

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

N.Y. Times Exaggerates Drop in D.W. Circulation

NEW YORK
Editor, Daily Worker:
Where is the boasted accuracy of the New York Times? In its item (10/4) "Daily Worker Reports 30 Percent Circulation Drop," it quotes gleefully the figures on average paid circulation as "off about 30 percent"—from 7,395 a year ago to 5,574 in the last 12 months. Most Times readers will think that "about 30 percent" means about one-third. But the actual drop, as shown in the figures given is 24.6 percent, or about one-quarter.

Bad enough, of course, but not as bad as the Times would have its readers believe.

G.H.

Clark's Views

Editor, Daily Worker:

It seems to me important to outline the substance of Joe Clark's "actual line and views" since—as he correctly states—they were not adequately reflected in the National Affairs Bulletin. I should like to attempt to do this.

(1) **On Marxism as a science.** Clark puts his view this way: "It is the method of Karl Marx—not his conclusions—which are immortal. . . . Unfortunately he couched his brilliant dissection of capitalism as 'laws' instead of tendencies." (D.W., June 20, '57).

But isn't the test of the method in the "conclusions," in the "laws" which make it possible to analyze, predict and influence events? Isn't the important thing about Marx his "conclusions" about capitalist economy and crisis, about history and class struggle, about the state and class oppression, about ideology and the class nature of society, etc.?

It is true that sometimes, as Clark says, Lenin or Marx made a wrong prediction. It is true that some laws have to be modified or further developed. But that is also true of the physical sciences. It doesn't prove that Marxism is only a method, a science without laws.

On the contrary, I think it is fairly obvious that by the laws they discovered Marx and Lenin made it possible for Communists to predict the course of capitalist economy and class relations, to work out correct tactics for the workers in the social revolution, and to change a good part of the world. The proof of the laws of Marxism, as in physical science, is to be found in their verification in life.

(2) **On Leninism and the West.** Clark holds that Leninism is only an "Eastern" doctrine, rather than "Marxism of the epoch of imperialism." Of the socialist revolutions to date, he says: "But these revolutions have created no guides or patterns for socialism in western countries, and certainly not for ours."

Now certainly each country must find its own path to socialism, according to its own traditions, history, culture and conditions. But isn't it also true,

HERE'S YOUR REGISTRATION

NOTE: SHADED AREAS ARE FOR USE

PRINT →

1. DID YOU PREVIOUSLY VOTE IN N.Y. STATE YES NO		2. SURNAME		GIVEN NAME	
3. STREET ADDRESS		ZONE		ROOM, FLOOR OR APT. NO.	
NO.	ST.				
10. HEIGHT	11. COLOR OF HAIR	12. COLOR OF EYES	13. MARRIED SINGLE WIDOWED	14. WAS APPLICANT CHALLENGED	15. CHECK CARD EXECUTED
18. FILL IN ONLY IF APPLICANT DID PREVIOUSLY VOTE AT A GENERAL ELECTION IN THIS STATE?		DID YOU REGISTER UNDER YOUR PRESENT NAME YES NO		IF NOT, UNDER WHAT NAME DID YOU REGISTER	
IF NOT, FROM WHAT ADDRESS DID YOU VOTE?					
NO.	ST.	CITY		COUNTY	
19. FILL IN ONLY IF APPLICANT DID NOT PREVIOUSLY VOTE AT A GENERAL ELECTION IN THIS STATE?					
ST. ADDRESS		BIRTHPLACE (IF BORN IN THE UNITED STATES) CITY, TOWN		STATE	COUNTRY
NAME AND ADDRESS OF EMPLOYER					
20. TO BE FILLED IN WHERE APPLICANT PRODUCES NATURALIZATION PAPERS					
PAPERS		NUMBER ON PAPERS		DATE OF PAPERS	
OWN <input type="checkbox"/>	FATHERS <input type="checkbox"/>				
MOTHERS <input type="checkbox"/>	HUSBANDS <input type="checkbox"/>				
CITY AND STATE		NAME OF PERSON TO WHOM ISSUED		IF NATURALIZED THROUGH SUCH HUSBAND BEFORE SEPT. 22, 1922	
TO THE REGISTRATION BOARD: IF A FOREIGN BORN APPLICANT FAILS TO EXHIBIT NATURALIZATION PAPERS HE MUST EXECUTE AN AFFIDAVIT AS REQUIRED BY ELECTION LAW SECTION 170. WAS AFFIDAVIT EXECUTED?					

This is a reproduction of the permanent registration form you will be asked to fill out when you register to vote. Registration continues through Saturday, October 12.

Voters who register will be entitled to vote not only this November but in all elections thereafter without

under imperialism, that in all countries there are certain basic common conditions, dictating a common pattern of development?

I think the Peking People's Daily (P.A., Feb. '57) was very helpful when it spelled out some of these basic common features, such as: the organization and leadership of a Marxist-Leninist Party; the acquisition of political power by the working class, by dint of the sharpest political struggle against the bourgeoisie; a worker-farmer alliance and government to carry through socialist measures and to crush illegal attempts to overthrow the legally constituted people's power; leadership of the State and Party for peace, to end national oppression and to carry out a planned economy, etc. As the Chinese comrades say: "the path of the October Revolution means precisely these basic things, leaving aside the specific form it took at that particular time and place."

(3) **On the Aims of American Imperialism.** Clark earnestly felt that our State Dept. had given up its aim of overthrowing the socialist regimes because they knew they couldn't do it. But then why are they spending so much money on Project X? Why Radio Free Europe? Why their tireless efforts in Hungary and now in Poland?

I think Clark's failure to understand the scope of this side of the State Department's aims leads him to say: "in 1956, proletarian internationalism required solidarity with the Hungarian workers opposing Soviet intervention." I think he failed to see how cunningly and to what extent American-inspired counter-revolution took advantage of the just grievances of Hungarian workers, and thereby threatened world peace and socialism, as well.

Does the State Dept. then only hope to be able to dominate the capitalist world? But to dominate the capitalist world they have to dominate the socialist world too. For, example when the imperialists seek to dominate Egypt and Syria, they run smack up against the socialist world which supports all countries struggling for national independence. To dominate one, they must beat down the other. Even Hitler decided he

had to dominate the socialist world before he could dominate the capitalist world as well.

I think at bottom Joe Clark lacked a basic class approach to matters of foreign policy. Sometimes, this was reflected in a tendency to equate the role of the Great Powers. Sometimes, he saw the U. S. and the USSR standing momentarily together in the UN, as in the Egyptian crisis, without sharply differentiating the opposite class approach of the two powers.

(4) **On the Soviet Union and Proletarian Internationalism.** I think Clark is right in saying that we, on certain occasions, made mistakes in mechanically following the line of Soviet foreign policy. But I think he interprets the French Party's thesis of "solidarity with the foreign policy of the Soviet Union" too narrowly when he takes us, to task about it. Even Tito and Gomulka recently expressed "solidarity with the foreign policy of the Soviet Union." They were supporting what they regarded as international working class peace policy against imperialism, and not exclusively Soviet policy, the policy of peaceful co-existence, in all its various concrete aspects. But in doing so, could they overlook the fact that the Soviet Union stands in front in initiating, fighting for and bearing the brunt of the struggle for these policies today, as it has in the past?

I think Clark is wrong also in insisting that our convention and National Committee "rebuff" Jacques Duclos and the French Party for their letter to us. We thanked them for their concern and assured them that this time we were on the correct path.

I don't think it was necessary in addition to rebuff them because, after all, they were concerned with some very serious matters affecting the fate of peace and socialism. I believe this goes beyond the bounds of fraternal relations.

I think these differences that Clark has with us, at least as I see them, are very fundamental. He apparently thought them important enough to make him resign from the paper and the party. I think we should evaluate his action within that framework.

EMANUEL BLUM

Daily Worker

Published daily except Saturday and Sunday by the Publishers New Press, Inc., 35 E. 12th St., New York 3, N.Y. Telephone ALgonquin 4-7954.

Reentered as second class matter Oct. 22, 1947, at the post office of New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 9, 1879.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

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