**Regarding the two different editions of *The Daily Worker* (New York and National)**

**and**

**Where do the scans in this digital archive of *The Daily Worker* come from?**

If it were up to me, I would have arranged to present here scans from original individual paper pages of *The Daily Worker* for every page here. Scans made at 300 to 400 dpi in 8 bit, relatively high contrast setting gray scale, on a flat bed scanner with each page pressed quite flat, and a red dropout filter, to virtually eliminate the effect of the paper aging and turning yellow brown, differentially more at the edges.

THAT would be the right way to create a high-quality digital archive of *The Daily Worker* (and for most other similar papers from this time period).

That is what we were able to do with The Militant, 1928 - 1970, here.

Unfortunately, access to original paper of *The Daily Worker* is not available to us, for the most part. NO library holding copies of it is willing to let me unbind their bound volumes and scan them. Nor are they interested in scanning such holdings themselves. All they do is keep the holdings locked up, and from time to time either toss them in dumpsters or release them to rare collectible book sellers.

Instead, in what I consider to be an act of stupidity and one that prevents a high-quality digital record of the content of the paper from ever being made, libraries holding original paper volumes of *The Daily Worker* content themselves with having microfilm scanned. The digital images from microfilm vary from execrably bad to at best marginally acceptable, but are always **far** poorer than what one can get scanning original paper. If you doubt this, compare my scans of original paper of October, November, and December of 1924 *Daily Worker*, of nine months of 1926 *Daily Worker*, of half of April and of May and June 1926 *Daily Worker*, and of April, May and June 1927 *Daily Worker* to any of the other digital images of the paper, and you'll see what garbage microfilm scans are compared to scans made from original paper.

Sadly, special collections and other libraries make a fetish out of hoarding physical volumes of decaying paper, locking them up out of reach of all, oblivious to the fact that it is the **content** of those volumes, not the physical paper, which we should be trying to preserve as well as we possibly can, digitally. Over time these petty small shop keeper mentality individuals who run such libraries and collections see that one or another badly filmed run of microfilm has been digitized, and say "OK... we don't need our physical volumes any more", and throw their paper out. In one case a renowned special collections library destroyed early holdings of *The Daily Worker* despite the fact I had repeated requested of them access to same in order to scan them, pleading with them they should either give the stuff to me, or scan it themselves, or get someone else to scan their holdings. But no... they destroyed the material without it ever being scanned.

The small number of issues presented here scanned from original paper by me on my broadsheet size flat bed scanner I got hold of because one special collections library got rid of six 3-month-of-the-paper-containing volumes of *The Daily Worker* original paper from the 1920s, and had them put in the hands of a collectable rare book seller friend of mine, who then sold them to me. As far as I can tell **NO ONE ELSE** is making digital images of *The Daily Worker* from original paper.

But it gets even worse than that in the case of *The Daily Worker*...

While spending months assembling into issue files and trying to assign functional and clear file names to the issues files so created... while trying to sort them out by both issue number and date **I discovered that for many of the years of publication of this periodical** (1925 thru 1933, and some of 1934, 1935 and 1936) **there were two issues of the paper published each**... a "New York Edition" (variously called "New York Edition", "Final City Edition", "City Edition", and "New York City Edition" in different years) and a "National Edition"

I found that in 1925 and 1926, the content of these two editions was mostly the same (other than regional advertisements and regional announcements of events), but the issue number and date on corresponding pairs of these two editions differed, with the New York edition bearing a date, day of week, and issue number ONE GREATER than that of its corresponding National Edition. This likely reflected the fact that the New York edition was printed in Chicago, then sent by train to NY City, so could not be sold as a morning paper the day it was printed, and had to be sold in New York as a morning paper the day AFTER it was printed in Chicago. In this period the New York Edition clearly announced itself as such in a box at the upper right corner of page 1. But the National edition distinguished itself only by the fact it did NOT say "New York Edition".

But then, in late January of 1927, publication of the paper was shifted to New York City. With this major change came other changes: Now the corresponding New York and National editions bore the SAME issue number and date and day of the week. At this point National editions issues were clearly labeled as "National Edition", and this continued until the practice of printing two editions ended, which appears to have occurred in October of 1936. Perhaps the MOST significant change that came about when the paper moved publication to New York City was that now every day there were significant differences in content between the New York and National edition. If you compared page 1's of the two editions, you'll see between 1 and 4 different articles between them. The most major stories usually were the same, though in some cases were printed on different parts of the page from one issue to another.

Having made this "discovery", I proceeded to contact special collections libraries, and the librarians there specifically connected with their holdings of *The Daily Worker*. And I reached out to several world renowned scholars of the communist left in the USA, as well, who I had had some contact with in the past. Hoping to learn more about this phenomena of there being two different issues of *The Daily Worker* published in the period of 1925 - 1936, inclusive.

To my utter astonishment, I found **no one** had heard of this. Not the Library of Congress, which had just put up on line the digital collection of Daily Worker I was organizing. Not Tamiment Library, which had received all of the archives of the Communist Party USA in the past. I could list a number of other libraries, such as Yale's, which actually made a big run of microfilm from its physical holdings of *The Daily Worker* but still did not bother to figure this out, even tho their run contained lots of both New York and National issues, each clearly identified as such in a box in the upper right corner of page 1 of the paper.

If you can show me printed evidence of anyone writing of the existence of these two editions, at any time, I would very much like to be made aware of it.

As a result of this, over the years, those putting together collections of *The Daily Worker*... either as original paper or onto microfilm... did not pay any attention to whether they were cataloging or filming New York or National editions. Thus **no where** in any catalog listing of holdings of Daily Worker at ANY institution **anywhere** is there information regarding what New York and what National edition issues they hold. There never was any effort to collect complete runs of both, because these libraries were blissfully ignorant of the fact that the two editions existed in the first place!

You can see now how very difficult it was for me to round up runs of both edition types.

The Library of Congress provided a near complete run of the paper in the period of 1924 to 1933 consisting mostly (not entirely, but mostly) of New York editions where the two types of editions had been printed. The Library of Congress kindly instructed me in how to mass automatically download all of the pages of Daily Worker they'd posted on their Chronicling America web site. These constitute the largest single fraction of Daily Worker issues presented here.

**Key to "flags" put in file names of issue files we present here that identify where the scans in them came from:**

**LOC: Files we got from the Library of Congress have the flag "LOC" in their file name, identifying their origin.** These account for the largest share of the scans presented here.

**RIAZ: My own scanning of original paper provided images of National editions for parts of 1926, 1927, and 1928. These are flagged in their file names with "RIAZ", which stands for the Riazanov Library digital archive project.**

**mfilm: low-ish resolution, poorly made scans I made from microfilm many years ago**

**Q: Scans offered by Proquest assembled into issue files have the flag "Q" in the file name.**

Yale's microfilm, scanned by (or for) Proquest and made available for downloading at terminals at universities who pay Proquest for access to such. Some of our presentation of National edtions of the paper and most of our presentation of 1935 and 1936 *The Daily Worker* derives from scans offered by Proquest to subscribers to its service.

**More regarding "mfilm" flagged issues (1925 National, in large part)**

Many years ago, as part of an abortive and failed effort to create at the time a more complete digital archive of *The Daily Worker*, I scanned microfilm of *The Daily Worker* held at Tamiment Library on a ScanPro 3000 for the entire year of 1925. Unfortunately, the microfilm was of not very good quality, and had numerous damaged or missing pages in the record. Much worse, this was one of the very first times I used a ScanPro to scan microfilm, and I was profoundly ignorant of how to properly use it at the time. Now, since then I've fully educated myself on how to properly use the machine... including having chatted for hours with the person who designed the machine to be sure I got it right in all respects. I have since then educated staff of microfilm departments from coast to coast... at U C Berkeley and at NYU. I really am now an expert in how to properly use a ScanPro 3000. Unfortunately, back then I was an ignorant clown when it came to using the machine. I failed to set page size properly, in a way that resulted in the actual resolution I was bringing to bear on the pages I was scanned being around 130 dpi or so.

**Legal note:**

Every page gotten from Proquest had appended to its bottom a warning injunction that read:

"Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission".

**NO** issues of *The Daily Worker* have a copyright notice in them. **NONE** in the entire period of its publication of from January of 1924 to January of 1958. For all material published prior to 1978, in the USA, if there is no copyright notice present that material is in the public domain. By extensive court precedent in the USA, all "slavish copies" (a technical legal term which has been defined, among other things, as including photographs, microfilm, and digital scans) of published paper in the public domain are ALSO in the public domain. No matter how much time and energy and skill and money were spent making such "slavish copies".

Thus, the injunction appended to their presentation of pages of *The Daily Worker* distributed by Proquest is entirely a falsehood. Perhaps it's an honest error on their part... a case of their adding that because in many other cases of material they offer it is a valid alert, and they just by accident appended to the *The Daily Worker* images. In any case, these scans obtained from Proquest... as is the case for all the other scans here... ARE in the public domain and may be freely reproduced and reposted and redistributed by any and all.

We hid from view that factually false warning Proquest put at the bottom of each page when we processed the pages, but if you have Acrobat Pro or some other tool that lets you view cropped data in a pdf file, you can reveal the falsehood Proquest appended to every page of *The Daily Worker* they offer via their subscription service.

**mfilm: low-ish resolution, poorly made scans I made from microfilm many years ago**

Many years ago, as part of an abortive and failed effort to create at the time a more complete digital archive of *The Daily Worker*, I scanned microfilm of *The Daily Worker* held at Tamiment Library on a ScanPro 3000 for the entire year of 1925. Unfortunately, the microfilm was of not very good quality, and had numerous damaged or missing pages in the record. Much worse, this was one of the very first times I used a ScanPro to scan microfilm, and I was profoundly ignorant of how to properly use it at the time. Now, since then I've fully educated myself on how to properly use the machine... including having chatted for hours with the person who designed the machine to be sure I got it right in all respects. I have since then educated staff of microfilm departments from coast to coast... at U C Berkeley and at NYU. I really am now an expert in how to properly use a ScanPro 3000. Unfortunately, back then I was an ignorant clown when it came to using the machine. I failed to set page size properly, in a way that resulted in the actual resolution I was bringing to bear on the pages I was scanned being around 130 dpi or so.

So I ended up with a really poor quality run of the paper in 1925. All National editions.

Happily, the University of Urbana supervised the making really high quality scans from microfilm for 1925 for the New York edition of *The Daily Worker* for the Library of Congress, which freely invites all to re-publish the scans they offer. And the New York and National editions of *The Daily Worker* differed little in that period. Additionally, we submitted to our benefactor who provided us with scans from Proquest a list of all the issues with missing or damaged pages of that early effort to scan 1925 National Edition microfilm of *The Daily Worker* of mine, and got them replaced with National Edition issues offered by Proquest. Thus upgrading the quality of that very early and poorly done effort of mine.

The ignorantly and poorly created scans I produced back then of issues of 1925 the National Edition of *The Daily Worker* are in this archive flagged in the file name with a bland "mfilm". I was embarrassed to put into the file names a flag clearly associated with ME, the one who made those scans. But honesty compels me to tell the true tale of my early improperly done poor efforts at scanning microfilm, years and years ago.

**arcorg: flag on a very small number of scans of Daily Worker I obtained from Archive.org**

Someone told me that there were scans of *The Daily Worker* on Archive.org. So I went and looked there. Indeed, there were. But they are nearly unuse-ably presented, in a jumbled fashion. and the scans are poorly made, with multiple technical errors, including grossly improper page size embedded that causes very low actual dpi rendition of the pages. Additionally, most of the scans there were from the SAME microfilm I had scans of made far more competently. However, for a half dozen issues I found scans there of issues we simply did not have, so I harvested those few scans off Archive.org to help improve our presentation. Such files have in their file name the "origin flag" of "arcorg".

Martin H. Goodman MD

Director, Riazanov Library digital archive projects

"friend of the family" of the Marxists Internet Archive

May, 2023 San Pablo, CA

One story might be worth telling here: The arrogant and petty bozos who called themselves "librarians" at Yale refused to copy their microfilm of Daily Worker for me to scan. This despite the fact a librarian there looked up their policies regarding microfilm copying (they hand filmed their holdings of *The Daily Worker* and have a master negative) and TOLD ME their advertised policy was that they did make copies of such film on request). When I asked why I was refused, the pompous clown there responded "We only make copies for researchers... you are not a researcher." When I pointed out my purpose was to make the material widely and freely available to all researchers via the Internet, this officious fraud who called herself a librarian did not reply. This behavior astonished a junior librarian there who I had initially been in touch with, but she was plankton in the administrative and power food chain at Yale's library.