

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

## Wants Paper That Fights for Socialism

CHICAGO

Editor, Daily Worker:

"Will the fight of the American workers and the Negro people be stronger **without** the Daily Worker?" The question is worthy of Gallup.

The real question is of course would the fight be weaker? And the answer would unfortunately have to be, "No, not particularly." In the first place, the paper, as a matter of stubborn policy, does not furnish any insights into the fight beyond what is furnished by countless other publications of liberal, labor, and Negro origin.

In the second place, the influence which the paper does exert is being exerted on obviously a small and ingrown following, with no sign of promise of earning a wider following.

In the third place, the paper shows every sign, as by systematically suppressing warnings from its readers, of sticking to the policy which has brought it to this pass even if it kills the paper.

And what about the fight for Socialism, would that be weakened without the paper? The answer is even so much more obvious that the very question has become a joke. The paper comes out day after day without a single article on the science of the fight for Socialism, or a single link-up with the fight for Socialism of any battle for an immediate demand.

Worse, it proclaims its loss of faith in such a thing as a science of the fight for Socialism. And when it does print an article about Socialism, it is to protest that it has no foreseeable interest in it except as it shall come of itself some day, and to our own nation as late as possible.

The American people do want to hear about Socialism. There are hundreds of thousands or a few million Americans who, disbelieving any science of Socialism, want all the same to be argued with about it. And who would pay for and contribute to a paper giving them a good argument.

They don't believe, but they want to be forced by overpowering facts and reasoning to believe.

This is as it has always been. The paper always did get that margin of support which kept its chin out of the water from people who cherished its being around for them to argue with.

And as almost everyone knows, they would eventually tell you, "A funny thing happened that I know you'll be interested in. You know how I'm always arguing with you, well, someone the other day was giving me the same arguments that I'm always giving you, and I found myself giving back those arguments that you give me. It seems that when I'm with you, I just have

to disagree with you, but when someone else disagrees with you, I can see where you're really right."

What is different is that the paper no longer challenges these countless people who in their hearts want to be challenged. It tries demonstratively to agree with their most surface ideas and aspirations, and does not, as it used to, insistently appeal to those ideas and aspirations in which they would more profoundly appreciate being **enabled** by facts and reasoning to believe.

I am enclosing another \$5, but such contributions are never going to save the paper. Nothing but a fundamental reversal of policy, restoring what the masses have always expected of the Daily Worker, and without delay, can save it. You want a miracle, a sudden great change without any change of objective circumstances to produce it.

The only practical value, if any, of this \$5, is therefore in my opinion merely the possibility that it might lead to a slightly less careless dismissal of the letter that accompanies it than would otherwise be the case.

I have contributed previously through indirect channels, and am rather evidently not an occasional reader but a subscriber. But I don't find the paper anything more, for a long time now, than just another liberal-and-labor publication, and less Marxist-Leninist oriented than several. And don't see how even the editors can imagine it to be anything more except through a long gradual process of self-hypnosis.

W. R.

## Si Didn't READ Copy: He Only RAN It

WALLKILL, N.Y.

Editor, Daily Worker:

While on vacation I read David Platt's excellent account (DW-8/26/57) of the interview of me by John Wingate on the TV show "Nightbeat" on Aug. 23. It was a faithful piece of reporting and re-created well a crowded half-hour.

However, one minor correction must be made for the record. Inadvertently, Platt quotes Wingate as referring to me as a one-time "copy-reader" on the now defunct New York American. That was an interesting newspaper in its own bizarre fashion. If my bolstered memory is correct, 32 years ago Gene Fowler was managing editor, Charlie Hand either political writer or city editor, Damon Runyon a sports writer and Arthur Brisbane the editorial poobah.

But I didn't read the copy of these gentlemen; I ran it. I wasn't a copy-reader; I was a copy-boy. That made for a considerable distinction in function, status—and wages.

—SIMON W. GERSON.

9/3/57