

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Says DW Can't Run on Hot Air

Dear Editor:

Most of us remember those 'good old days' when the most revolutionary thing we could do was to get on the picket line. It was a sort of rank and file suggestion, made for the benefit of addicts of theory, who had a disconcerting habit of hogging the spotlight with long-winded speeches. Long on talk and short on action.

Well, God bless them, they are still with us. Only the most revolutionary thing they can do now is to cough up for our financially embarrassed Daily Worker. The old gal appears to be threatened with foreclosure.

We're going to need her in the days to come, and active and fighting, not in the poor house. We've come a long way since the revelations of Khrushchev. Many a leftist has found his tongue and the means of communicating his thoughts to Speak Your Piece. "When it rains it pours," the old saw goes. Where once there was only a trickle there is now a flood.

But what availeth it for man to Speak his Piece if the very means of broadcasting it to the rest of the people and to posterity . . . the DW, be placed on the auction block? What will these interesting reflections and ideas be worth when they are locked up individually in ourselves? Oh we know money's a bother and that it's vulgar to be constantly harping on it, but the fact remains that we live in a grossly materialistic world, made up for the most part by dollar-chasing Republicans and Democrats, and that without the filthy lucre we just can't live or breathe.

So let's face it; the DW can't operate on hot air. And isn't it a little peculiar that this speak your piece, a non-Communist, should be setting an example for the Faithful?

Enclosed you'll find 5 bucks.

Sincerely yours.—M. H.

Asks What Happened To Word 'Leninist'

Aug. 28, 1956.

Editor, Daily Worker:

Last week Sam Coleman in a letter to the Daily Worker issued what amounts to a blanket denial that he, or any other leader of the Party, is in favor of liquidation of the Party. At the same

time he implied that, among others, Alex Leslie in the Monthly Review is in favor of such a move.

Today we read a letter from Alex Leslie indignantly denying Sam Coleman's insinuation. It seems that everyone is against liquidating the Party — just as everyone is against sin. The only question is: what is your definition of sin?

It would not be profitable to argue with Comrade Coleman regarding his subjective intent, but one can question the objective result of the proposals he so tentatively puts forward in his letter. If he has disclaimed liquidationism in the beginning of his letter he seems to have embraced it by the end. All he proposes is the "radical transformation of our Party—our program, outlook, structure." He also sets forth some arguments for changing the name. What more is there to change?

Why are the leaders of the New York State Committee so cautious in all their discussion of changes in the Party about reference to Marxism-Leninism? This is a lost word in their vocabulary. They do not say in print that they are in favor of dropping it, they just talk around it. Comrade Coleman, for instance, says, "we must have a Marxist party, a party of scientific socialism, drawing upon the great store of Marxist theory developed by Lenin, Mao Tse-tung and others." Yes, indeed. And let us draw upon Jefferson and Lincoln, too. And Debs and Dulong. But upon what principles do we build? Coleman says the party must chart "its own course by the interests of our own country and our fellow working people." Have we heretofore charted it in the interest of a foreign power? And where is there a reminder that our native interests are not opposed to those of the workers of other lands? Where, in other words, is internationalism?

I ask these questions not of Comrade Coleman alone but of all those Party leaders who have touched upon the matter of: "What kind of Party" without answering the basic questions.

ARTHUR (ZIPSER).

A Reply by Joseph Clark

Editor, Daily Worker:

It would be a sad day for Marxism if the issue of whether the Russian party model is suit-

able for Western lands, were to be decided just by a quotation from Lenin.

In the DW (Sept. 4) a letter signed Arthur takes issue with my claim in a recent column that Lenin "excoriated the Communist International in 1922 for having adopted procedures which he said were suited for Russia but not for the rest of the world."

My column, which dealt with policies of Italian Communists, argued on the essence of the proposition, namely that Russian procedures were not suitable for Italy and that Italian Communists were successful because they used Italian procedures. I also noted that since Lenin was a Marxist he too realized that the Russian path to socialism was not obligatory for Marxists elsewhere.

The letter by Arthur says that in citing Lenin's speech to the 4th congress of the Communist International I "completely distorted Lenin's intent." Arthur says that what Lenin objected to in the Comintern resolution on organizations was only that it "would not be understood by foreigners because it was set forth in terms of Russian experience and because it was too long and wordy."

Those were indeed the first two exceptions Lenin took to the resolution. But then he went on (p. 332 Selected Works, International Publishers):

"And thirdly, if as an exception some foreigner is able to understand it, he cannot carry it out."

I would recommend to Arthur Lenin's advice in that remarkable speech "to sit down and study things," and "to start learning from the beginning." It seems to me that those Marxists who have sought to learn things from the beginning, and who based themselves on life, not dogma, concluded that the Russian party model is indeed unsuitable for other lands.

JOE CLARK.

Daily Worker

Published daily except Saturday and Sunday by the Publishers New Press, Inc., 35 E. 12th St., New York 2, N. Y. Telephone ALgonquin 4-7904.

Registered 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	