motors"—when, of course, he meant the "general staff" of the military forces. But the hot-weather alibi evaporates; the house is well air-conditioned. Joe Martin, we fear, had simply been fact-conditioned by three years of a businessman's administration."—Terre Haute Advocate.

# McKeon

(Continued from Page 3)

impassioned denial that the tragic march into a tidal creek was something secret he was trying to keep from his superiors.

"I wasn't trying to hide nothin'—that's the God's honest truth," he said.

In answer to a question by the president of the court of seven officers, McKeon said he believed his battalion commander held him responsible for teaching discipline.

McKeon is charged with manslaughter, oppressing troops, and drinking on duty in the presence of a recruit.

The manslaughter charge said he

"did, by culpable negligences, unlawfully kill "the six recruits by leading them into the creek in the dark without first familiarizing himself with its hazardous condition.

"Had you ever been in Ribbon Creek before?" Marine Maj. Charles B. Sevier, trial counsel, asked McKeon.

"No, sir, I never had," McKeon replied.

The accused sergeant looked uneasy, hunching forward in the chair, his rather pale face glistening.

"And you never made any type of reconnaissance that night?"

"I didn't reconner," McKeon replied. "But before I stepped off the bank, I looked at it, and it didn't look dangerous to me, sir."

## A NOTE TO OUR READERS

A number of readers have written us criticizing the editors for the manner in which we published, in our issue of June 1, 1956, the text of a speech delivered by James Allen at a Jefferson School forum on Civil Liberties and Socialism. The article was preceded by a statement that Allan's speech did not represent the views of the editors. We wish to state that the criticism is well founded. The article should have been published without such a foreword. If the editors had any disagreement we should have found other means to express it. Singling out the Allen article in such a fashion was in bad taste and not in spirit with the free discussion we have developed. We wish to apologize for this injustice to James Allen, who is an honored former editor of our paper and a regular contributor.

THE EDITORS

# 5-STATE LABOR PARLEY MAPS FALL ELECTION DRIVE

PORTLAND, Aug. 1 (FP).—Re-election of Sen. Morse (D-Ore) and Sen. Warren Magnuson (D-Wash) was billed as a top priority goal for labor at a 5-state area conference staged by the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education last week.

It marked the first time that representatives of "non-political" unions as well as heads of internationals and councils which are still outside the merger, met together. States represented were Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana and Nevada.

Delegates heard the host state, Oregon, where AFL and CIO State Councils amalgamated last June, praised as much further along in the field of political effort than the other northwest states where there has been no such merging. They also were told by Al Barkin, COPE assistant director that labor itself often sells itself short politically.

## NOT REGISTERED

"Our people, through laziness, through indifference, through stupidity if you please, are the ones who fail to register and vote," he declared.

"We're kidding ourselves if we think we're engaged in effective political action when 70, 80 or 90 percent of the membership of some of our locals are not registered. If all our people were registered and voted we would not have to worry about Morse or Magnuson, or a right-to-work law in Washington."

Noting Big Business' drive to unseat Sen. Morse, COPE co-director James McDevitt predicted the Oregon liberal's campaign will be "the roughest, toughest campaign for senator in the United States."

Morse has been made the target of anti-labor sentiment nationally, and funds for his opponent, millionaire ex-Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay are being solicited on an anti-Morse basis in each of the 48 states, McDevitt said.

Other speakers at the conference included Jack Kroll, co-director of COPE, George Brown, political education director of the new Oregon state labor council, William J. McSorley Jr., assistant national director of COPE and Al Hartung, international president of the International Woodworkers Union.