

Normally, we of the newspaper world grieve when we hear that a newspaper has died. A voice has been stilled in the market place of opinion and fellow craftsmen have lost their jobs. But in the case of The Daily Worker, we suspect, there will be few if any tears shed in the newspaper world of this country.

The reasons are obvious. For more than thirty years The Daily Worker won itself the unenviable reputation of being Moscow's organ in this country. From its beginning in 1924 through 1955 it followed every convolution of the Soviet line faithfully, regardless of logic or its own past position. For many of those years it yielded not even to Pravda in its worship and exaltation of Stalin. Against this background there is a certain poetic justice in the fact that The Daily Worker's demise is directly traceable to Nikita S. Khrushchev's revelations of some of Stalin's crimes.

But if we have no regret that The Daily Worker passes from the scene, we do regret that some of the people associated with it have not yet seen the clear implications of the new line they tried imperfectly to introduce into the paper during the last eighteen months. Against the furious opposition of William Z. Foster and others like him, John Gates and some of his associates tried to make The Daily Worker an organ that would criticize the Soviet Union on occasion, as in the case of Hungary, but would still represent communism. Foster was right, of course.

To be a Communist paper, in the historic tradition of the Communist party in this country, The Daily Worker had to accept the perfection of the Soviet Union and Soviet policy as its basic axiom.

Those who deny that axiom have no place in that party or its organs. Is it too much to hope that Mr. Gates and his associates, who have dared face some of the truth about the Soviet Union, will come to this realization soon?