

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Reader Wants To Disengage

Editor, Daily Worker:

I was startled to read letter from "A Reader" referring to "Comrade Khrushchev" and predicting that if Eisenhower faced three Soviet questioners in the same way "then I am certain that he would have to admit that our system of capitalist slavery is outmoded and doomed to disappear."

I am a reader too, and I daresay I speak for most of the readers in saying disengage me, save me and preserve me from such 1921 phraseology and such general nonsense.

READER.

Wants More On the Budget

Editor, Daily Worker:

I have the impression that the Daily Worker has neglected both in its news columns and editorials the battle of the budget now raging in and out of Congress.

Aside from quantity, the quality, in my opinion, with the exception of the May 10th "Memo to the President" editorial was not of the highest, neither probing enough in its analysis nor fresh enough in its tactical approach. Surely this struggle around the budget deserves deeper study than we have yet seen in our press.

In its periodicals and in the daily press Big Business during May not only had detailed news coverage of the battle of the budget, but featured articles, background articles and editorials on the question were present in abundance.

Of course, it is not only a question of the budget in itself, but a number of related questions call for discussion and profound examination by our columnists, our economic experts, our editorial writers—in the light in of the Marxist-Leninist method and theory. There was such a promising beginning in your May 23 editorial which said that budgets "reflect the structure of a society, and the struggles around the budget are genuine social struggles of different classes and groups with-

in classes." But where is the follow-up?

A series of feature articles—or editorials—or both are still very much in order in my opinion. I would like to list briefly some of the questions that I believe need thorough study and sound analysis.

1. What is behind the current drive by sections of Big Business and their representatives in Congress to cut Eisenhower's proposed arms appropriation—even though it might only be a cut of one or two billion dollars?

2. Since the main objection of these forces is a slash in welfare appropriations, what kind of stand will Eisenhower, in the near future, take on these threatened cuts?

3. What is the significance of the regrouping that is in the process of taking place in the Republican Party—and in Big Business circles—on the issue of the budget? What could it mean for '58 and '60? Comment is needed on this observation: "It is clear that what is at stake in the battle of the budget is not only the level of government spending but the leadership of the Republican Party." (Business Week, May 18, 1957.)

4. While organized labor officially supports the Eisenhower budget—both its "defense" and social aspects—is there any evidence of contradictory trends in the ranks of labor? What effect will this support given by the labor leadership and leading northern Democrats to the Eisenhower budget have on their own election program in 1958?

5. How is this battle of the budget and the conflict in the ranks of Big Business related to the current Eisenhower-Stassen stand on disarmament and negotiations?

6. How analyze this largest peacetime budget of Eisenhower in relation to the threat of inflation, in the context of the boom and bust cycle of capitalism?

What can progressives and Communists and the Daily Worker do both in analysis and in the projection of action proposals to contribute to this complex struggle against monopoly's budget?

Timely analysis not to be confused with the "final" word on a given situation, is important not only because it might affect a certain strategic outlook, but because it might call for a changed tactical approach in the struggle.

It would be one-sided to end this critical note without commending our paper for its excellent coverage and militant crusading on such issues as the civil rights fight and the stopping of the H-bomb tests.

—D. E.

June 3

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 4-9554.

Reentered 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