

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

CP Resolution On Theory

Editor, Daily Worker:

Herb Signer's account of the discussion and action on the question of theory gave a false picture of what happened. It was wrong in approach and in at least one essential fact, that referring to my position.

He summarized the convention action in his opening paragraph as having declared "its independence in matters of theory." If that is so, what is the name of the theory we now hold. To arrive at this conclusion, Signer placed the discussion on theory in the framework of an exchange of views on Jacques Duclos' critical letter on the draft resolution. That was not the case.

Some remarks were made in the discussion about Duclos' opinion but that was not central to the short discussion on theory.

The Duclos letter came up at another time on the basis of a proposed reply read to the convention and then referred to the incoming National Committee for final editing. It was stated, I think that the views of Marxists of other countries will always receive a welcome hearing but the party will decide its views and policies by its own independent judgment.

Having an independent judgment, making decisions as an independent but internationally-minded party that we are and always have been, is one thing. Stating that we have declared for independence in matters of theory is quite another thing.

What the convention did mainly in the section of the draft resolution on theory was to underscore the necessity of approaching, understanding and applying our theory not dogmatically and in doctrinaire fashion but flexibly and creatively and in this regard not accepting uncritically the views of Marxists of other lands but subjecting them and all views to the test of reason, of international and national reality. It emphasized therefore that we must interpret and apply our theory with full regard for the specific features of our own country. As I understand it, that was the sense and merit of the original draft which on this important point remained unchanged.

However to overcome well-based fears that the term "interpret" and other formulations in the draft might mean a rejection of the universality of Marxism-Leninism and hence of its validity for our country, important amendments were made among them the following statement: "Marxism-Leninism is a scientific analysis of the universal and objective laws of social development. It is the generalization of the experience of the working class of each country and of all lands and like all science is an international product."

So much for general approach. Now about some facts. Signer reports me as opposing the final text. He does not quote another comrade to the effect that the draft was a rejection of Marxism-Leninism.

I did not oppose the text on the theory nor did I vote against it. I spoke in clarification, ex-

pressing satisfaction with its substantial improvement but pointing out there were still carry-overs of formulations from the original text which were ambiguous and could mean all things to all men.

I said that science requires precision of formulation—since vagueness in theory does harm in matters of practice. I expressed agreement that we must study various aspects of theory (in fact it wouldn't hurt if a program be worked out for membership and leadership) but I stated that the selection in the text for further study of "the theory of the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat" cast some doubt on their validity for our country and I thought that unwise. It was an improvement over the original draft which wrongly stated that Lenin's theory of the state had been modified by the concept of the possibility of the peaceful transition to socialism. That could hardly be the case, since Lenin himself had seen the possibility and advocated from March to July and again in September 1917 the peaceful transition to socialism in Russia.

My approach on this and other questions was essentially different from that of some comrades who opposed the final text. As for myself, I worked for, supported and voted for the main resolutions of the convention, considering them acceptable and a substantial improvement over the original drafts. In fact I regard the convention both in general political direction and in the election of leadership as gratifying and as providing a sound working basis for the advance of the party and its mass work.

—WILLIAM WEINSTONE.

[Ed. Note: This story, like the others by Herbert Signer, our reporter, was written on the basis of information given to all reporters at briefings by the Communist Party convention press committee. Signer was barred from the convention, as were reporters from all newspapers and wire services.

We believe that the paper's overall coverage of the convention, considering all circumstances, reflected the actual proceedings and outcome.]

'Prosperity' In Buffalo

Editor, Daily Worker:

BUFFALO

That roaring lion, Prosperity, is once more descending upon our town. Up go the interest rates, like flags to greet him. Aren't you happy your own little nest egg in the savings bank is earning 1/4 of 1 percent more?

But down go the building starts. If you impudently want to borrow money, its 2 or even 3 percent more. Fewer homes this year, fewer improvements.

But the big boys are in the same boat with us. Doesn't that give you a cozy feeling—or are you thinking about Jonah?

Anyway, Lackawanna's huge Bethlehem Steel plant has put off indefinitely its touted 1/4 billion expansion program. Ford Stamping has laid off several hundred men. Chevy engine has laid off 200 and the foundry at the same plant is on a four-day week. Several of the Bethlehem mills are on four-day weeks. And in the fabrication and metal shops throughout the area there are also several hundred layoffs.

Prosperity, also, it seems, takes its toll from the workers.

Congrats on the convention reporting.

—ARMY

On Albert Maltz And Lydia Bailey

Dear Dave Platt:

It seems to me that John Howard Lawson missed the whole point of your remarks on Albert Maltz and Lydia Bailey. If I understood you correctly you were saying if there had been room for dissent in the communist movement in 1946 as there is in 1957, Maltz would have had a chance to argue his position in the market place of ideas; instead his position was squelched by a higher authority.

As for Lydia Bailey, I gathered from your column that you were not defending the movie but the right to express an opinion about it in our press without having to apologize publicly on orders from above because the opinion happened to be a "wrong" one.—J.C.A.

Times Article on Housing and Negroes

Editor, Daily Worker:

The Real Estate section of the New York Times for February 3rd carries an extremely interesting article on housing and Negroes. On this question the metropolitan press does little editorializing. American democracy is patently very vulnerable in this field, so the less said the better.

I recall how the Committee on

Segregation in Washington, D. C., set up by President Harry S. Truman reported back that the great realty boards were among the most arrogant bearers of the white superiority ideology that poisons and brings moral deterioration to the minds of millions of Americans.

This article in the Times starts: "Private Housing Eludes Negroes." How amazingly clarifying! The white realtors are out of range and sight but can't you see the houses in the exclusively white areas just jumping around when a Negro home hunter appears. How well they dodge. If that Negro catches one little old or new house napping, there is someone there the next night with a bomb to avenge the apprehended dwelling. Who? The Times article doesn't say. Neither does the F. B. I., therefore, it couldn't have been Communists.

Next from the Times: "Even personally unbiased builders hesitate through fear of financial loss." Hesitate, of course, to sell to a Negro citizen. Here the inference is that property depreciates when or if a Negro purchases or moves in.

The proof to the contrary has been established and submitted time and time again. The President's commission exposed this "Big Lie" but the Times doesn't mention it. For all the Times cares the reader can come to the

conclusion that a good house just simply doesn't want Negro tenants and the psychological impact upon receiving one just knocks it all away.

But the Times goes on to prove that nothing can be done about this state of affairs. "Special Projects Fail" it tells us. You see, we are supposed to be naive enough to believe that serious efforts are being made in the direction to end the years of a policy of segregation but the trial just automatically fails. The "Special Projects Fail," but not without aid and encouragement from sources, governmental and otherwise.

Then the punch headline: "Racial gravitation tends to turn 'open' plots into non-white ghettos." In plainer English Negroes seek segregation. Shades of Levittown! "Less than 1 percent of Philadelphia's new housing reportedly has been available to Negroes." This is the patent of the country.

Incidentally, in another section of the same paper we find "Christians urged to oppose racism." Perhaps the twain shall meet! I mean the realtors and the Christians. Only the billions in profits flowing from the realtors' policies of segregation stands between that meeting.

Well, there is the immorality of profits and some of the profits of national immorality.

—WM. L. PATTERSON

You Can't Legally Delay Integration in Schools, Negro Attorney Tells Delaware Segregationists

WILMINGTON, Del. — Attorney Louis J. Redding, attorney for the Delaware State NAACP, last week in the U. S. District Court here branded the court room defenses of six Sussex County school boards to "legally" delay integration in the public schools as being "insufficient in law."

Redding, who, up until the past six months was the only Negro practicing attorney in the whole state for the last 27 years leveled his fire at the school boards from Milton, Milford, Greenwood, Laurel, Seaford and Frankford-Dagsboro and called upon the court to throw the defense out, and permit his client to enter the schools as their constitutional rights.

The above-named school boards through their attorneys presented these arguments in opposition to desegregation—any local board action "would be either ignored completely or overridden by force" because of the emotional climate of

the area—there is lack of facilities for maintaining law and order in enforcing integration in one spot while segregation still exists in nearby spots—and that the area below Dover (Del) is in all applications in this case a single community and should be regarded as such in any integration planning.

THE school boards, the scrappy civil rights attorney pointed out cannot advance reasons to justify delay until a prompt and reasonable start has been made to comply with the U. S. Supreme Court order outlawing segregation in the public schools. On the basis of the board's answer at this stage, he told the court, the plaintiffs "are entitled to the relief they ask—their entry to the schools."

Redding continued his reply by stating that "wrongful conduct engaged in by others" is no basis for the school boards to deprive his clients of their constitutional rights.

The police powers of the state "cannot be used to suppress" and cannot run counter to "constitutional limitations."

Tackling the single community argument, Redding noted that it is "beside the point." Each school board is responsible for its own community and cannot legally complain that some other district is segregated.

IF THERE is such a single community, he continued, a single action could have been filed in the court for a ruling affecting the entire community.

The boards, it was also pointed out could apply to the federal court for protection against any yillegal interference.

Attorney Redding is slated to present oral arguments on Feb. 20 on his motion for a pretrial judgment compelling the Clayton school to admit Negro pupils.

Philadelphians Blast 'Eisenhower Doctrine'

PHILADELPHIA.—Termining the "Eisenhower Doctrine" as "unwise, futile and needless and dangerous provocation in the present unstable Middle East," two prominent Philadelphians—Elizabeth P. Frazier, a state leader of the former Progressive Party, and Rev. Kenneth Ripley Forbes, an Episcopalian and well-known peace advocate, have joined in a public statement calling for defeat of the proposals in Congress.

"That part of the 'Doctrine,'" they declare, "which gives the President carte blanche to wage war is an exact parallel to the ill-advised threat to the Peoples Republic of China in the matter of the off-shore islands, which brought us nearer to World War III than anything in the past 10 years."

"That part of the present proposals which authorizes the spending of \$200,000,000 for economic aid is futile because it is vague and unrelated to any constructive, long-range plan for helping the Middle

East as a whole."

"AS THE Friends Committee on National Legislation very pertinently says: 'A really new and constructive U. S. policy in the Middle East might propose—among other things—a solution to the Suez Canal, attention to the aggravating problem of 900,000 Arab refugees and to the Arab-Israel conflict. It might include imaginative concepts such as buffer zones, neutral or disarmed zones under international authority.'

"It should deal in a major way with the water problem and support the full development of the Jordan, Nile, Tigris and Euphrates rivers. There is much evidence that economic development would be more effectively handled through the UN than on a bilateral basis."

Miss Frazier and Rev. Forbes stress that "The present proposals ignore all these things. Their net result will be an incitement to war and a further aggravation to Amer-

ican-Russian relations which are already dangerously strained."

"The pressure of public opinion against them is the only reasonable hope of defeating these proposals in Congress," the statement concludes. It urges that two letters be written immediately—one to U. S. Senator Joseph Clark, Jr., and the other to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, both at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., opposing the proposals.

Raise Rewards For Pioneers in Soviet Siberia

MOSCOW, Feb. 19. — The Soviet Government is offering high financial and material rewards for farmers who emigrate to Far East Siberia.

A Moldavia newspaper received here contained an advertisement offering families a free trip the 5,000 miles eastward with transportation of two tons of possessions, all cattle and a bonus of 1,000 rubles (\$250 at the official exchange rate) for each member of the family, with tax exemption for five years after arrival.

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.

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

3 mos. 8 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 3.00