

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Disagrees With CP Statement on Clark

NEW YORK.

Editor, Daily Worker:

There is no recent event I can think of that would seem to bear out more strikingly the reasons set forth by Joe Clark for his resignation from the CPUSA—but not from the fight for Socialism—than the reply of the National Administrative Committee itself. (DW-8/12/57).

In saying this I want to make clear at the outset my belief that men and women who compose this committee are good men and women, people who first came into the movement for Socialism out of the highest motives, people who have in the past made important contributions to this country, usually at the cost of great personal sacrifice—and many of whom will, in the future, continue, as individuals, to make such contributions. Nevertheless I must say that the statement on Clark is further painful evidence of the degree to which the leadership of the then-majority of the Party at the national convention, have continued to retreat since February, have failed utterly to understand the meaning of inner-party democracy, while continuing steadfastly in the blind refusal to apply dialectical materialism to life.

Without here getting into the specifics of the issues between Clark and the NAC, I should like to comment:

The NAC states: "It was not because of Clark's exercise of the right to dissent that he was criticized, but because of his abuse of this right." This is then explained further: "The use of posts of leadership in the Party or institutions supporting the Party, to campaign for personal opinions in opposition to the majority, decisions of the Party is impermissible and a misuse of a Party trust. . . ."

Now this statement is amazing because it refers to no specific action by Clark in which he misused this trust by defying "majority decisions of the Party." Clark wrote an article clarifying some of the false reasoning and certain false facts contained in an article by George Mor-

agreement to share abstract revolutionary doctrine, and an agreement to use force against the government in the future do not add up to a conspiracy presently to use illegal language. The language which the appellants agreed to use and did use is undoubtedly anathema to the bulk of the American populace, but it is not unlawful. We can neither sustain their conviction for such talk nor permit the jury to draw wholly unwarranted inferences that on occasion the appellants may have slyly made much more sinister remarks. Since the proof does not establish a conspiracy to use illegal language, none of the appellants could have been a member of such a conspiracy; and all five convictions must be reversed.

We are reluctant to upset these convictions, not because the appellants are persons who seriously and angrily criticized the most cherished American institutions—for that is their constitutional right—but because we are loath to disturb a jury's resolution of a contested factual issue. But where a jury's finding is not supported by the record it is our duty to reverse.

Here, on the critical issue of whether these defendants or the Party engaged in criminal speech during the three years prior to the indictment, there is no direct evidence of a single example of such advocacy, despite ample opportunity for observation by FBI agents with access to the conspirators' innermost councils. The circumstantial proof was too

ris. He wrote another giving his opinions on what the ouster of Molotov, Malenkov, etc. from Soviet leadership accomplished—and what it failed to accomplish. From time to time he stated his opinions on Hungary.

Now in what sense were any of these an "abuse" of the right to dissent? . . .

As a non-Party member, but a continuing reader of—and contributor to the DW, I feel these questions deserve consideration, because one can't have confidence in a paper or its columnists unless one can assume that the opinions expressed in its column are the full, frank, unadulterated opinions of its columnists.

BOB (from the Village)
9/10/57

Charges CP Playing Role of Sancho Panza

BOSTON

Editor, Daily Worker:

Says Gates: "We are not Titoists, Gomulkaists, Maoists or Khrushchevists. We are American Communists who think for ourselves . . ." etc., blah, blah, going on to give some kind of a description of "communist" nationalism.

I should like to raise the question—why wasn't Clark fired long ago? Are we being asked to give money to print obstinate individual opinions? There is so little difference between Clark's letter and Gates' lovey-dovey reply that one can only wonder why Gates' doesn't join this comrade in his lone battle for Clarkist "socialism" in the wilderness.

The retention of Clark (and certain others) demonstrates how the DW has so disgusted readers since joining forces with the N.Y. Times last October as to be a major factor in the decline in CP membership.

The party position that it aims to re-recruit disgruntled ex-members is sad and reflects the same old sectarian attitude. Can we see beyond the deadwood to the American people? Until we reach them we are nothing. Let the individual fighters for socialism who have left the ranks go on tilting at windmills. Should the party play the role of Sancho Panza?

ONE OF THE FAITHFUL

full of gaps to be probative. We would mock both fair trial and free speech as meaningful constitutional guarantees were we to ignore the deficiencies of this record.

Here government informers infiltrated the concealed state board (of the Connecticut Communist Party—Editors) and observed nothing even mildly incriminating. We do not know how the government could make a better showing on retrial than it did not on the first attempt. Consequently we order the district court to enter judgment acquitting all five appellants.

Chinese Report Fighting Last July

HONG KONG, Sept. 18—The New China News Agency today reported that several Chinese officials and "revolutionary bandits" were killed in fighting last July 16 in South China.

The agency, in a Canton dispatch dated Aug. 27, said four officials were killed along with the family of a fifth official and a number of women workers in a restaurant.

It said 24 of the bandits were "virtually eliminated" the same day and that the remainder of the "criminals" were captured within 10 days.

The dispatch, reporting the incident in Yatang Hsu village of Kwangtung Province, said the officials killed were defending a food station and tax office.