

# Dear Editor

## LETTERS FROM READERS

### Speaks Her Piece

#### On Homework and Tito

Dear Editor:

I've been meaning to "speak my piece" for a long time, but it took Bertha Reynolds's article on the housewife's job to finally push me into it.

I think Miss Reynolds misses the point of the struggle for equality of women in her article. Maxists do not, as she says, "tell (women) to walk out on the job (of being housewives) because it is obsolete and socially useless." They are fighting against, as I understand the Marxist position, the primitive division of labor idea which is still so prevalent, that a woman's "function" is to stay home and a man's "function" is to go out and work.

We do not argue that there is no dignity and honor in maintaining a home and bringing up kids. What we want is for the women who do work, either for need or by choice, to know that their children are properly cared for, and that after a hard day's work outside the home they do not have to shop, cook, and clean until they fall exhausted into bed.

Also, a housewife who wants to stay home—and it should be a matter of choice—should be provided with enough help so that she really feels dignified at the end of the day. Only then will the "profession" of homemaker be looked upon with respect, both by those who choose it, and those who return home in the evening after being outside all day.

#### BROOKLYN HOUSEWIFE.

P. S. While I am writing you, I want to ask you, what ever happened to Derek Kartun, foreign editor of the London Daily Worker?

He wrote a "documented" report which was circulated here, "Tito's Plot Against the Peace." Where did he get his information, which turns out to be false? Has he explained?

★

#### Can't See Harm In Communism

BELLEVEUE, Ill.

Dear Editor:

I have been reading your paper, "The Worker," and want to tell you how much I enjoy it. The articles are wonderful and give you the truth—and I hope that the paper will continue.

What is wrong with the American people? Why are they accepting the idea from this so-called outstanding government, these big time publishers that Communism is very, very bad; belonging to the Communist Party is like committing a horrible crime; being a member of the NAACP is a sin; associating with Negroes is just inexcusable.

I thought America was the land of the free and you are supposed to be able to do what you want. I see nothing wrong with communism, but do get confused about some of their basic ideas, because all of this blown up distortion to confuse the people of America.

Who can't find fault with big business organizations, these multi-millionaires who try to control the government and rule with a dollar sign because they can pressure and influence money mad politicians for their own ultimate end? These persons ought to clean up their own backyard instead of trying to cover up their schemes by telling the people lies and propaganda.

R. C. B.

★

#### More About Trujillo Victims

Dear Editor:

The missing, presumed dead Dr. Jesus de Galindez is only one of three Dominicans who have been slated to be murdered in New York City by agents of

dictator Trujillo, according to an article in Look magazine for May 29.

The others are said to include the author of the article "League of Threatened Men" (Look magazine, May 29) Wenzell Brown, and two more are named as previous Trujillo victims, who were murdered in New York City with impunity in 1935 and in 1952. The five were dedicated to exposing in articles, books, and lectures the Trujillo terror and aggressions of Trujillo in Latin America.

Trujillo agents, according to Wenzell Brown's article have "picked off" associates of the five also in Havana, Puerto Rico, Caracas, and elsewhere. "Lucky" Luciano gangsters are leaders among the agents, according to the article.

The article states that Trujillo holds vast properties in Manhattan, upstate New York, and elsewhere, and "has hired scores of writers, radio stars and publicity men" (American) to glorify him. New York newspapers printed full-page advertisements of glorification of Trujillo early in April. (Galindez was last seen March 12).

The Washington law firm of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., is reported to have accepted \$60,000 to represent Trujillo in the United States.

The New York University Press is said to have received a book manuscript from Galindez on the Trujillo regime, just before his disappearance.

(Liberty Book Club has just reissued the novelette classic, "Masters of the Dew" by Jacques Roumain of Haiti, one of the victim nations of Trujillo's aggressions).

With no prosecutions in any of the three cases, and without a greater public outcry, Wenzell Brown and his fellow-survivor Nicholas Silfa, who are continuing in their anti-Trujillo cause,

may possibly be rubbed out in their turn practically at will.

W. R.

#### Has Qualms About TV Column

Dear Editor:

So now we have Ben Levine with his arm around the shoulder of good old Harry Truman, the creature who set in motion the murder of the Rosenbergs, the burning-alive of Koreans with gasoline-bombs, and the years and years of jail for Communists for "conspiring to teach." Or were we wrong about all that too?

Wasn't it a "wholesome" incident—he reminisces (June 24) when Truman threatened to maim one of the music critics who all agreed, in honest concert reviews, that Margaret was not a good singer. After all, he "laid aside his Presidential dignity."

He "acted like the average American father defending his daughter," says Levine in the words of the Democratic Party hacks who flooded the letter-columns of the newspapers with them at the time. Levine has some notion of the fairness and decency of the "average American father."

And the music critic was never punished, boasts Levine, (meaning "like in Russia") "he was not arrested or fined, he was not called a Cosmopolitan." For this was "American democracy," suggests Levine proudly. And even though, in American democracy, a President's daughter should not be called an inadequate singer like any other person who is an inadequate singer, the music critic gets off with mere threats and abuse and having to apologize.

And The Worker, as usual, prints it without a qualm. It's enough to make an honest Communist vomit. Even honest anti-

## Study Seeks Greater Use Of Women

"GRADUATE EDUCATION FOR WOMEN," a report by a faculty-trustee committee. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1956. \$3.50.

By ELIZABETH LAWSON

HOW TO use America's woman-power more effectively was one of the subjects discussed last October at Brookings Institution. The conference, in its report on "Human Resources and National Security," had this to say:

"A very difficult question that awaits evaluation, if not solution, is the changes that are called for with respect to the fuller development and more effective utilization of the potential of American women. If there is serious concern about increasing the number of highly trained persons in our society, we should recognize that women represent the greatest potential supply."

Comparatively few women in the United States achieve higher training, and even fewer are able to make use of it, although the number of girls who finish high school is about the same as the number of boys, and in intelligence they are equal. These are the conclusions—and I see no reason to doubt them—of the study "Graduate Education for Women." Holders of the Ph. D. degree conferred by Radcliffe College between 1902 and 1954 were questioned in gathering the material.

★

MORE than half of those who

## BOOKS

answered the questionnaire declared that they had encountered obstacles because of their sex. Most frequently, they complained of less pay and slower promotion than was given to men of equal or even inferior qualifications. "There are still difficulties for a woman in getting the kind of experience that is necessary to be 'tops' in physics," one woman declared.

Other comments regarding pay and promotion were: "At all stages of my career salary has been much, much lower than for a man with exactly the same position. I would say in general that in teaching even in a woman's college, promotion is much slower for a woman than for a man."

Placement was another complaint. Many institutions refuse to employ both a husband and a wife. Answers to the questionnaire included such statements as these: "Far fewer opportunities are open than to men. Many fewer institutions, particularly in the field of political science, will consider women; also almost none give preference or even equal opportunity to a woman, first for appointment and second for promotion. Because there are fewer opportunities, there are fewer 'bargaining' points than men have."

"One response to my professor's effort to place me was that there was no opening there for a woman, but if there were a man available with my qualifications, they would like to take him."

Still another graduate spoke of the subconscious feeling in any institution employing women that "you are there on sufferance and ought to be thank-

ful for anything you can get." Discrimination in placing married women was reported even greater than in placing single women. One interviewer from a chemical company remarked: "We have no policy against hiring women, but we have not hired any since the war."

WORST of all the problems reported, as might have been expected, was the burden of housework, which cuts down the amount of writing and research these trained women can do, and consequently lowers their status on the job market.

"There is no provision here for the mechanics of life for women," one woman wrote from a university, "i. e., no faculty houses for women. Housekeeping, shopping, and cooking take time." (Virtually all the women who answered the questionnaire, by the way, were unable to afford any household help—a proof that the book is not a discussion of the problems of the well-to-do).

Yet even for unmarried men in that university town—not to speak of the married ones—ways were found to abolish the household chores so that men could work at top productivity. "The fact that on the whole men faculty members publish more than women," another university professor stated, "is at least partially explained by the fact that women, whether married or not, are responsible for running homes and simply do not have the time or energy when carrying a full teaching load to do food shopping, cooking, and cleaning, keep their clothes in order, and then do research." With lower salaries,



NEWS NOTE AMA CALLS FREE POLIO SHOTS STEP TOWARD SOCIALISM...

Communists were nauseated by the thing itself.

Re-read Levine's words. See if they can be weaseled out of as kidding. "Did not this incident indicate," he asks seriously, "something wholesome in American democracy?"

W. R.

#### Wants to Know Are Ideas Deleted?

Dear Editor:

It has been my observation that a great many letters printed in this column are enthusiastic in their praise or damnation of some particular person, seldom are ideas discussed. Are the letters which you receive selected and edited in this direction?

This is the only conclusion I can reach after reading my deleted letter published on June 3. I concede that my letter was long, but I cannot concede that you were correct in cutting out the parts which offered concrete suggestions on the problems of

women. For example, the picture which heads "On the House." How many more years must we look at this picture of a sexy white woman dusting in high heels? Why do you feel that this patrician picture expresses your concept of housewives? Compare the picture for "On the House" with the first picture in the first article of Elizabeth Lawson's series.

Which picture expresses best the opinion of The Worker? I think every person on your staff should examine this question before writing another word directing working class women in the struggle for socialism.

I also mentioned subjects for articles which could be written for The Worker; techniques of PTA work, teaching children about Socialism, religion and Sunday School in the progressive home, and how mortgaged homes in the suburbs affect the entire outlook of progressives.

Why weren't these ideas presented? Housewife.

women spend more time in preparing meals."

Others complain that although they do work, the cost of nursery schools and similar social services is deductible only to the extent of \$600, and then is hedged with so many conditions that only the lowest-salaried families can make any deduction whatever. "It is ludicrous," one woman said, "but this is not considered a business expense."

WHAT, then, is the solution? Part-time jobs? "The most interesting jobs are not offered to part-time people," wrote a graduate, and the editors add that part-time jobs are "routine jobs, filling-in, and temporary situations." Or is the answer in dropping out of work for 15 or 20 years and then resuming one's profession? The fact is that in work which requires higher training, advances in the field are so rapid that by the time a woman is ready to go back, her knowledge is hopelessly outdated. "Ten or 20 years is indeed a long time to be away from one's profession," write the editors of this study.

There are solutions, although this book does not give them. One, which can be achieved in the next session of Congress if we put our minds to it, is the passage of a bill introduced in 1956 by Representatives Fine and Multer, both of New York. This bill would raise the tax deduction for the care of children of working mothers from \$600 to \$2,500.

Another is a system of community services at low cost to help free women from the chores of the individual household. Such a system would be no foreign importation. No nation in the world is technically as well able to provide these services as is the United States.