

# Misquoted by Hearst, Says L. A. Communist

By LESTER RODNEY

Dorothy Healey Connelly, chairman of the Los Angeles Communist Party, yesterday charged the Hearst press with misquoting her comments on the historic Supreme Court decisions which freed five of the 14 California Smith Act defendants and ordered new trials for the other nine. Mrs. Connolly is one of the nine.

In prominently featured news stories, and an editorial entitled "Communists Score 'Greatest Victory'", Hearst papers throughout the land had quoted Mrs. Connelly as saying the Supreme Court decisions were "the greatest vic-

tory the Communist Party in America has ever received", and "It will mark a rejuvenation of the party in America. We've lost some members in the last few years, but now we're on our way".

The obvious purpose of the Hearst play was to try to obscure the real meaning of the Supreme Court decisions for the entire country and its traditions, and portray them as something which just helped the Communists.

In her wire, Mrs. Connelly categorically denied making any such statements. "I did say", she corrected, "That the decisions were a great victory for the democratic rights of all Americans. When the rights of Americans, including

Communists, to engage in their constitutional advocacy of socialism are upheld, the Bill of Rights is thereby strengthened in its traditional protection of free speech, free association and free press for all varieties of opinions".

The Daily Worker phoned the managing editor of the New York Journal-American, the local Hearst afternoon paper which featured the editorial and its alleged quotes in Wednesday's edition. We informed the editor, Sam Day, of Mrs. Connelly's denial, and asked what the Journal-American intended to do about it. He said he would have to check on the origin of the quotes.

In a few minutes he called back

and told us that the editorial originated in Los Angeles and suggested we phone the Los Angeles Examiner. (The late William Randolph Hearst originated the system of one key editorial to be sent out to Hearst papers in all cities, a monolithic practice in violation of free newspaper judgment which still obtains).

We phoned the Los Angeles Examiner and put Mrs. Connelly's denial of the quotes to managing editor Warden Willard.

"We didn't get any protest on it after spreading the story and the quotes all over page one on Tuesday", he said, "It was unchallenged then, so it seems clear she decided

(Continued on Page 7)

# 'Misquoted'

(Continued from Page 1)

she had said something wrong and got a nudge from New York."

We asked what was the source of the alleged quotes and Willard said, "A reporter".

But, we said, we have a wire from the person allegedly quoted, saying that the quote was false. Was it his position that Mrs. Connelly was not telling the truth?

"Don't put words in my mouth", he said, "I didn't say that. I just say it wasn't protested until now and I stand by it."

Suppose, we said, in spite of the fact that it wasn't immediately protested to him upon its first appearance, it was proved to him that the quotes were indeed false. Would the Examiner then retract the false quotes and publish what Mrs. Connelly actually said?

"The Examiner has always had a reputation for fair play", Willard said stiffly, "But I don't want to go into any iffy assumptions".

We will be watching the Examiner, and the rest of the "trained seal" Hearst press, to see what kind of fair play Mrs. Connelly receives on her unequivocal, witness-documented denial of the quotes attributed to her.