

Fourth International

Titoism in Evolution

Between Hammer and Anvil of the 'Cold War'

By Michel Pablo

●

The UE Faces the Split

Crisis of Unionism in Electrical Industry

By Irvin Marnin

●

Stalinism and the Negroes

How History Is Adapted for Political Ends

By J. Meyer

Manager's Column

Last month we reported the success of the Los Angeles branch of the Socialist Workers Party in selling copies of **Fourth International** on the college campus. This work is now beginning to pay off in the form of new recruits to the party, Literature Agent **Bert Deck** writes us. "Every time we sell the FI our student periphery group is augmented."

* * *

The experience of the Los Angeles comrades confirms what we have said many times about the importance of **Fourth International** as a means of winning influence on the campus and converting young, energetic people to the banner of Marxism.

* * *

Los Angeles has found it best to detail one comrade to sell the magazine while others carry on the discussions that are inevitably aroused even by the titles of the articles. Such discussions lead in the most natural way to the sale of additional literature such as **The Militant** and to pamphlets presenting the viewpoint of Trotskyism on timely subjects.

* * *

A good share of the credit for the Los Angeles success goes to "Vivian and Rita who have handled this work recently." Comrades Deck adds that V. Grey's article in the October issue, "Steel: Achilles of U.S. Industry" is a "real gem" and that "everyone here is enthusiastic about it."

* * *


Literature Agent **Natalie Smolen** of New Haven writes that a visit to the campus at Yale proved most encouraging. "We sold all the current **Militants** we had on hand, three copies of **Fourth International** and four copies of the pamphlet **Socialism on Trial**."

* * *

The **Seattle** branch sold 15 copies of **Fourth International** at various meetings for Anna Louise Strong, according to

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Volume 10 November, 1949 No. 10 (Whole No. 100)

Published Monthly by the  **Fourth International Publishing Association**

116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-9330.
Subscription rates: \$2.50 for 12 issues; bundles, 20c for 5 copies and up. Foreign: \$3.00 for 12 issues; bundles 21c for 5 copies and up.

Re-entered as second-class matter May 27, 1948, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Managing Editor: **GEORGE CLARKE**
Business Manager: **JOSEPH HANSEN**

CONTENTS

Evolution of Yugoslav Centrism	
	By Michel Pablo 291
The UE Faces the Split	By Irvin Marnin 298
Fate of a Monopoly	By V. Grey 304
Some Comments on Falling Rate of Profit	
	By Arne Swabeck 307
Stalinism and Negro History	By J. Meyer 309
Book Review	
Barnett's "Universe"	By B. Lens 314
Arsenal of Marxism	
Problem of the Ukraine	By Leon Trotsky 317

Literature Agent **Marianne Stanley**.

* * *

How about reports from other branches on your experiences with **Fourth International** in organizing work on the campus? Let's hear about your successes, your problems, the reaction of students to various articles and suggestions for improvement of the **FI** in meeting the educational needs of students.

* * *

"I want to congratulate you for publishing a splendid magazine," writes **D. P.** of Minnesota. "Each issue is full of information that the so-called news magazines do not print.

"The 'American Empire' issue was especially good. I just finished reading the latest issue and thought the statement of the Socialist Workers Party on the Stalin-Tito conflict and the article on Tan Malakka were very good. Also the articles on Israel were good.

"The **Fourth International** is very well written and although some of the articles are pretty deep for the average person at first glance, after studying the article and reading it a few times, it becomes clear."

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946, of Fourth International, published monthly at New York, N. Y., State of New York, County of New York.

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Joseph Hansen, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of the **Fourth International** and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily, weekly, semiweekly or triweekly newspaper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the acts of March 3, 1933, and July 2, 1946 (Section 537, Postal Laws and Regulation), printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and address of the publisher, editor, managing

editor, and business managers are: Publisher **Fourth International Publg. Assn.**, 116 University Place, New York 3; Editor **George Clarke**, 116 University Place, New York 3; Managing Editor **James P. Cannon**, Vincent R. Dunne, 116 University Place, New York 3; Business manager **Joseph Hansen**, 116 University Place, New York 3.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and address of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.) **Fourth International Publg. Assn.**, 116 University Place, New York 3; **James P. Cannon**, 116 University Place, New York 3; **Vincent R. Dunne**, 116 University Place, New York 3; **Joseph Hansen**, 116 University Place, New York 3.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the twelve months preceding the date shown above is (This information is required from daily, weekly, semi-weekly, and triweekly newspapers only.)

JOSEPH HANSEN
business Manager

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 27 day of September, 1949.

(SEAL)

Reba D. Hansen.

(My commission expires March 30, 1950.)

SUBSCRIBE TO

**Fourth
International**

\$2.50 FOR ONE YEAR

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 10

NOVEMBER 1949

NUMBER 10

Evolution of Yugoslav Centrism

By MICHEL PABLO

It has now become clear that far from having been lanced, the Yugoslav "abscess" now threatens to poison the entire Stalinist organism.

As has been predicted the split between the Yugoslav CP and the Cominform which was provoked by the Kremlin has proved irreparable and definitive.

In less than a year, the logic of the unfolding struggle has obliged the two adversaries to race over the successive stages of the conflict with unbridled speed and to confront one another in a duel to the death: The Kremlin, having completed the economic blockade of Yugoslavia, and having revised its prior "theoretical" definitions on the class character of Yugoslavia with the facility for which it is unique, now labels Yugoslavia as a "capitalist fascist state" run by a "clique of spies" which must be crushed at any cost. On their side, the Yugoslavs—far from being intimidated by this monstrous campaign which surpasses in violence, perfidy, ignominy and comic hysteria anything Stalinism has hurled against its political opponents in the past—have on the contrary mounted a counter-offensive on all planes and particularly on the ideological plane and have courageously exposed the "great masters of hypocrisy."

It is possible that the international revolutionary vanguard has not yet been able to gauge the historic importance of this conflict for the future of Stalinism, and for the future of the workers' movement. It is even interesting to note that the so-called anti-sectarian tendencies—who are preoccupied with a "universal gathering" of revolutionary forces opposed to Stalinism—have been led, because of their theoretical confusion and their sickly fear of Stalinism, into completely underestimating the significance and the consequences of the Stalin-Tito conflict and to hold themselves aloof from it in glorious sectarian "isolation."*

*We are referring here specifically to the position adopted on this question by Shachtman in the United States and by *Confrontation Internationale* in France. In a brief note relating to Yugoslavia, in number three of the latter publication, its always "well-informed" and "impartial" editors acknowledge for their part that Tito has really betrayed the Greek partisans and, it appears, has made contact with "pro-nazi Slovak nationalists." After this presentation, the note concludes with this profound "theoretical" analysis of Titoism:

"Tito's chances are those of a nationalist-collectivist opposition arising from the internal contradictions of the Stalinist bureaucratic system and are especially favored by the rivalry between the USSR and the USA. If the master of

The Yugoslav affair is proving to be of cardinal importance on two counts: for its consequences in Yugoslavia itself, a country which has undergone a revolutionary period and where the crisis created by the Kremlin is imperatively posing before its revolutionary vanguard the fundamental problems of the workers' movement in our times; for its consequences in the entire Stalinist world where it has aggravated the crisis and facilitated the crystallization of a new opposition to the Kremlin.

Under pressure of the logic of the struggle against the Cominform and the Kremlin, the Yugoslav communists and the revolutionary workers of that country have been obliged to put their finger on the questions which relate to revolutionary orientation in our epoch: the problem of the USSR and Stalinism, the construction of socialism, the International, and to give their answers to them.

Flowing from this fact, from this ideological ferment, a profound differentiation is inevitable, one which will crystallize on the most advanced position of Marxism-Leninism, at least in an important section of the Yugoslav revolutionary vanguard.

On the other hand, the example of Yugoslavia's resistance to the Kremlin, which thus far has been victorious and has not led it back into the imperialist camp, is stirring, developing and crystallizing opposition tendencies which are forming in the Communist Parties all over the world and particularly in the "peoples democracies."

Crisis of World Stalinism

The expansion of Stalinism after the last war has gone hand in hand with the development of the most acute crisis which Stalinism has experienced since the liquidation of the proletarian wing in the USSR during the years 1936-38.

The exploitation of the revolutionary workers movement in the postwar world exclusively for the interest of the Soviet bureaucracy is proving to be unrealizable, and is giving rise to widespread resistance particularly in those countries which suffer the most from the despotic and extortionist grip of the Kremlin.

The Yugoslav dissidence is the most striking proof of Yugoslavia succeeds in holding power, then we can foresee an attempt to create a Titoist ideology internationally, with a bureaucratic collectivist content, and consisting of a number of those minorities and individuals who, having grown tired of Moscow dictation, will see in Tito the mainstay, the unifier and the substitute strong man—while feigning to see in him the champion of socialist democracy."

the incompatibility of the extension of the power of the Kremlin even with the existence of Communist parties which are completely isolated from the masses of their countries and are merely branch offices of the GPU.

The revolt is now brewing in all the satellite countries, and the Kremlin, to maintain its position, will find it necessary to intensify its repressive measures against the Communist Parties themselves through which, deformed as they are, the discontent and the resistance of the masses is making itself felt. Purges and Moscow Trials follow one after another in the satellite countries and will become ever more extensive. There is no perspective in the present conjuncture for a possible stabilization of the terrorist regime of the Kremlin in the satellite countries.

Yugoslavia's example will stimulate resistance and will deepen the frustration of the Kremlin which will see "Titoist" agents everywhere and will make life impossible for all the leading members of the Communist Parties in this zone. It is bound to reduce all these parties to the status of mere machines, without any life of their own and managed directly and completely by the GPU.

But the crisis of Stalinism is not confined to the buffer zone. The echoes of events in this area and the effects of the Yugoslav affair are reverberating far beyond this zone. They are spreading into the whole Stalinist world and joining with the special causes of crisis of the Stalinist movement in each country, thus contributing more and more in pushing the general crisis of Stalinism now maturing over the world to its culminating point.

It is not an exaggeration to anticipate, if the Yugoslav affair evolves favorably, if the Tito regime does not compromise with imperialism but on the contrary develops a more consistent revolutionary line, that we may yet witness the debacle of Stalinism in the years to come on a vast scale. For all these reasons the revolutionary vanguard should be conscious of the immense potentialities of the Yugoslav affair and do the utmost to assist its favorable evolution.

We cannot just wait for what the Yugoslav Communist Party does on its own in developing a correct platform and for what Yugoslavia does on its own in continuing to fight on two fronts against imperialism and against the Kremlin. What will happen to the Yugoslav CP and to Yugoslavia depends largely, depends primarily on the active aid which the international workers movement can give from now on to this new revolutionary development in the world.

In the remainder of this article we will point out the recent progressive achievements by Yugoslavia and by the CPY on the economic, political and especially on the ideological arena.

I. THE COLLECTIVIZATION OF AGRICULTURE

On the economic field, it is necessary to point out the measures taken to accelerate the preparations for the collectivization of agriculture, particularly since the split with the Cominform and the Kremlin.

The Yugoslav Communist Party seems to have a par-

ticularly clear and quite "classical" theoretical conception of the road to be followed to realize this transformation: They proceed from already existing restrictions on property and on the exploitation of the land* for the purpose of favoring a broad cooperative movement, which is developing in depth as well as in content, in accordance with the general rhythm of the industrialization of the country.

Collectivization of agriculture should correspond on the one hand to the possibility of industry and the state to furnish the countryside with all the necessary equipment for mechanized farming and to provide it with cheap industrial products, and on the other hand to the persuasion of the peasant masses by example of the advantages of a mechanized, collectivist economy.

This result can be achieved by beginning to give an impulsion to a rudimentary cooperative movement and by developing it to higher forms in accordance with the progress of industry and the development of the collectivist consciousness of the peasant masses.

The rudimentary cooperative is that of the lower type of work cooperatives in which "the peasants combine their small properties to form large collective farms, or where they work the land in common utilizing the common means of production, applying the methods of planning and adapting themselves to the agrotechnical means." (Ibid, Paris, July 1949.)

As of January 1, 1949 there were 1,318 such cooperatives in Yugoslavia; at the end of March 1949 more than 2,800 new work cooperatives had been registered involving more than 110,000 families and accounting for some 510,000 hectares of land. In September 1949, the number of cooperatives rose to more than 5,000 covering 250,000 families and more than 1,400,000 hectares of land (Ibid, Oct. 10, 1949).

But the most important step in this field was taken by the creation of agricultural work cooperatives of a higher "purely socialist" type decided on at the congress of peasant cooperators held in June 1949. In these cooperatives "not only the means of production but also all the land becomes

*The Yugoslavs state that in the application of agrarian reform they have gone much further than all the other "Peoples Democracies." The law on agrarian reform applies the principle that "the land belongs to those who till it." Owners who do not themselves cultivate their land have been completely expropriated without indemnity together with all their buildings and equipment. Also expropriated were the properties of the banks and private firms. The properties of the church are limited to 10 hectares. The maximum established for other properties ranges from 20 to 30 hectares according to whether the property is situated in one or another of the federal republics. Also coming under the purview of the law are surpluses of cultivable land over 3-5 hectares where the owners are not farmers. "The most important differences," the Yugoslav leaders state, "between Yugoslavia and the other peoples' democracy countries consists in the agrarian reform in Yugoslavia having taken the character of a socialist measure. More than half of the lands sequestered in the agrarian fund have become part of the state sector and have been assigned to the peasants work cooperatives. Thus was created a powerful socialist sector in agriculture, which has not been done in any other peoples' democracy country." (Yugoslav Information Bulletin, September 15, 1949.)

common property and the remuneration of members is based solely on labor put in." (Ibid, July 1949.)

Concerning the policy of "curbing the capitalist elements (kulaks)" who reappear on the countryside and on which several laws already exist, a recent decree of the federal government stipulates that "the rich peasants are obliged to sell to the state a much larger share of their surplus of grain than they have been required to deliver up to now, from 80 to 95%. On the other hand, only the toiling peasants, the agricultural work cooperatives and the agricultural farms of the general cooperative type may henceforth sell their produce at tied prices while the rich agricultural cultivations will be excluded from this measure." Ibid, July 1949.)

II. REFORM IN LAW ON PEOPLES' COMMITTEES

In connection with the structure of the state, and on political thinking on this matter, it is necessary to note the reform in the law on Peoples' Committees presented by Edvard Kardelj at the seventh regular session of the Yugoslav National Assembly held in June 1949. The new law "modifies and in fact largely amends the existing law" adopted in May 1946.

Unfortunately we have not yet been able to obtain the complete text of this new law. But in a long speech made in presenting this law, Kardelj clearly stresses that the new law takes into consideration the criticisms formulated by the Yugoslav leaders at the Fifth Congress of the Yugoslav Communist Party (1948), namely that their "soviet organization" should become both more democratic and more centralized so that it can enlarge the participation of the masses in the direction of the state while at the same time making its functioning more efficient. Kardelj stated:

By its profoundly democratic character and by its concrete organizational elaboration, this Law constitutes an extremely powerful stride forward in the development of our State structure and, as such, this Law is at the same time an important contribution to the theory and practise of socialist development. It has been our intention, in full harmony with the principle of unity of authority and democratic centralism, to give the strongest expression to that profound democratic aspiration of the masses in relation to self-government, to participation in government of the State, which has always been characteristic of all genuinely popular governments in the world and must indeed be characteristic of the revolutionary proletariat and of socialist democracy. (Ibid, June 7, 1949.)

In the course of his speech, Kardelj delivered a hard-hitting polemic against the concept of "peoples' democracy" as a distinct stage between capitalism and the dictatorship of the proletariat, a concept held by the "theoreticians" of the "peoples' democracies" before their latest turn in December 1948, but one which the Yugoslav leaders have never shared.

Insisting, on the other hand, on differences which still exist between the system of state power established in Yugoslavia and the system which exists in the other "peoples democracies," Kardelj sums up these differences as follows:

There still exist remnants of the old bourgeois state in

these countries which assume the form of the survival of parliamentarism, divided authority, the absence of local organs of popular power in place of which there function organs which are directly dependent on the Minister of the Interior. Where organs of popular power (councils) do exist, their personnel is designated from above. Thus for example, up to April 1948 in Bulgaria, the local authority has been exercised by mayors and functionaries, local and departmental heads, all of whom are appointed by the Minister of the Interior. In Rumania up to the beginning of this year, municipalities, districts and departments were administered by functionaries appointed by the Minister of the Interior. The law on peoples' councils in Rumania is as recent as January 1949. In Hungary "the old bourgeois system of divided authority is still in full force." In Poland also there are still no elected councils (June 1949). The peoples' councils were created after the liberation with the participation of delegates representing "all parties and democratic organizations."

Kardelj explains these vestiges of the "old bourgeois regime" which still exist in the other "peoples' democracies" by the fact that, contrary to Yugoslavia where there was a revolutionary movement of the masses "under the leadership of the CPY," in the other "peoples' democracies," "there was no broad participation of the masses in the struggle for power." For this reason the old state apparatus had not been completely shattered from the outset. The broadening of power accorded by the new law of June 1949 on the peoples' committees is explained by the Yugoslav leaders as the consequence of the broadening of "socialist" conquests of the country.

In his speech, at the Fifth Congress of the party, Tito had referred to the need of using "the first opportunity" to "partially modify (the text of the Constitution adopted in January 1946) principally (in that section) on the social and economic organization" of Yugoslavia so as to better express the changes "which had already gone much further" since that time in the economic and social structure of the country.

Kardelj concluded his presentation speech on the new law as follows:

In many matters, life itself had overtaken the first Law on Peoples' Committees, which was adopted in conditions when the socialist construction of Yugoslavia was in its infancy. The socialist sector, at that time, embraced only big and middle industry, wholesale trade, banking, etc, whereas the sector of local economy remained, in the main, in capitalist hands. . . . Now, however, the socialist sector predominates in local economy and trade as well. The Peoples' Committees have become direct leaders in the entire work of economic, cultural and social construction.

III. IDEOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES WITH STALINISM

The most striking ideological progress of the CPY dates from recent months this year as a result of the principal role assumed by the Kremlin in the Stalinist campaign against Yugoslavia which reached its climax in the Budapest trial.

In effect the Yugoslav leaders presented their position

at the outset as a conflict which had arisen between their party and the other parties of the Cominform (they even said and wrote that it was between their party and *certain leaders* of these parties), but they were careful not to accuse the Russian Communist Party, and Stalin in particular, directly as the ones who were really responsible.

As late as December 27, 1948, in his speech before the Federal Assembly on the budget, Tito attacked the "various leading personalities of peoples democracies" but he noted that "no one in the country of the Soviets has formulated any complaints against us on this question" (on the question of trade between Yugoslavia and the capitalist countries).

Moshe Piyade, speaking shortly after on January 20, 1949 at the Second Congress of the Serbian CP, declared that "everything spoken, written or done in this country throughout these seven months of unscrupulous persecution on the part of those from whom we had the right to expect nothing but friendship and support, is proof that, *almost endangering our own just cause*, we have done everything in our power to make it possible for the (Russian) Bolshevik Party to emerge as little damaged as possible from this conflict." Piyade considered that the authority of the Russian CP was "international capital" and that the responsibility for its preservation was not merely "national but international."

"For that reason," he added, "the Budapest radio station should not be allowed to go on repeating that the Informbureau (Cominform) Resolution was adopted on Stalin's initiative and that it reflects his wisdom. In Yugoslavia such propaganda has only the opposite effect, for nobody here is capable of discovering any wisdom in the resolution, least of all Stalin's. We can but send them one word of advice: look after that authority better, for we all need it and it is precious to us all."

Up to July 1949 it is difficult to find direct attacks against the Stalinist leaders of the USSR in the Yugoslav press. But as a result of the dropping of the Yugoslav demands on Slovene Carinthia at the Big Four Conference in Paris on July 1949, the Yugoslav government sent a protest note to Moscow on August 3rd. Since that time, the Kremlin sharpened up its campaign against Yugoslavia, sending it note after note, and step by step completed the economic and diplomatic blockade of the country by the USSR and the other "peoples' democracies."

On August 25th, an article in *Borba* gave the following explanation of this new attitude of the Kremlin:

"Up to now the government of the USSR has permitted various propaganda agencies in the Information Bureau countries to disseminate the resolution (of June 1948) and to carry on agitation in its favor. Having discovered that this campaign has not yielded the desired results but on the contrary has turned against its inspirers, the Soviet government has **decided to publicly and directly assume the principal role in the struggle against small Yugoslavia whose only "crime" is of not having submitted to orders and instructions because Yugoslavia is dedicated to the defense of equality between states, peoples and movements.**" (Unless otherwise noted, all emphasis is mine.—M. P.)

However even in August 1949, the commentaries in the

Yugoslav press continued to be cautious and circumspect. On the 25th of August, *Borba* speaks of "erroneous ideas" on "the sovereignty of other smaller states on the part of the Soviet Government which believes that it is entitled to use a language of threats, a language of the master and of giving orders." Two less official organs employ sharper terms. *Politika* (August 23) writes: "These two notes (August 11 and 18) formally confirm for the first time the hostility of the Soviet Government towards the construction of socialism in our country as well as their *conscious opposition* to the socialist transformation."

The same paper deplors "the most vulgar fascist methods of persuasion"—"lying methods" of the "heroes" of the Information Bureau under the direction of Moscow. The newspaper *Rad*, organ of the Central Committee of the Trade Union Federation of Yugoslavia declared on August 23: "The Soviet Government would like to see relations of command prevail in the socialist world instead of equalitarian and friendly relations. *It sells out Slovene Carinthia and betrays the heroic struggle of the Greek people.*"

Betrayal in Greece

The next stage which accentuated the ideological differentiation with the Kremlin was reached in connection with the Greek affair. The Kremlin and the Cominform had accused Yugoslavia of having closed the Greek-Yugoslav border in complicity with the monarcho-fascists of Athens and of having stabbed the "democratic army" in the back. The Yugoslavs replied that these accusations served in reality "to attribute to the Yugoslavs the lack of success of the Greek democratic army." (*Rad*, August 31).

But why this "lack of success," and why this attempt to attribute it to the Yugoslavs?

In two articles appearing in *Borba* (September 8 and 12) two Yugoslav leaders, General Louba Vuckovic and Tempo, an alternate to the Political Bureau, probe deeply into this question and arrive at conclusions which are of cardinal importance in the ideological break with the Kremlin. Vuckovic views the Greek civil war as a military specialist and condemns the defensive methods adopted by the Greek partisans after the removal of Markos "who was against capitulation and the defensive, against bargaining with the imperialists." The new command of Zachariades, on the contrary, had as its principal task "to wait until the Greek question was 'solved' through diplomatic channels, through agreement of the USSR with America and Britain. From this completely wrong political perspective came wrong tactics—the tactics of the defensive."

Vuckovic draws the following conclusion in an article rich in profound and correct observations on partisan war and the proper tactics to be used in them:

It is more important now to Zachariades and his friends to slander Yugoslavia, to allege that the monarcho-fascists used Yugoslav territory for the attack against the Democratic Army, . . . than to put the Liberation Army of the Greek people on the correct road and to bring it to final victory. Zachariades' aim is clear: to liquidate the national liberation struggle of Greece, who knows for whose interests, and to throw responsibility for all this onto Yugoslavia. The leaders of the USSR, who

have already announced through their representatives and official news agencies that they were ready to discuss liquidation of the struggle in Greece, are also mixed up in this dishonest business."

The article by Tempo covers the same subject but he treats it much more profoundly. For him, the Greek defeat is the climax of a line of betrayal which dates from the last world war for which the Kremlin bears the responsibility. It has a much more general interest moreover because his "critical analysis," he says, will contribute "to a great degree in clarifying the causes for the defeat of many Communist Parties." In fact "the Communist Parties in many countries have also known similar defeats (France, Italy, etc.)."

"To our knowledge," Tempo writes, "no leadership has tried to give a critical analysis for the defeat and lack of success experienced by numerous Communist Parties in the world. Only the Bolshevik Party (Russian) has tried to explain the 'lack of success' of the Communist Parties of France and Italy by the absence and by the remoteness of the Red Army. It is obvious that this non-Marxist and non-Leninist analysis of the defeat of the Communist Parties of France and Italy cannot be accepted because it does not seek for the causes of the defeat in the internal weaknesses of the party but in external factors. This analysis is not only non-Marxist but is directly counter-revolutionary. It debilitates the internal revolutionary forces of every country and orients them to rely upon the outside, on the armed forces of the Soviet Union."

Roots of Stalinist Policy

In the course of his article Tempo admits that the opportunism which was demonstrated by the Greek Communist Party during the entire war and immediately afterwards during the uprising of December 1944 "is not some specifically Greek manifestation" but should be attributed to the general line of the Kremlin during the Second World War. "It was the leadership of the Bolshevik Party (Russian) which in fact 'advised' (in 1944) the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia to dissolve the party organizations in the army, to abolish the political commissars, to remove the red stars from our overseas caps."

The leadership of the Russian Bolshevik Party "proposed these measures so as to avoid giving offense to international bourgeois reaction and so as not to *allegedly* weaken the forces of the anti-Hitler coalition. . . . Did not the leadership of the Bolshevik Party even advise the leadership of the Yugoslav Communist Party not to resolve the question of power in a revolutionary manner, but to come to an agreement with treacherous counter-revolutionary reaction which was grouped around Drazha Mikhailovitch, to "provisionally" recognize the monarchy and to resolve the question of power by parliamentary methods of struggle after the liberation of the country?"

*The day after the appearance of the Tempo article, Tito in a speech to the miners (September 13) denounced the same "conception of the exclusively revolutionary role of the Red Army which actually means the demobilization of the latent revolutionary forces which exist in every people, in every working class. Every working class is capable of fighting and winning the new social order. Bayonets have never correctly spread a progressive idea and brought social transformation, but only enslavement."

And here is Tempo's principal conclusion in regard to the "roots" of these opportunist manifestations:

"The roots of these manifestations rest in the concepts of the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, namely that all questions of the international revolutionary movement should be resolved exclusively from the point of view of the Soviet Union (more exactly from the point of view of its understandings with the imperialists, from the point of view of whether or not it extends the control of the Soviet Union) and not from the point of view of the international workers movement in general and its interests in each country in particular."

Lacking only in this conclusion, one of the *most daring* and *clearest* which the Yugoslav leaders have made in the recent period on the meaning of the Kremlin's policy, is to point out that *the interests of what Tempo calls the Soviet Union are in reality the self-interest of the Soviet bureaucracy.*

The confusion on this cardinal point, whether deliberate or real, naturally prevents the Yugoslav leaders from critically probing the phenomenon of Stalinism and deriving from it the necessary conclusions to enable them to elaborate a program of truly international value.

The Budapest Trial

The next stage in their ideological clarification came on the occasion of the Rajk trial in Hungary.

The former Yugoslav volunteers of the international brigades in Spain, among whom are many of the present principal Yugoslav leaders, who were directly accused in the Budapest trial as "spies and agents of imperialism," opened a merciless fire against the "leaders of the USSR" who staged the Rajk trial for the purpose of "aiding the infamous campaign carried on against Yugoslavia."

Meeting in extraordinary conference on September 14 in Belgrade, they sent a telegram to Tito in which they say:

"The monstrous and counter-revolutionary attack which has been unleashed against our country by the Information Bureau, which is nothing but the blind weapon of the leaders of the Communist Party of the USSR, has brought internationalism to the gravest and most unprecedented crisis. The deluded leaders of the USSR have begun to trample underfoot one after another the principles of internationalism, to destroy the moral principles and to spit on the traditions of internationalism."

Yugoslav reactions became more violent as the Budapest trial unfolded. All aspects of this monstrous orchestration were submitted to a hard-hitting and thorough criticism: the juridical side, the facts, the political aims pursued in this machination.

It remained for Moshe Piyade to draw the most audacious and the most interesting conclusions on what the "Budapest trial revealed." In his first article in *Borba*, on September 22, Piyade for the first time linked the Budapest to the Moscow trials:

"The Budapest trial is reminiscent of the trials in the Soviet Union in 1936, the organizers of which could have helped in staging the Budapest trial with their abundant experience. Still, the trials in Moscow, although they were of significance for all Communist parties, were the internal affair of the Soviet Union, the indictment charged and

the trial was conducted against Soviet citizens accused of various crimes, among which was also of having linked up with German and Japanese fascism. But Hitler was not charged nor mentioned. A non-aggression pact was concluded with him a few years later, on which occasion even toasts to his health were exchanged. And now when the Public Prosecutor is Minister of Foreign Affairs, this type of trial is transferred to the international arena, it is becoming an article of export."

We have come a long way from the time when Piyade wanted to safeguard the prestige of the leaders of the USSR, a prestige which he then considered "international capital."

The mechanism of the trial was now enough to permit him to characterize it "definitely, without hesitation, without any fear of error, as a new foray of the *counter-revolution directed from Moscow*. This penetration into Europe of the sinister methods of the Soviet intelligence service is a harsh example of the 'leading role' of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Union."

(The author then quotes another section of the Piyade article which was reprinted "in the October *Fourth International*.—Editor)

But when Piyade attempts to discover the cause of this degeneration he sees only "*Great Russian and greater-state chauvinism*" of "certain people in the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." Thus he still remains in the field of effects, of epiphenomena and not of real causes. The notion of the *Soviet bureaucracy* is still foreign to him.

The final conclusion of his article however deserves special attention because it is pregnant with other conclusions which the Yugoslav leaders will be led to in their effort to give a coherent explanation of the policy of Moscow and the Communist Parties.

"It has proved," he writes, "that the counter-revolutionary attitude of these Bolshevik leaders towards Yugoslavia cannot be an exceptional or partial deviation from the general line, that it cannot progress parallel with a general, correct revolutionary attitude; but that it is a component part of a new policy, a new ideological line, which is a deviation from the basis of Marxism-Leninism itself, a work of revision which has encompassed all fields of theory and practise."

"Masters of Hypocrisy"

On October 6th, a new article by Piyade appeared in *Borba* entitled "The Great Masters of Hypocrisy" in which he chronologically fixes the point of departure of this "new... deviationist and revisionist line" of the Russian leaders:

"Since that very day when they proclaimed that *Trotskyism had ceased to be a tendency in the international workers' movement and had become an agency of fascism*,"*

*On October 4th Tito referred to "Trotskyism" in these words in a speech to 600 generals, officers and guests after the Yugoslav army maneuvers: "We know what harm Trotsky did; we know that his work was from the viewpoint of ideology correctly estimated as harmful. But what followed him is another matter. How many innocent communists suffered from the name of Trotskyist though they had nothing in common with it."

since that day and particularly after the second world war, all ideas not in agreement with the ideas of the soviet leaders have been declared Trotskyist and equated to a fascist agency. From this point there remains only physical extermination and the burning of heretics, *all discussion being excluded*."

In the same article, it is true, either out of deliberate or real confusion, Piyade attributes to "Trotskyism" which he ties to "Menshevism," "erroneous ideas" which "constitute the two important pillars of the present revision of Marxism-Leninism in the Soviet Union," a revision "marked by the stamp of Trotskyism and Menshevism," namely: "the impossibility of a successful revolution without the intervention of the Soviet Army and the impossibility of building socialism anywhere in the world without the aid of the Soviet Union—and what hides behind this 'aid' is perfectly clear to the peoples of Yugoslavia."

"From these concepts," Piyade continues, "arises the policy towards Yugoslavia now being pursued by the leaders of the CP of the USSR; from these ideas also arises the transformation of internationalism into Great Russian chauvinism, the theory of Russian scientific priority and the incomprehensible fear of 'servility to the foreigner,' the glorification of all the Czars and the policy of conquest, the fatuous petty bourgeois notion that conceives of Russia as a predestined nation, the foremost and the most cultured in the world and that the line followed by Lenin descends directly from Chernishevsky and not for example from Marx and Engels.* From this also flow the barbarous methods of struggle against heretics and this gross emanation of hypocrisy which is the principal feature today of Russian policy toward Yugoslavia."

Yugoslavs at the UN

The entire last period of differentiation by the Yugoslavs from Stalinism opened up at the present session of

*In this field also, Piyade goes much further than the other Yugoslav leaders who are more moderate in their disapproval of the "nationalist exaggerations" of the struggle against "cosmopolitanism" raging in the USSR. Boris Zihel, for example, in a pamphlet called "Communism and Fatherland," fully justifies this struggle but believes it necessary to add:

"What struggle against cosmopolitanism means, first of all, is struggle against contemporary bourgeois ideological decay, against the detrimental and destructive influence which it exercises on different national cultures, and on the social consciousness of the working masses. It needs must, therefore, have a quite definite class character.

"It would be wrong and un-Marxist to term as cosmopolitanism the recognition of the superiority of foreign culture in the past, or in the present for that matter (if the culture of a more progressive nation is in question), of its beneficial effect on the development of other national cultures. Internationalism on the cultural front is the recognition of the real merits of different nations in the achievement of universal culture, and in acquainting their nations with those merits and with the achievements of other peoples. . . . To consider as absolute the leading role which a definite national culture has at a given time, to project that leading role arbitrarily into the future, has nothing in common with real love for one's national culture, or with internationalism on the cultural front. . . . It should be stated that the tendency towards such absolutism of Soviet, or rather Russian culture at times pervades modern Soviet works, different articles, film scripts, critiques, etc., and meets with no criticism."

the UN. Tito defined the general attitude taken by the Yugoslav delegation in a speech he delivered on September 8, 1949 in the Serbian village of Stolice:

"In the United Nations we voted for such Soviet proposals when they were correct in principle, such as, for example, the question of Greece, but we did not vote when Yugoslavia herself and relations towards our country were in question, but abstained. Where they speak about the rights of small nations, about war mongering propaganda, we could not say that what was not right was right and that the Soviet Union was not doing it, because they are rattling sabres here. We shall not say anything, but we shall not give our vote where they violate Socialist principles."

In an interview with the editor of the *N. Y. Times*, (October 3), Edvard Kardelj formulated the "guiding principles" of the Yugoslav delegation at the UN: "Strengthen peace and the sovereignty of peoples, equal rights and democratic relations between states, respect for the independence of each country and the elimination of all interference of any state in the internal affairs of other states, strict observance of the Charter of the United Nations."

On the question of voting, Kardelj stated "that Yugoslavia would vote in complete independence, according to its convictions, in the spirit of the above-stated principles."

And up to now, that is the way they acted as is proved by Yugoslavia's votes on the question of Greece, China, and the Italian colonies. In the same spirit, the Yugoslav delegation submitted a draft "declaration on the rights and duties of states" to the General Secretariat of the United Nations. Both the US and the USSR prevented a discussion on it. (The author does not here discuss the false and reformist statements of the Yugoslav delegations—that the UN is the main instrument of peace and that capitalism and socialism can cohabit peacefully in the world—as they have been dealt with elsewhere in the Trotskyist press.—*Editor*)

Finally we should note the participation of the Yugoslav delegate, Vilfan, in the debates in the Social and Economic Commission, where his intervention was based on the Yugoslav doctrine on economic relations between states and particularly "socialist states." This problem was posed to the Yugoslavs in the course of their relations with the USSR and the other "peoples' democracies" before the break, but it was elaborated "theoretically" at the UN session. The theoretical work of the Yugoslavs on this question is of particular interest and we hope to return to it in another article. For the moment we will limit ourselves to pointing out the general line and conclusions of this work.

The automatic play of the law of value, which is realized universally in trade between nations, leads—the Yugoslavs state—"to the greatest disproportions and to the worst exploitation of weak and backward states by the most powerful and most developed states." (The Yugoslavs, basing themselves on Marx, give a very detailed analysis of the capitalist conditions and consequences of world trade).

In the imperialist world, the influence of the big monopolies causes "the most shocking disproportions and inequalities." In "the socialist world in formation," composed, they say, of the USSR and the "peoples' democracies," the problem according to the Yugoslavs is one of "suppressing, or at least of creating the conditions for the abolition of exploitation of small and backward states by bigger and more developed states, by establishing relations between the USSR and others which conform to socialist principles."

The Yugoslavs stress that the USSR is far removed from such principles and on the contrary practices "capitalist methods." According to Vilfan, these methods consist of the following: a) "trade is conducted on the basis of world capitalist prices" to the disadvantage of the backward countries; b) "the more developed socialist countries continue to insist on a unilateral structure of exports unfavorable to the insufficiently developed countries (who among other things are obliged to export an 'excessive' and 'disproportionate' amount of raw materials and food-stuffs without reciprocal compensation) and the advantage of the capitalist monopolies is replaced by the monopolist position of the more developed socialist country"; c) the mixed companies founded in the "peoples' democracies" with the participation of the USSR have proved to be a form of exploitation of these countries by the USSR.

* * *

In our opinion it becomes obvious that what we are witnessing in the whole development of the Yugoslav Communist Party is the development of a *left centrist* tendency. The Yugoslav CP experienced a specific development during the war and even then represented a left centrist tendency, nurtured by the revolutionary movement of the masses. Naturally its Stalinist origin must be taken into consideration. Far from arresting its development, this *left centrism* is particularly favored by the split with the Cominform.

It depends on the active assistance of the international proletariat, let us repeat once again, whether the perspectives of this tendency not only remain good but become excellent for the world communist revolution and for the revival of the international workers' movement.

October 15, 1949.

BUY NOW

Stalinism and the Labor Movement:

- | | | |
|--|--------|-----|
| 1. Leon Trotsky: Stalinism and Bolshevism | 32 pp. | 15c |
| 2. James P. Cannon:
American Stalinism and Anti-Stalinism | 48 pp. | 15c |
| The End of the Comintern | 36 pp. | 10c |
| 3. Art Preis:
Stalinists on the Waterfront | 32 pp. | 10c |

Order from

Pioneer Publishers

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE, NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

(send coins, stamps or check)

The UE Faces The Split

By *IRVIN MARNIN*

(This article was written after the UE convention but prior to the CIO convention where the split occurred.—Ed.)

The 14th convention of the UE (United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, CIO), which took place in Cleveland in September, marks the beginning of an acute crisis for the Stalinist leadership of this union. For the first time in its fourteen-year history the union leadership faced a powerful opposition, fairly well-organized and with a definite perspective. The threat of split or secession from the CIO now dominates the atmosphere in the union and no perspective of internal peace and unity will be established until this issue is resolved. For the leaders of the locals, for the rank and file, and for the leaders of the two caucuses, this is the crucial question. Where will the union be tomorrow? Where are we going?

The real interest and desires of the rank and file of the electrical union found no clear voice at the convention, the independents being completely overwhelmed and silenced in the stifling embrace of the two bureaucracies. We will have to examine the proceedings with minute care to determine how the pressure of the ranks managed to break through in any respect. That section of the American working class represented by the UE is no exception to the fact that at the present stage of development of the labor movement the objective needs of the ranks are effectively sealed off, or bent to serve the political needs of American imperialism or the interests of Soviet foreign policy by the two warring gangs of bureaucrats.

The bureaucracy in the labor movement, whether it be "pro-American" or "pro-Russian," continues to hold sway in the different unions to the extent that their political orientation permits them to appease the demands of the workers while acting as obedient flunkies for the two world antagonists. When the labor lieutenants either of capitalism or of Stalinism can no longer "produce the goods," the real grass-roots mass opposition to their policies will come into full expression. Until that time the workers will permit the present leaders to fight it out without intruding dramatically and powerfully into this thieves' brawl. This is particularly true of the UE which has been subject to Stalinist domination since its founding days back in 1935-1936.

An NLRB Union

The basic and determining method of organization of this union was the use of the NLRB election machinery. After the organizational strikes against the radio shops such as RCA and Philco and against some of the small machine shops, the union settled down to the job of winning elections in the larger corporations of the electrical industry. During this period a firm alliance between Carey and his supporters and the Stalinist contingent under Emspak and Matlés was effected. Not an iota of difference disturbed the internal atmosphere.

There were no organizational strikes in the large units—which set the tone for the organization after 1940—such as General Electric, Westinghouse, Sylvania and the electrical division of General Motors. In many cases company unions in these plants were won over to the UE and the company union leaders made an adjustment to the new environment. They brought with them the tradition of "friendly relations" with the companies. In not a single case did any of these big units wage strikes on a national scale until 1946. In fact, national agreements were not achieved in GE until 1938, more than a year after the GM victory, and in 1941 in Westinghouse in the wake of the Ford and "Little Steel" strikes. The flood-tide of rank and file revolt against capitalist tyranny in the plants such as took place in Detroit, Akron, Toledo, Youngstown and Flint seemed to pass the electrical workers by. This was a decisive factor for the development of the union.

The UE came to represent the Communist (Stalinist) Party version of the bureaucratic organization of the steel workers by the Murray-Lewis machine resulting from the private agreement between Lewis and Myron Taylor of U. S. Steel. It was the answer to a bureaucrat's prayer of being able to "talk left" and sound "militant" but to practice peaceful "business unionism." Since this bold talk found no expression in the actual life of the union, the membership paid little if any attention to it.

The UE, like most unions, was run by the bureaucracy not with the approval but, rather by the sufferance of the membership. The noisy propaganda of the UE that "the members run this union" actually meant then, and now, rule of the union by a tiny coterie which is loyal to Stalinism and which manages to neutralize political opponents and successfully slander and discredit any opposition.

To a far greater extent than the other big unions of the CIO, the UE has a large proportion of the membership scattered in small shops and amalgamated locals, all of which are controlled by the machine and represent a difficult problem for any opposition. This factor, plus the fact that the union has no national center—such as Detroit, Akron, or Pittsburgh—which helps to form a pattern of solitary and give courage to the ranks by the presence of sheer numerical strength, were other determining influences in establishing the union's tradition in its years of development.

Relations with the companies up to this point have been no different from those of Reuther or Murray. In fact, for many years the national negotiators of the UE bargained on more friendly terms with management than did Reuther and many other CIO leaders in other industries. They never fought to wipe out the incentive system which oppressed the workers for so many years. This was not just a war-time sell-out on the part of the UE leadership but a continuation of pre-war policy. Instead of organizing a real struggle against this system in the large com-

panies, they chose the easy way out: a little more "take-home pay" for a lot more work through the practice of "protecting time values," which also protected company profits.

The two large minorities in the union, women and Negro workers, never got the full protection which a militant union should have afforded them. Approximately 35% of the members are women. In many shops a wage inequity between women and men workers doing the same work still exists. Except for the Stalinist official, Ruth Young, there is not a single woman who is prominent in the national or district leadership of the union. Particularly in the big shops, the Jim Crow practice which prevents Negro workers from taking skilled jobs or of being upgraded according to seniority has never been opposed too vigorously. During the war the issue was completely forgotten. On this question the record of accomplishment of the UE is easily one of the worst in the CIO, far behind the UAW and even lagging behind Murray's steel union. There is not a single Negro on the General Executive Board, very few in the district leaderships and a not much better proportion in the large locals.

This inglorious record of "achievement" is beginning to catch up with the Stalinist leadership. In 1946 the strike votes in the UE plants, despite the national strike fever which swept the nation, showed smaller majorities for strike action than did the votes in steel, auto and elsewhere. It was a concrete expression of the absence of a militant tradition and training right in the unions. Some locals almost collapsed before the strike ended and were propped up by help from other locals in the area.

Such is the background of this NLRB, milk-fed war baby and piece-rate ridden union. It is the balance-sheet of years of complete Stalinist control of a mass union of American workers. Today they are plagued with raiding, the loss of strikes, a serious drop in membership and the threat of complete loss of the union. It is true that even a genuinely militant leadership would find itself hard-pressed in the face of the alliance of the employers, the labor bureaucracy and the government. But the lack of membership backing is the product of the rank opportunism and bureaucratic control with which Stalinism "built a union of the CIO."

The Roots of Stalinist Control

Some of the anti-Stalinist groupings, from the social democratic *New Leader* to the Shachtmanite *Labor Action*, would have us believe that the Stalinists "control" the UE solely by means of "dictatorial terrorism," by a small-scale replica of Stalin's police state in the Soviet Union. A product of feverish Stalinophobe imaginations, this theory is actually an attempt to whitewash the bureaucratic regimes in the unions controlled by the labor lieutenants of American imperialism.

The scribblers for Reuther and Dubinsky don't bother to explain what is unique about the bureaucratic methods employed by a Stalinist union leadership. In what way do they differ fundamentally from the repressive measures—expulsions, the use of job control, etc.—by means of which

Reuther, Dubinsky, Beck, Murray and their kind persecute rebellious militants and opposition groups? The pretexts and the verbiage may be different, but the club is the same.

The theory that the Stalinists without state power can defy the laws of the class struggle and project Russian police state methods into American unions is not a new one. It was the justification of Shachtman and Burnham for supporting Homer Martin against the CIO in the split which occurred in the UAW in 1939. Shachtman never explained how the UAW-CIO, in which the Stalinists were then a formidable power, could subsequently eliminate CP influence almost completely from the union. The "police state" theory is too convenient to relinquish: it now provides theoretical justification for supporting the creatures of the State Department heading the UAW bureaucracy and the leaders of the UE opposition.

Nor can these Stalinophobes explain how the "police state" regimes of the Stalinists in the NMU and the TWU crumbled almost overnight in face of mass rank and file opposition. The Stalinist "police state" in these unions proved a far weaker barrier against the workers' discontent than the "normal" machine-rule of the AFL and CIO bureaucrats whose crimes and betrayals are no less numerous than those of the Stalinists. The "terror" theory explains nothing about the roots of Stalinist "control" of the UE but it speaks volumes about the real sympathies of the pseudo-socialists. It is their alibi for Carey's failure to win the UE and is the basic motivation for their capitulation to the labor lackeys of American imperialism.

Yet this question remains of extreme importance to the rank and file of the UE who must organize the forces necessary to oust the incumbent leadership. Without clearly understanding the roots of Stalinist "control"—which are fundamentally similar to those of the official bureaucracy—it will be impossible to determine the correct methods of struggle.

Statistics may prove that the electrical workers received less gains than workers in other unions. But workers generally don't study statistics. As far as the rank and file is concerned, the UE Stalinist bureaucracy has "produced the goods" just about as well as most of the "right-wing" leaderships, and better than many, even if this was accomplished in the honeymoon period of the war when gains were relatively easy to win. This is the primary "root" of their control.

The same lack of political consciousness, the same forces which still permit the workers the luxury of attempting to adjust themselves to capitalist society instead of seeking a way to overthrow it today, permits both bureaucracies to continue in office. These factors which permit Murray to control the steel workers also permit the Stalinists to control 400,000 electrical, radio and machine workers.

The great agitation for "CIO policy" by the Carey forces fell flat in the past and would continue to do so if the question of the split had not arisen. "CIO policy" means very little to the ranks, and for those elements who have responded to the red-baiting drive of the Carey group it is simply a convenient rack to hang their pet hates on.

The policy of "getting the reds" attracts some of the worst among the breed of union office-seekers. The many workers who resisted the red-baiting attack in the UE were driven to the defense of their Stalinist leadership because they identify such an attack with capital and reaction—typical, in their minds, of the usual big business attack on all unions as being "radical." Many of them say: "All unions are radical, and if the papers hate our union so much because we are more radical, I guess we have a better union."

Carey and his counterparts in the other CIO unions have thus far been unable to produce any dramatic and telling empirical evidence to demonstrate that they were better union leaders or that their leadership would produce higher wages, better working conditions, improved social insurance or stronger unions. Nevertheless other CIO leaders attempted to make some kind of positive appeal to the ranks in the struggle against Stalinist machines in their unions. Reuther, at least, had his 1946 GM program and strike leadership which attracted the workers. Curran went to the rank and file and organized some sort of progressive anti-Stalinist opposition, temporary as it was. Carey's main weapons were "CIO policy" and red-baiting.

The UE secondary leadership in the locals, whose level of political understanding is far below that of the auto workers, is in most cases still "loyal" to the leadership which they identify with the "union." The "enemy" (other factions) is painted in the vilest terms by the poison-pen slanderers of the Stalinist machine. To many if not most UE members the Carey faction is "an ACTU gang of outside disrupters." "We"—the national administration—is the union to these members. Once this identity is established—and it has been to a great extent—it is extremely difficult to oust the group in power by simply shouting "red" and "Commie." It is almost as difficult as it would be for the capitalists to destroy a powerful, well-established union, by means of a frontal assault.

The tenacious loyalty of the worker to his union is one of the dominant features of American life today. This force also protects Matles, Emspak and Fitzgerald. When the mantle of "the union" is ripped off and their naked Stalinism is exposed for all to see, they will be doomed. As Stalinists they could not hold the union together more than two minutes, but that is not what they have been up to now to the rank and file and secondary leaders.

There is a difference, however, between the CP and the other bureaucracies which may prove to be the Achilles heel of the Matles group. By and large the membership, on controversial questions, does not support the political program of the UE leadership. The social-patriotic trend is too great for them to support Wallace, to be against the Marshall plan, defend the policies of the Soviet bureaucracy. The fact that neither "CIO policy" nor "anti-CIO policy" excites them very much demonstrates that for the broad masses both are abstractions which do not directly affect their lives. However, once the question is posed point-blank in terms of split, the membership will be forced to take sides in order to protect its bread and butter.

The leadership of the UE, particularly in the person

of James Matles, has been very fond of blowing its horn, especially since 1946. They practice the technique of the "big lie" which is endlessly repeated: "The UE set the pattern in 1946. We set the pattern in 1947 and 1948. We led the way in vacations, holidays and night turn bonus." For a union which once boasted that it is a "non-striking union," we have grounds to examine the record with some scepticism.

In 1946, the UE "set the pattern" by crawling behind the backs of the GM auto workers and accepting the terms which the UAW had rejected. The auto workers were left out on the street, while the GM electrical workers were marched back to work after one month on the picket lines. The only pattern set has been a pattern of treachery, betrayal and deceit, the ruthless use of the struggles of other workers to further the aims of the Stalinist leadership and to preserve their rule in UE.

Again in 1948 the UE made much ado about nothing. They yelled loud and long in the pages of the *UE News*, denounced the bosses, held meetings to agitate the members but never called for a strike vote or even hinted at taking one. It was still the old "do-nothing-but-talk-loud" policy which guided them. After the UAW settled with GM and Chrysler, Matles jumped on his charger and "set the pattern" by accepting the same contract with the GM Electrical Division, and then a miserable percentage raise with Westinghouse and GE which favored the higher paid workers as against the unskilled.

In 1949 the UE had a golden opportunity to "lead the way" since they had the earliest date for a wage re-opener. The union heads met with the large chains, who gave them a flat "no," and then proceeded to call off any negotiations for a long period of time. They could have started in April, but did not do so. When the steel workers rolled onto the field of action, the UE withdrew to see what would happen. In the meantime, the UAW took strike votes at Ford and Chrysler and rolled up fine majorities for strike action. The UE tops still waited. After the steel workers hit the bricks, subsequent to their acceptance of the fact-finding report, and after Reuther settled with Ford, Matles and Co. reopened negotiations with GE, Westinghouse and RCA, all of whom could have "led the way" for at least five months.

This pattern of militancy in words and timidity of action was so obvious by 1949, that even Murray made a point of citing their "cowardly, militant in-action." Goaded on by the provocative taunts of the Murray group, and by the necessity of "producing" something better than the other, Matles has finally called for strike votes against the large chains, but even this is still equivocal. At this writing such votes had not yet been taken.

The 1949 alibi of the UE Stalinist machine is that the "workers didn't give us any backing in April; our union is confused by the Carey-ACTU disruption in our ranks; then we had to wait for the steel fact-finding report to see the lay of the land," and so on. Now they are again "talking militant" in denouncing the fact-finding report which they "had to wait for." Apparently other unions don't have factions and caucuses which lead to what the monoliths call "disruption." Any opposition is disruption to them.

At the convention the Stalinists placed themselves in the position of being the militant spokesmen for a wage increase and against the fact-finding procedure. The Carey faction went down the line in support of the Board's findings and the 1949 wage freeze, while denouncing the Stalinists for their do-nothing policy in GE and Westinghouse. It was a case of the pot calling the kettle black. The Carey forces have not been known to be particularly militant in the big shops, and the Stalinists had a long record of doing nothing and of running to government boards during the war for settlements.

Debate on Union Conditions

The debate on the two resolutions on collective bargaining did accomplish one thing. It demonstrated that an independent, militant opposition could have annihilated the spokesmen for both caucuses and exposed the false policies of both Murray and the Stalinists. The minority resolution gave concrete criticism of past and present policy and called for a "general wage increase to equalize earnings with those prevailing in steel and auto." This was the first time the Carey group even took a bread-and-butter issue to the convention.

The speech of Paul Jennings of the Sperry Gyroscope Local 450 in Long Island was probably the best attack on the Stalinists that a UE convention ever heard. He did an annihilating job of exposing the New York District leaders and their recorded failure to achieve any gains in recent negotiations. He demonstrated that a superior contract was won with his company, and that his local did that job. When Matles took the floor to praise the contract and take some credit for it the demonstration against his remarks was so intense that he had to leave the microphone. It was a new experience for him. Jennings' excellent attack on the Stalinists was blunted by his support of the Carey resolution which backed the steel fact-finding report. Both sides dealt telling blows against their opponents.

It was in this debate that the objective needs of the ranks managed to push through the fog of "right-left" controversy to find expression—even if in distorted form. It also was the key to the "secret" of how to defeat the Stalinists. It gave conclusive proof of how great a threat a militant opposition, which fought a principled fight to advance the real interests of the workers on all questions—instead of scurrying to cover under the flags of American imperialism and CIO policy—would have been to the Stalinists. If the entire fight of the Carey group had been along the line indicated here, it is quite likely that it would have won the independent delegates and captured the convention. But then he would no longer be the James Carey of the Marshall Plan and the "CIO representative" at various congressional investigations and committees.

Negro Question in UE

Neither could the opposition properly attack the Stalinists for their self-confessed failure to establish decent conditions for the Negroes. Jim Crow conditions in the UE are a matter of general knowledge. In an article in the

UE Steward of September 1949, Ernest Thompson, business agent of Local 427, and himself a Negro, wrote: "Since the war we must say that our record has not been impressive enough in the fight for Negro rights. There have been too many instances where our white members have permitted the bosses to discriminate against Negro workers in the shops."

This comes from a man who supports the administration and is covering up their failures by speaking about the "members." But not a single voice was raised at the convention to expose the complete failure of the UE leadership to wipe out Jim Crow in the shops and in the union. Carey, a member of the "CIO Committee to Abolish Discrimination," should have taken the lead to expose the Stalinists on this issue. Neither he, nor his friends, rose to do so.

The program which Thompson offered in the article should be the program of any UE opposition on this question, namely: 1. Upgrading of Negro workers according to seniority; 2. The integration of Negro workers into apprenticeship training programs; 3. Jobs for Negroes in white collar and salaried fields; 4. Community action in defense of Negro rights on the part of the union. A national exposure of the inadequacies and betrayals of the Stalinists in connection with the problems of the Negro and women workers could win tremendous support in the ranks, but the present opposition prefers the support of reactionary elements to launching such a struggle.

The opposition did effectively point out the drop in UE membership, making this specific in such cases as Amalgamated Local 475, which dropped from 25,000 to 8,000. The Stalinist figure-jugglers, just prior to the convention, again started using the figure of 600,000 UE members." This is obviously false. Of all the large unions this one has witnessed the most catastrophic decline in membership since the end of the war, from a high point of over 700,000 members in 1944 to below 400,000 today. Lay-offs have been severe, and the raids and secessions have taken tens of thousands out of the UE. In 1948 the administration claimed only 480,000 members and admitted that 85,000 of these were laid off in the "recession." The Carey figure of 385,000 seems to be accurate and conforms to the membership represented in convention voting—far more so than the vain boasts of the UE officers who are trying to blow themselves up to the size of the UAW and the steel union.

But the "horn-blowing" technique will be of little service to them in the coming struggle or at the final denouement of Stalinism in the UE.

The Carey Opposition

Some circles, such as the Shachtmanites, are now proclaiming the "democratic" character of the "new UE opposition" which presented itself at the 1949 convention. It is true that they gathered new forces, such as the delegation from the GE plant in Lynn, Local 201, and from the Westinghouse plant in Pittsburgh. Fred Kelly, candidate of the opposition against Fitzgerald, was a long-time supporter of the Stalinist administration and only broke with

it this year. For the first time the opposition presented a serious challenge to the administration, going down to defeat by a three-to-two margin as compared to the five-to-one and six-to-one majorities of the Stalinists at the previous post-war conventions.

But to call the Carey group "democratic" or "progressive" is to distort the meaning of such words into complete gibberish. The conference which met at Dayton to plan the opposition policy represented only the Carey "pork-choppers." The rank and file was never consulted in the drafting of an opposition program. Its program on the question of fact-finding boards, and on the other disputed questions such as local and international autonomy, democratic right to decide political policy in each union, adherence to CIO policy, can hardly be called "progressive" except by those with strong imaginations.

The Carey opposition is a poor development, a child born of sick parents and nurtured in the poisonous atmosphere of smoke-filled rooms and consultations with priests. The fresh air which the rank and file could have provided was never permitted to enter. Although the Carey group is not completely an ACTU phenomenon, as the Stalinist slanderers would have us believe, the "labor priests" have influenced it a great deal.

At the time of his split with the Stalinists back in 1941, Carey symbolized the militant organization of the radio and machine shops by strike action. His ouster by the Stalinists at that time by the narrow margin of 635 against 539, was the product of a carefully planned Stalinist coup. The split was on the war question since it was the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact and Carey was trumpeting for aid to Britain and the Stalinists for the "Yanks Are Not Coming" committee. Then, as now, Carey did not contest them on the question of how to fight against the companies. He could only shout "red" and was completely outmaneuvered.

During the war years he and his henchmen kept quiet and collaborated in foisting the sell-out policies on the membership. There was no visible opposition offered at that time because the two political lines were welded together. No rank and file insurrection took place such as that which appeared in the UAW against the "No-Strike Pledge" in 1943-1944. When Carey reorganized his faction in 1946 he was still acting as representative of the interests of the US State Department.

Since 1946 the Careytes have hardly covered themselves with glory on the wage front. They never opened their mouths at the conference boards to challenge the demands or strategy of the Stalinists. They did not do particularly well in their own locals in putting up a militant fight against the companies. Carey's continual emphasis on "politics" and his silence on wages repelled decent unionists who wanted to fight against the Stalinists. His behavior made it an easy job for the machine to make the tag of "outside disrupter" stick.

In 1941, the UE was a small union, and the members today know little and care less about Carey's early record. They don't read history and statistics to decide what to do in the union. Only today counts, and today the odor sur-

rounding the Carey caucus repels rather than attracts. The powerful propaganda machine of the administration has been very effective in convincing many in the ranks that this "outside force" must be defeated in order to preserve and protect the union.

Carey's activity at the convention, plus the clever demagoguery of the Stalinists, succeeded in sending many independent delegates back to their locals as firm defenders of the UE leadership. Gone and forgotten were the UE crimes of the war period. To many militants the present triumvirate of Fitzgerald, Matles and Emspak represents militant, aggressive unionism and the Carey people are "disrupters," "company men," "yellow-unionists" and "fact-finders." It is unfortunate, but that is the situation. It is also a contributing factor in explaining why no independent, left wing grouping has yet arisen on a national scale. The two gangs of thieves have succeeded in corrupting and prostituting most of the independents for their own purposes.

This is the situation in the union as the delegates and the ranks face the question of a split.

The Looming Split

Since 1946 the Stalinists in the CIO have been like people walking on eggshells in the attempt to work out a new line. It has been a long time taking shape, the hesitation giving proof that their union base was precarious, that they were unsure of their membership and how far they could go. Certainly this was true in the UE where the Stalinists ducked the question of supporting Wallace at the 1948 convention. In effect, the Stalinists have followed a hand-to-mouth policy, reacting from day to day against the punitive decisions of the top CIO leadership.

But now the showdown is no longer to be put off. Anticipating the fateful decision to be made at the CIO convention, the Stalinists have decided to split rather than submit to Murray's dictation. The UE, the last major CP stronghold of national importance in the CIO, saw the finishing touches put on this policy.

In a six-point ultimatum addressed to the CIO, which obviously will not be granted, the GEB is empowered by the UE convention to withhold per capita tax from the CIO if their demands are not met. These demands order Murray to lift the charters of secessionist locals, press charges against raiders, to order Carey to "cease and desist in wrecking activities," and to stop "interfering in the affairs of the UE."

The legitimacy of the demands for a cessation of raids against the UE cannot be challenged. Yet it is a strange, ironical sight to see the Stalinists become the champions of democratic rights and autonomy. During the war they themselves used the whip of "CIO policy" to hound and silence dissidents in the UE. They infringed on the autonomy of local unions and will do worse now. In fact, the GEB is now empowered by an amendment to the constitution to step into any local where "disruption" exists and to place the "guilty" parties on trial before the GEB if the local fails to act within 10 days. It is noteworthy that the Stalinists in the UAW bitterly and correctly condemned

as "bureaucratic" a similar proposal made by Reuther at the UAW convention.

Justified though their complaints may be against the abuse of their rights by the CIO, the Stalinists are in reality not campaigning for the *principle* of autonomy but merely for their own right to rule over the unions they control without interference from bureaucrats in other unions or from their own members. The Stalinists' ultimatum and its threat to withhold per capita tax is essentially an attempt to put the onus for the impending split on the CIO leadership. This was clearly manifest in Fitzgerald's reply to reporters who asked what the UE would do if the CIO refused to accede to its demands. He said: "To hell with them." It was manifest in the preparations to purge the union of opposition before the split with the CIO occurs and is indicated by the following GEB resolution directed against the Carey group:

"We condemn these disruptors and traitors, who are acting as puppets for outside forces who wish to destroy democratic industrial unionism in the U.S. We call upon the membership to repudiate them, to unite against them and the employers and to drive the traitors out of their locals and out of their unions."

These measures, however, are essentially the reflex actions of Stalinist bureaucrats to the offensive of the CIO leadership. The real initiative and responsibility for the split is on the side of Murray, Reuther, Carey and Co. The Stalinists are not being punished for their crimes against the electrical workers, nor for their treacherous rupture of the solidarity of the workers front against the corporations in past strikes. There is no "CIO policy" on such questions. The Big Brass of the CIO, no more than the Stalinists, could not pass muster under a policy which held them accountable for their loyalty to the workers' interests.

The Stalinists have been indicted and will probably be "hung" at the CIO convention for their refusal to endorse the Marshall Plan and the North Atlantic Pact, i.e., for their "disloyalty" to the foreign policy of American imperialism. That is the sole issue. The resistance of the Stalinists to CIO dictation is motivated primarily by the interests of the Kremlin's "cold war" strategy and not at all by a desire for a more radical policy which would better serve the interests of the workers. Conversely, the aims pursued by Murray and Carey in the split are prompted by the needs of the State Department, by a desire to house-break and bureaucratize the CIO. Confronted with this Hobson's choice, the militants can follow only one course: to continue to wage an unremitting war against the criminal bureaucracies on both sides without permitting themselves to be isolated from the CIO which represents the main stream of the workers in the electrical and mass production industries.

Perspective for Electrical Workers

A grim perspective faces the rank and file of the electrical industry in the coming period. They will be caught in the pincers of the civil war between the two bureaucracies and will pay the price with broken unions and torn-

up contracts. Neither side will hesitate for a moment to sacrifice union gains so as to obtain "sweetheart agreements" at the expense of the workers. Jurisdictional picket lines and strikebreaking will be on the order of the day. And we can be certain that the corporations will exploit the fratricidal conflict to weaken unionism in the industry.

The chances under these conditions for a Stalinist-led union to survive are slim indeed. It will face the combined force of the CIO apparatus, the red-baiting press (which will link the Stalinist union leaders with the 11 CP leaders convicted at Foley Square), the corporations, the state and city governments and the courts. In addition, the AFL will probably intervene to snatch what it can for its craft union affiliates.

It may be that under such conditions the Stalinists will make a turn in the direction of militant action. But the forces against them are formidable. The corporations are now obdurate in their opposition to granting any new concessions. If the powerful steel and coal unions cannot secure trifling demands without a life-and-death struggle, what are the chances for an isolated Stalinist union fighting an even more powerful array of enemies? Here the past sins of the Stalinists will catch up with them: a membership trained in opportunism, and a union erected on the foundations of "business unionism" is poorly prepared for such a remorseless struggle.

In a situation laden with danger for all the workers of UE, the most pressing task for the militants is the fight to save their union and their hard-won gains. Lacking the independent strength to defeat the unprincipled bureaucrats in both camps, it is nevertheless necessary to organize their forces on a program in opposition to the interests of the lackeys of the State Department and of the Kremlin. Such a program would consist of demands for rank and file control of wage policy, for a real fight for the thirty-hour week, for the formation of an independent labor party, for genuine democracy and the return to union autonomy within the CIO.

The real mass explosion which will give rise to a powerful grass-roots opposition capable of giving new leadership to the UE and the CIO generally has not yet taken place. But the forces which will generate such an explosion are accumulating in capitalist society and find their personification in the Trotskyists and in the thousands who think like them without knowing it. Such a leadership will build a movement free of the dictates of the State Department or the Kremlin and will lead great struggles in the coming period. To believe otherwise is to condemn the working class to eternal subjection to capitalist tyranny.

AGAIN AVAILABLE SOCIALISM ON TRIAL

The official record of James P. Cannon's testimony in the famous Minneapolis Labor trial of 1941, with a new introduction by Farrell Dobbs.

This 112 page book contains a well rounded and authoritative presentation of the basic principles of Socialism.

35c (in bundles of 5 or more, 28c a copy)

Pioneer Publishers

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE - NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

Fate of a Monopoly

By V. GREY

The first of these two articles on the steel industry appeared in the October Fourth International.)

So far, we have been discussing the steel "industry." But this is an abstraction: the "industry" must be counterposed to its parts, of which it is not really the sum. The "industry" must be counterposed to the "industries"—the corporations—who are in now quiet, now open competition among themselves, regardless of "understandings."

In spite of the monopolistic character of the industry there are nevertheless deep conflicts among its parts, and between it and other industries. Suffice to say that the U. S. Steel Corp., though still the leader, no longer controls such a large percentage of total facilities as it did in the past. And Bethlehem, which is supposed to be a part of "little" steel, and did not exist in 1900, now produces as much as U. S. Steel did before the Second World War: 14 million tons per year.

The steel "industry" as a whole well understands what an old man of the sea this business of "capacity" is upon their backs. The "industry" has been the chief fighter against increasing capacity. But yet the corporations who make up the industry have each been increasing their individual capacity—so that the total industry capacity is still growing, more slowly than before, but growing nevertheless.

So far we have been looking only at the *general* pattern. As soon as we look closer, we may perceive that the all-important "break-even" point is widely different in different corporations, though it averages out to somewhere between 70-75% nationally.

Competition and Capacity

If Bethlehem, for example, has more open water plants to get cheaper delivery of materials and its "break-even" point is hence at 70%, it might be very much to its benefit if general production went down to 80% and cleaned out some company or some of the plants of a company which was not so situated, and Bethlehem gained that company's customers. Then Bethlehem's production might go up to 90%, or even 100%.

So Bethlehem and the other companies, looking forward to a scramble for customers, build their competitive fences and improve their equipment. And in so doing, increase their capacity! The very thing they have been fighting so hard against—on theoretical grounds.

For the past two years, capacity has been increasing steadily as a result of this jockeying for better competitive positions against the time when so much capacity will not be needed. During the same time, industry spokesmen have fought their loyal servants in the government on this question. They have stoutly averred that only 75 million tons of steel a year will be needed in the 1950's.

But in the past two years, they have spent a total of over a billion dollars in plant improvement. And willy-nilly will have increased capacity nearly 4 million tons in 1948 and 1949—bringing the total to about 95 million tons. Capacity, like a roaring furnace that must be fed with golden coal, rages on, up and up. And while the iron masters see the devil grinning out at them from the furnace they are powerless to tame or to control it.

One must produce cheaper and therefore more than the competitor. It must be made possible for the same number of laborers to produce a greater tonnage of steel. "Then too," they opine, "while steel is in such great demand let us patriotically fill the shortage and cash in on the demand, by all means! At the same time we may reach out for new customers against the time when customers will be hard to get." So, knowing that a surplus will develop, knowing that increased capacity is their greatest enemy—they increase their capacity!

It is quite true, however, that they do this in a certain way. The expansion, if anarchic and "unlawful" from an industry-wide point of view, is planned and purposeful within the individual corporation. This planning is first marked, as previously stated, by the utter absence of plans to build any *new* plants. There are economic reasons for this, equally as significant as their general fear of increased capacity, reasons which we will examine in a future chapter of this story.

Even within the individual plants there is very little extension of basic facilities, that is, building of new blast furnaces (which make the iron from the raw ore), and only a few dozen open hearth steelmaking furnaces. But the engineers have turned again to the already existing equipment, with the aim of making it more productive. In the seeming renaissance of recent days, they have introduced every kind of technological improvement possible.

Technological Improvements

They have remodelled the finishing end: the rolling mills, which turn out rails, bars, sheets, structurals, etc. They have made it possible for still less men to run them than before. When you enter a rolling mill the size of an armory, you see the red-hot blooms and billets sliding over the rolls like logs down a swift river. You see a monumental mass of machinery in the red glare of the steel—and, if you look well, perhaps five or six shadowy figures you may identify as men.

If the engineers have built few new furnaces they have done much to increase production in the old ones. Republic Steel, for example, reports from its Cleveland plant that the new "top pressure" used in their blast furnaces gives an increase of 200 tons of cast iron per day per furnace and with a smaller total of coke than before.

Another interesting, and very important development is in open hearth steel production. High pressure oxygen is induced to the "bath" (the boiling steel) in order to absorb the carbon more quickly from the liquid, blast-furnace cast iron, and thus quicken the "heating" time. If two hours can be cut from a nine-hour heat, production may be increased proportionally.

This improvement is probably cheaper than most of the other recent technical changes, some still in the earlier experimental stages. But just as the tiny super-hard carbide-cutting tools, introduced several years ago, could cut so fast they called forth a revolution in the structure of the big machines to which they were fastened, so the innocent oxygen pipe will play a tune to make the old furnace-floor machinery dance at an unaccustomed pace.

There will have to be bigger charges of materials into the furnaces to get the full value of the oxygen process. Hundred-ton charging machines will have to be junked and redesigned. Furnace doors must be enlarged, larger steel ladles made (present ladles hold 80-120 tons) and new furnace-floor procedure devised.

More important metallurgically: engineers have to be set to work figuring how to reduce the sulphur in the boiling metal as rapidly as the oxygen absorbs the carbon. The average mild steel must be pretty free of both the carbon and the sulphur. The sulphur reducing agent, when it is discovered, may perform still greater wonders in increasing production. But at what greater cost in new equipment? At what new investment, that wears golden wings when steel can be sold and leaden shoes when it cannot?

Struggle of the Giants

What is of more pressing importance financially to the immediate future; however, is the manner in which the actual improvements, the capacity-increasing improvements, have been put into effect, and by what companies. It is clear that these inventions have increased the *total* capacity. Are the companies, therefore, not in the same relation to one another that they were before, but now only on a higher level of production?

Not at all. *Different companies have specialized each in different improvements.* Bethlehem Steel is experimenting feverishly with the oxygen process and is the only company so far actually to build a special plant for the production of oxygen. It has left the top-pressure field clear for Republic. U. S. Steel, on the other hand, claims it has increased production over half a million tons a year, and possibly a million later on, by virtue of its special coal-washing process. (Mechanically mined coal is much cheaper, but often inferior, for the making of coke for steel. Hence the coal "washing.")

Each of these three big corporations, with the corner of its eye no doubt on the others, has gambled highly on its "own" process. Each process obviously increases the respective company's capacity. *But at what rate?* And at what rate as against the others? It is too early to answer this question but not too early to pose it.

The following table of figures reflects the changes in the financial strength and competitive ability of two corpora-

tions. No iron-clad conclusions can be made from the figures since they represent investments that have not yet begun to pay off on a normal "going" basis. But it may be seen that the respective rates of profit vary widely. And the variation itself changes from year to year.

	Capitalization per ingot ton of capacity	Net Income per ton of ingot capacity	Net Income per ton of ingot production
U. S. Steel			
1946	52.06	3.00	4.16
1947	50.90	4.07	4.44
1948	60.85	4.14	4.42
Bethlehem			
1946	51.54	3.24	4.17
1947	53.43	3.96	3.99
1948	55.58	6.55	6.74

It is quite possible that the giant U. S. Steel company which appears at a disadvantage in the above table, may be still digesting the huge investments it has recently made, before it can make the "proper" returns—and get out and eat up Bethlehem Steel also.

It is possible that Bethlehem's \$6.55 income on an investment of \$55.58 is a flash in the pan. U. S. Steel's increase of \$10 per ton investment over 1947 may pay off bigger next year or the next, and put it way beyond Bethlehem in every way. But these "possibilities" are not vague whimsies of the gods of chance. They are definite variables directly determined by: 1. the increased productivity gained per dollar by the money spent (in the extreme left hand column) and 2. the amount of future sales of each company as compared with its capacity to produce. The fluctuations in the above table already indicate that all is not well among these "friendly competitors" and "beneficent monopolists," as they are sometimes called. In fact, if the above differences are not ironed out artificially by compromise—and this is hardly likely at present—they must be wiped out by battle between these giants.

"Death in the Midst of Life"

But let us look again now at the totality of the pushes and pulls, the stresses and strains, as they all add up to make an entirely different pattern from anything anyone or any group ever intended. Let us speak of the "industry" as a whole again, while keeping in mind its inner conflicts. In looking more closely now at the figure of 100% of capacity for the first three months of this year, we may recognize it not as a sign of strength, but a sign of weakness.

Even the proud round figure of 100% of capacity conceals a few limps below the average in some areas and individual figures of 105% and 110% in other areas as furnaces are strained and pushed to the maximum. But this is not the decisive factor here. What is decisive is this: that while competition for the present market forces them to expand, the *general* decline forces them to contract. And the decline is the greater force.

In previous periods of prosperity, increased business was an increased lure for capital to build plants ever faster. And consequently production never caught up with ca-

capacity. They now refuse to build, although they ride the old horse to a stop. Real expansion does not get under way. The increase in capacity is both relatively and absolutely slower than after World War I. "In the midst of life," to employ an ecclesiastical phrase, "we are in death."

We have established the total of production the industry must turn out to "break even" as slightly over 70 million tons. Perhaps the economy can continue indefinitely to consume capitalistically at least that much steel? It is that "perhaps" the steel barons have in mind when they bring out their charts and graphs and predict the average production in the 1950's (assuming peace) as about 75 million tons. It is a wish-figure. A wish-figure tempered by a little bit of pragmatic pessimism.

Commentary on Capitalism

What percentage of capacity can they expect? Let us make a chart of our own. The following table gives an interesting commentary on capitalism. It shows what percentage of steel was turned out as against a possible 100. We have compiled the "averages" ourselves and they do not refer to a percentage of the total production for the period but—as each year's capacity varies, and each year's production varies—to the average of the percentage figures, year by year for each period.

Average percent of capacity at which American steel industry operated:

1898-1918 — 69¾%	1918-1927 — 69¼%
1927-1947 — 69%	1929-1939 — 52%

Each of the first three periods includes "good" times and "bad." And the first two include war and peace. If the 1950's are to be anything like the past fifty years, the sales of steel in any given year would be about 69% of the capacity of that year. *And 69%, you must remember, is considerably lower than the "break even" point of 75 to 80%.*

But it would be too formal, too schematic to take even a fifty year period as a determinant. This is to be regarded as a *tendency*. It would be possible, on the basis of this table, to predict the inevitable and automatic doom of the steel industry. But such a prediction would be unscientific.

First because, as Lenin said, "there is no absolutely hopeless situation for capitalism," and second because figures themselves lie. The 69% is no more a permanent figure than the formerly "unshakable" 6% interest rate was. It represents a certain relationship under capitalism. It reveals that the steel industry, while expanding at varying rates, caused steel capital to be optimistic in just about the same rough proportion as business was expanding, and hence to reinvest to just that extent. It must be remembered too that this average rate of 69% is only established as a mean percentage and the actual figures fluctuate widely. But it must also be remembered that the first quarter of this year was the first such period that steel production hit the 100% mark. This alone indicates a serious change in the outlook of the steel capitalists.

Even if times continue to be "good" the steel barons are expanding at a rate much lower than the earlier part of

this fifty year period. The contradiction in the table of course is that, while the rate of expansion is constantly lower, the percentage of capacity produced constantly averages out the same. But the big boys know of these statistics too. And they are out to beat them.

Thus, if in the past they had expanded more slowly, they believe that their sales, though the same absolutely, would have been higher than 69% of capacity. It is clear to them that even the 75 million tons they see as "normal" for the industry in the 50's would fall well below 69% of capacity, if the "normal" enlargements of capacity continued to be made in the 50's.

So now they are determined not to expand at all, or to expand much more slowly. If the rate of expansion has been slowing down due to the play of unconscious economic forces, now the brake must be put on consciously. And if this can be done, the present bonanza sales will continue to bring in bonanza profits.

The Markets Are Shrinking

But even this is a fantasy. The recent big sales of steel did not represent real new business or new investment so much as they merely replaced old equipment, filled up the consumer's vacuum created by war, constructed the buildings delayed by war and took over markets vacated by the vanquished. The domestic market is shrinking. But our steel colossus bestrides a *world* that is shrinking too. The French, Belgian, Polish, Italian, Swedish and Hungarian steel industries are back to their pre-war output. The English, Russian and Czechoslovakian have well surpassed their pre-war position. *Iron Age* reports: "Such a good job has been done rehabilitating the steel industry in Europe that steel from the U. S. may have a tough time competing." And even this is not the end of it, since the West German industry, which can potentially supply the world with an additional 10 million tons a year, above its present output, is being revived more and more each year. As after World War I, Germany has already surpassed its old rival, France.

So the hoped for figure, 75 million tons, based on a general rate of expansion, is just as unreliable from the optimistic side as the figure 69%, based on the same general rate, is from the pessimistic side.

For steel production even to stand still today, the rest of the economy must be expanding. The ribs of new ships, the skeletons of new buildings, the bodies of new machines, are made from the *ordinary* production of steel. Years ago steel bounded forward a thousand leaps in order to equip thousands of others for a single leap. Then, in its prime it provided for the exuberant youthful expansion of the others. When these others are in turn grown up, steel grows quickly old.

From all this we must conclude that steel is, even at this favorable moment, in decline. And that the pressure on steel to sell and sell, will be more tremendous than ever before. The incentive to produce with less labor will be great, but due to the monumental concentration of constant capital, its realization small. The drive to cut wages, however, will be ruthless.

But worst of all, the tendency to close down whole plants at a time will become more pronounced. Should production fall below the "break-even" point—that is, the given percentage of capacity—then capacity itself must be cut. The more inefficient plants will have to go. No plant will be operated for long at a loss.

Who Will Pay for Steel?

"There is no absolutely hopeless situation for capitalism"—and that includes the steel industry. The steel corporations are not without hope. They have their solution. The workers must be made to pay for the sickness of their master. They must work for less in some cases, not work at all in others. They must go to war. They must grovel

under the Iron Heel of fascism. They must suffer more than they ever did before. Or they must take the industry over, socialize it, save it and themselves from annihilation.

Socialization is not only a defensive measure, but is also the first prerequisite for the rebirth of steel and its expansion on a basis comparable to that of its youth. And then the piddling estimates of the Murrays, Reuthers, Beans, and Trumans will give way to the socialist planning of a liberated class and the performance of a liberated industry. Producing for use not profit, the workers can then produce at 100% of capacity and forget about the old "break-even" point. Or they can be producing at 20% or 10% of capacity because they are constantly enlarging their capacity beyond Andrew Carnegie's wildest dreams.

Some Comments on Falling Rate of Profit

By ARNE SWABECK

V. Grey's article, "Steel: Achilles of U. S. Industry," published in the October Fourth International, graphically illustrates some of the inexorable contradictions inherent in the process of accumulation of capital. His analysis is excellent, and it follows the Marxist approach to these problems. Moreover, he demonstrates that American industry and especially the steel industry, precisely because of its high technological development, provides the fullest confirmation of the analysis of the laws of capitalist production made by Marx.

Grey lays bare some of the fundamental aspects of these laws as they apply to the steel industry: the disproportionate expansion of constant capital (equipment and raw materials) as against variable capital (labor-power, wages) and the resulting higher organic composition of capital which fosters the tendency of the average rate of profit to fall. This is most apparent in this giant among powerful American industrial combines.

On the whole Grey has performed a most commendable job. But his analysis suffers from a certain weakness. If not directly, at least indirectly, there appears to be an implication that the tendency of the falling average rate of profit is synonymous with what the steel barons proclaim as the "break-even" point for their industry.

In 1939 the steel magnates estimated the "break-even" point to be 50 percent of capacity. Today they insist that this figure has reached between 70 and 75 percent. And this change happened during a decade of war and unprecedented prosperity. Proceeding from this point

onward in arithmetical progression one could easily visualize the time—not in the too distant future—when this figure might reach 100 percent, whether or not a depression intervenes. Would the steel industry then have to produce at a loss, go out of business, or be taken over by the state?

On the other hand Robert Nathan, presenting the case for the steel workers union before the Presidential Fact Finding Board, was equally insistent on a "break-even" point for the steel industry today of only 33 percent of capacity.

It is possible, of course, that Nathan does not understand the theory of the tendency of the falling rate of profit or, at least, ignores it. And it is perfectly obvious that the steel magnates would apply every trick of their accounting devices to move the so-called "break-even" point up to the highest plausible level.

A Page of Skulduggery

It would be a mistake to identify the industrialist's "break-even" point—arbitrarily and artificially established—with the tendency of the falling rate of profit. It represents rather a page from the chapter of skulduggery and swindles perpetrated by these predatory capitalists essentially for the purpose of defrauding the steel workers of a livable return on their toil.

These techniques were carefully analyzed and presented in great detail by Donald Montgomery, chief of the Washington office of the UAW-CIO, to the Joint Committee of the Economic Report in the hearings on corporate profits

held in Washington, D. C. during December 1948. In the case of U. S. Steel, these hearings brought out the following:

1. At the end of 1940 U. S. Steel adopted the "last-in, first-out" (Lifo) method of reporting most of their inventories. With inventory valued at the last or higher cost in a period of increasing prices, with the so-called inventory profits having been written off.

2. During the war (from 1941 through 1945) capital facilities were depreciated under the five-year amortization certificates ("accelerated depreciation"). This accelerated depreciation during the war amounted to a total of \$223 million for the five-year period over and above normal depreciation charges. In the postwar period depreciation allowances were substantially increased to cover "higher replacement costs." Thus, in the middle of 1947, an additional 30 percent was added to the depreciation allowance. In 1948, this was advanced to 60 percent.

3. In the twenty-year period—1928-1947—depreciation charges amounted to a total of \$1,555 million while capital expenditures were \$1,594 million. Thus the increased value of the U. S. Steel Corporation since 1928 has been financed almost entirely by depreciation charges and not from any re-invested profits.

But none of these exorbitant depreciation allowances are included in reports of net profits made. Profits appear correspondingly reduced; and the "break-even" point, moving upward at an accelerated pace, becomes pure fraud.

The realization of profit and the accumulation of capital is the primary urge and the motivating force of all capitalist

production. This and this alone is given serious consideration by the steel magnates when demands are made for expansion of productive capacity, or when demands are made for increased wages by the steel workers union.

The phenomenal expansion of the steel industry during the last century of its existence has subjected it ever more to the fundamental laws as well as to the contradictions of capitalist production. Its gigantic machinery operated by relatively few men, so vividly described by Grey, represents the disproportionate expansion of constant capital relative to variable capital. With each new labor-saving machine, labor productivity rises to greater heights and the absolute mass of that part of labor which is unpaid and represents surplus value is increased.

Living labor alone produces surplus value. But in the steel industry this has meant a continual decline of living labor employed in comparison to the amount of constant capital invested. As a result, the surplus value produced has also continually declined in comparison to the total capital invested. And since the proportion of the mass of surplus value to the value of total capital employed forms the rate of profit, this rate tends to fall continuously.

Falling Rate of Profit

Marx always insisted that the fall in the rate of average profit manifests itself as a tendency and not in absolute form. Its effects become clearly marked only under certain conditions and over long periods. But Marx also established the fact that the same causes which bring about this falling tendency of the rate of profit also produce a counterbalance to this tendency.

The growth of the social productivity of labor expresses itself also in a progressive increase in the absolute mass of the appropriated surplus value or profit; thus on the whole a relative decrease of variable capital and profit is accompanied by an absolute increase of both.

There is an accelerated accumulation of capital. Generally the growth of total capital proceeds at a more rapid ratio than that expressed by the fall of the rate of profit.

According to R. Weidenhammer's analysis in the *American Economic Review* for March, 1933, the rate of profit on the invested capital of the U. S. Steel Corporation fell from approximately 8 percent in 1902 to 4.5 percent in 1927-1929 (the rate rose sharply during the war years of 1916-17). But the corpora-

tion's surplus rose from \$25 million in 1902 to \$700 million in 1929 while its assets increased more than threefold. In other words a vastly increased mass of profit compensated for the diminishing rate of profit.

One of the outstanding factors counteracting the tendency of the falling rate of profit is represented by a greater intensity of exploitation of labor. This tends to raise the rate of profit by increasing surplus value without a corresponding increase in the value of fixed capital. Various methods of rationalization of production including actual speed-up are applied. *U. S. News and World Report*, July 1949 states: "All U. S. factories, as a group, operated at a rate of efficiency that was 7 percent higher during the first four months of this year than it was in all of 1948, on the basis of official indexes." It is to be assumed that the steel magnates enjoyed their share of this greater intensity of exploitation of labor.

The tendency of the falling rate of profit is checked also by such means as the cheapening of the elements of constant capital. This may apply to both equipment and raw materials.

Prices of raw materials are often cheapened by the development of synthetics and other substitutes, by greater efficiency of production and greater supply, and, not least of all, by more intense exploitation of colonial labor. Apparently it was not too difficult for Robert Nathan to prove before the Fact Finding Board that Big Steel could grant the thirty-cent-an-hour package demanded by the union out of the saving from the recent fall in the cost of raw materials alone.

It is just as true for machinery and other fixed capital as for raw materials that value does not grow in proportion to their mass. Both the quantity and the productivity of the former tend to increase more than their price. For the machinery and tool-producing industry this trend is more marked than in the average of capitalist production as a whole. Thus the same development which increases the mass of constant capital relatively over that of variable capital, reduces the value of its elements as a result of the increased productivity of labor.

Effect of Monopoly

However, the rate of profit within the process of production itself depends also on many other circumstances. Even entirely apart from surplus values produced

or economies affected in constant capital, the rate of profit depends on what Marx calls the second act of the process of capitalist production—the sale of the products.

The rate of profit depends not least of all on the constellation of the market. For instance, during the recent war period monopoly capitalism sold its output at arbitrarily set prices to the government in which the monopoly capitalists were also represented in person. In addition the government helped to hold down costs of production through its OPA measures. Prices and profits were not lowered by competition, and advertising costs could be held to a minimum. All of fixed capital, including its new additions, was set into motion by labor.

This "market" absorbed the enlarged output of commodities and permitted a complete realization of surplus value and profit. No doubt the rate of profit experienced a new even though temporary rise. Of this booty, to be sure, the masters of the steel industry pocketed their bountiful share, and they are now giving a demonstration of their determination to fight to the bitter end against any encroachment on their swollen profits.

On the whole the monopoly control of American industry, with its arbitrary price-fixing and tariff protection for the big internal market, exerts its effect in checking the falling rate of profit. Externally, American imperialism, after its victory in the war, endeavored to extend this check to the world market by the elimination of such competitors as Germany and Japan. However, it thereby extends also all its own internal antagonisms and becomes more inextricably bound up with the malignant growth of paralysis and decay of world capitalist economy.

For the sake of clarity on some of these important aspects of the laws of capitalist production I thought it necessary to submit these remarks as an extension to Grey's article. However, I can readily agree to Grey's forecast of the future vulnerability of the steel industry which holds true in general for capitalist industry as a whole.

Life and Death Struggle

Like a "floating" foundation threatening collapse, the tendency of the falling rate of profit shows the constantly deeper cracks and fissures in the structure of capitalist economy. The industrial overlords are compelled to struggle incessantly to brace it up. Both the

tendency of the falling rate of profit and the struggle against it condition the most fundamental aspect of capitalist development.

Since the rate of profit is the incentive to capitalist production, its falling tendency checks the formation of new independent capital. Even the efforts to offset the tendency by increasing the mass of profit through changing the organic composition of capital succeeds only temporarily, inasmuch as this change again asserts its downward pressure. The tendency of the falling rate of profit aggravates the contradictions between the absolute development of production and the limited conditions of consumption.

That the steel industry gave a resounding "NO" in answer to the big clamor for further expansion of productive capacity is quite understandable from their point of view. From its roaring infancy,

the steel industry grew with the development of new industry and the industrialization of new regions. Now the decline of the rate of expansion is easily observable. Roughly this corresponds to the declining rate of expansion for American industry as a whole.

But it would not be correct to ascribe this entirely to the tendency of the falling rate of profit. The constantly higher organic composition of capital also sets into motion simultaneously and antagonistically a restriction of the growth of the market by imposing new limitations upon the purchasing power of the great mass of the workers. Capitalism develops the forces of production far more rapidly than the forces of consumption, and the latter are subject to a number of specific laws. Thus, wages tend to fall relatively as output and profits rise. Consumer income rises at a slower pace than investment income. That is why the steel

barons get cold chills as they anticipate the ultimate effects of the high cost of excess capacity.

The decline of the rate of expansion of capitalist production gives expression also to a decline of ability, or of the means of converting profits into capital. This carries with it a decline of the ability to create a consumers market. Marx put this whole question in a nutshell when he said:

"The real barrier of capitalist production is capital itself. It is the fact that capital and its self-expansion appear as the starting and closing point, as the motive and aim of production; that production is merely production for capital, and not vice versa, the means of production mere means for an ever expanding system of the life process for the benefit of the society of producers." (Capital, Vol. III, page 293.)

Stalinism and Negro History

By J. MEYER

The policy of Stalinism in regard to the working masses everywhere is universally recognized as a policy of *manipulation*. From the Kremlin comes the line. The workers are supposed to obey, sometimes, as in June 1924, without an hour's notice. This, of course, is based upon an enormous contempt of the masses who are seen as political cannon-fodder and nothing else. But as the self-professed party of the working-class, Stalinism must present itself as guardian of the immediate and historic rights of the workers who are the initiators of a new free society. To be aware of the reality, which the Stalinists need to manipulate and to disguise, is gain, an invaluable insight into their theory, propaganda and political practice. Nowhere is this dual attitude more strikingly illustrated than in their attitude to American Negroes.

In 1937, two years after the inauguration of the popular front policy, American Stalinism invaded with fanfare the history of the Civil War. To the Winter 1937 issue of *Science and Society*, Richard Enmale contributed "Interpretations of the American Civil War." "The time has come," he proclaimed, "for American Marxist historians to complete the unfinished tasks of the liberal bourgeois historical school." He denounced the Bourbon historians but he omitted the entire school of Negro historians whose thirty years of serious work on the Civil War, though in form limited to Negroes, in reality had already provided the indispensable groundwork for any comprehensive analysis of the period. In his analysis of the social forces of the Civil War, Enmale omitted Negroes altogether.

This was a serious tactical error. The essay was used as the Introduction to *The Civil War in the United States* by

Marx and Engels and there the Negroes were "included." The way in which they were "included" became as time passed highly instructive. Enmale gives full statistics of the number of Negroes who fought and the number who died. He praises their "heroism," "their caliber as fighting men," and "their eagerness to enlist and fight for freedom"; some rose from the ranks to become officers; a great number rendered valuable services as cooks, laborers, etc. That is all. Here, naked and as yet unadorned, is the summation of Stalinist policy, theoretical, historical, strategic and tactical on Negroes and therefore on the Civil War. There are many Negroes (manpower), heroic and ready to die (shock troops); they have men of ability who are fit for leadership (recognition).

Enmale again ignored the Negro historians. Thus the contemporary Negroes were kept in the background, theoretically and politically, in the role reserved for their ancestors in the actual conflicts of the Civil War. In this apparently slight but pregnant episode was embodied the general Stalinist conception of history and its particular application to Negroes in the United States. It has been refurbished, embellished, disguised, but it remains in all essentials the same wherever the Stalinists touch the Negro question.

In 1937 there also appeared James Allen's *Reconstruction*. This book bore traces of the period when Roosevelt was being called a fascist by the Stalinists. But whatever it had of value, it owed to W. E. B. DuBois' magnificent *Black Reconstruction* which had appeared in 1935. DuBois is solemnly reproved by Allen for "failing to grasp the fundamental bourgeois character of the revolution." Here again the Stalinists revealed themselves. DuBois did indeed make

the mistake of calling the Reconstruction governments a sort of dictatorship of the proletariat. Far from doing harm, the conception that lay behind the mistaken formula was the strength of DuBois' book: he recognized that the Negroes *in particular* had tried to carry out ideas that went beyond the prevailing conceptions of bourgeois democracy. Precisely this was aimed at the heart of the whole Stalinist, popular front conception. Hence their hostility to DuBois. DuBois is praised, however, both by Enmale and by Allen for his "spirited defense" of the Reconstruction government—both use the same phrase.

Faithful Disciple of Stalinism

Thus, in 1937, Stalinism prepared a) to place itself before the Negroes as the vindicator and guardian of their historical rights; b) to show not merely liberal historians but liberal politicians how valuable was the Negro and precisely what he had to contribute; c) to whip up the Negroes themselves for the necessary heroism and martyrdom; and d) to see to it that the Negroes, historically and politically, were kept in their place.

The man who carried out the line in regard to Negro history was Herbert Aptheker. In popular pamphlets Aptheker demonstrated many of the elementary facts, to a large degree suppressed, of Negro revolutionary struggle in the United States. Aptheker has also published a book and a collection of articles where the same subjects have been treated with a more scholarly apparatus. Altogether his writings have been the most effective weapons in the Stalinist propaganda armory among radicals, Negroes and Negro intellectuals in particular. Presumably among all intellectuals, the two books pass as Marxism. Yet in the work of a dozen years, Aptheker has never once stepped outside the bounds of the limits prescribed by Stalinism for Negroes—as manpower, as shocktroops and as deserving of "recognition." So organic to present-day Stalinism is this attitude and so Stalinized is Aptheker that he can find in his quite extensive explorations only what fits this pattern, infinitesimal as it may be; and is blind to everything else, though it shout for notice without benefit of research. The pattern shapes the structure of his work and the very style of his writing.

The Negro intellectuals and historians are indirectly and directly aware that something is wrong with the method and results of Aptheker's "Marxism." (See for example the article by Ernest Kaiser in *Phylon*, 1948, No. 4.) But they will need to grapple seriously with Marxism to penetrate to the corruption behind the facade of class struggle, conflicts of social systems, panegyrics to Negro heroism, etc. with which Aptheker generously sprinkles his writing. We propose to begin that task here by contrasting side by side the method of Marxism and the method of Aptheker. We shall begin with the subject which Aptheker has, so to speak, made his own, the question of slave insurrections.

Slave Insurrections

Negro slavery was more or less patriarchal so long as consumption was directed to immediate local needs. But in proportion as the export of cotton became of interest to

the United States, patriarchal slavery was, in the words of Marx, "drawn into the whirlpool of an international market dominated by the capitalistic mode of production." The structure of production relations was thereby altered. By 1860 there were over two thousand plantations each with over a hundred slaves. Division of labor increased. Slaves began to perform skilled labor, were hired out for wages. Slave production took on more and more the character of social labor. The slave revolts that began in 1800 were therefore of an entirely different character from those of the seventeenth and eighteenth century.

Gabriel's revolt in 1800 involved at least one thousand and perhaps many thousands of slaves. Gabriel himself was a blacksmith. The insurrectionists had themselves made swords, bayonets, and bullets. So much for the new revolutionary forces. In a system of labor that is predominantly social, revolution and counter-revolution are closely intertwined. Though the revolt did *not* attract national attention, it impelled the slave-owners to become declared enemies of the idea of gradual abolition, which had hitherto held sway among semi-liberal circles in the South.

Unrest grew with the economy and in 1817 the slave-owners formed the Colonization Society. Under the guise of philanthropy this powerful society aimed at creating and controlling all opinions about Negroes and slavery in the North. Its program was to deport all free Negroes to Africa. Free Negroes fought it undeviatingly from the start. Thus was the battle joined which was to end at Appomatox in 1865. The climax to this phase came in the next decade, 1820-30.

This was one of the crucial decades in American history, the decade of transition from colonial America to nineteenth century capitalism. Politically this took shape in the tumultuous democracy of Jackson. The first great slave revolt of the period is the revolt of Denmark Vesey. Most of Vesey's followers are urban artisans. They are determined never to "cringe to the whites." They are suspicious of the domestic slaves. The revolt failed, in 1824.

The sequence of dates from 1824 is very important. It is about this time that we have the first indications of an organized Underground Railroad. In 1826 is organized the Massachusetts General Colored Peoples Association. The free Negro had now entered definitively upon the political scene. Vesey had been a free Negro. The response of the slave-owners was violent. Along with relentless persecution of the free Negroes in the South, they multiplied their efforts to expand the persecution to the North. They wished to silence the free Negro and to drive him out of the country altogether. In 1827 the Negroes published *Freedom's Journal*, the first Negro newspaper in the United States, and dedicated to the militant defense of the Negro rights. The Colonization Society, determined to smash it, bought up John B. Russwurm, one of the junior editors of the paper; the paper had to suspend publication.

In 1828 David Walker laid his *Appeal* before the Massachusetts Association. The famous document called openly for slave insurrection. It was published in three editions and sold 50,000 copies in less than five years, some of which reached the South. Wrote a North Carolina news-

paper: "If Perkins' steam-gun had been charged with rattle snakes and shot into the midst of a flock of wild pigeons, the fluttering could not have been greater than has recently been felt in the eastern part of this state by a few copies of this perishable production. When an old Negro from Boston writes a book and sends it among us, the whole country is thrown into commotion."

Two states enacted laws prohibiting the circulation of incendiary publications and forbidding that slaves should be taught to read and write. For the second offense the penalty was death. For Walker dead \$1000 was offered, for Walker alive \$10,000. The slave-owners tried to extradite him from Boston. They failed. But they continued to terrorize free Negroes in the South and instigated a terrible persecution of the free Negroes in the North, particularly in Cincinnati and other parts of Ohio, involving thousands.

The free Negroes published another paper called *The Rights of All* and the same leaders who had organized *Freedom's Journal* called together the first National Negro Convention in September 1830. William Lloyd Garrison's *Liberator* appeared in 1831. At that time the majority of white anti-slavery proponents were gradual Abolitionists and supporters of the Colonization Society. Even Garrison supported the society. By their published arguments and by personal contact the free Negroes persuaded Garrison as to the true nature of the Colonization Society and Garrison began an international campaign of denunciation against this organization.

Significance of Turner's Revolt

At this critical moment came the greatest of all Negro revolts, that of Nat Turner, a "mechanically gifted man." It failed, but it struck terror in all the South and startled the whole country. Walker's *Appeal* could be blamed but Walker was dead. Garrison, however, was alive. Overnight he and his obscure *Liberator* were made responsible for the uprising and became nationally famous. As Turner's was the last of the great revolts of the early nineteenth century, so it precipitated on a national scale an entirely new form of struggle.

This is not mere Negro history. It is the central line of the history of the United States. The Missouri Compromise took place in 1820. All sides, terrified by the abyss that had yawned over the Missouri struggle decided to suppress all discussion of slavery (except along the poisonous lines of the Colonization Society). De Tocqueville and others noted the blight that had descended over free discussion in the whole country. It was this nation-wide conspiracy of silence that the sequence of events from Vesey to Turner's revolt blasted wide open. Revolting slave, the persecuted free Negro and the New England intellectual had got together and forced the nation to face the slavery question. When Garrison wrote "*I will be heard*," he was not being rhetorical. That was the first problem: to be heard. After Turner's revolt that problem was solved for Garrison.

A Superficial Treatment

Now let us take Aptheker's treatment of this period in *The Negro in the Abolitionist Movement*, the section headed

"Early Nineteenth Century." "The first generation of the nineteenth century witnessed a significant expansion in the anti-slavery activities of the Negro people which did much to prepare the ground for the tilling and harvesting that was to come from 1830 to the Civil War." We read on: "Among the individuals" was Peter Williams, Jr., a minister in New York City. He worked so hard that in 1834 he was appointed to the Board of Managers of the American Anti-Slavery Society, Garrison's organization. James Forten vigorously denounced slavery. "Negroes ever in the forefront" did "vital spadework" for the Abolition movement. Reverend Nathaniel Paul made "radical" speeches. Groups sprang up. David Walker published his *Appeal*. It was sent into the South and when discovered "caused great excitement." There were Negro newspapers which actually appeared before Garrison's *Liberator*. That is all there is to Aptheker's "Early Nineteenth Century."

But maybe in another pamphlet, *Negro Slave Revolts*, he deals seriously with the effects of the revolts? Not he. He finds that the year 1800 is the most important year in the history of American Negro slave revolts. Why? "It is the year in which John Brown and Nat Turner were born, the year in which Vesey bought his freedom, and the year of Gabriel's conspiracy."

Between 1824 and 1831 there was the creation of a new movement in which Negroes and whites are in appearance separate but in essence unified. This was *not* the kind of unity of whites and Negroes that took place when Negroes joined Washington's army and became appendages to an already established revolutionary movement. The driving force in the formation of this new movement was the insurrectionary slave and the free Negro in opposition to the Southern slave-owner.

In a lengthy chapter on the effects of these rebellions, Aptheker says: "At least one important effect of the slave rebellions is apparent. This is the added drive that they directly gave to the Abolitionist movement." But what he means is something far different from what we have described. For him, the revolts serve to "stimulate" the Northern Abolitionists. Aptheker tells us that the slave-owners were forever preaching of the docility and contentedness of the slave while "news of slaves conspiring and dying" *proved* the opposite. To this is added characteristically that John Brown was "inspired" and "influenced" by Nat Turner's revolt to strike his "noble and world-shaking blow against human bondage."

In *The Negro People in America* (p. 48) Aptheker attacks Gunnar Myrdal for not understanding the slave insurrections. He says that "above all" these rebellions "pricked the consciences" of Jefferson and Madison, "stimulated" anti-slavery feeling and served to "inspire" the Abolitionists. He has a deep compulsion to play down the positive contribution of the Negroes in the developing events. Thus in "Buying Freedom," an article in the collection *To Be Free*, he says that the activities of the Negroes were "fundamental" to the Abolition movement. But he immediately explains: "Each of these actions demonstrated the inequities of bondage and the deep desire of the Negro for liberation" (p. 39).

Aptheker sees the slaves, the mass, on the one side and the Abolitionists on the other. He faithfully follows the Stalinist line of viewing the Negroes as manpower and shock troops. Cut away from seeing the binding revolutionary link, he is compelled to substitute inspiration as the tie. Hence the following: "And to this day, selfless devotion of Gabriel's, Vesey's... bequeathed to lovers of liberty a memory that remains green... death of these was not in vain. No blow struck is ever wholly lost."

While it is legitimate and natural to derive inspiration from heroic martyrs, it becomes an absolutely false method when rhetoric is used as a substitute for the concrete role played by the Negroes in building the revolutionary movement. It has nothing in common with the Marxist method of theoretical analysis.

Turn now to Aptheker's more critical writings. In his book on *American Slave Revolts* he spends forty pages on what he calls "The Turner Cataclysm." You look in vain for any conception of what the Turner revolt meant to American revolutionary politics, of the close logical and historical connection between the revolutionary slaves and the revolutionary needs of American society.

Marxist View of Abolitionism

Let us now sketch a Marxist analysis of the Abolitionist movement. The Abolitionist movement was an expression of revolutionary classes and groups. To the slaves, the free Negroes and the urban intelligentsia was added the North-west farmers.

The concrete link and theoretical axis is the Underground Railroad. One road ran through the Ohio of the small farmers who could see across the river the effects of slavery. Another road ran through the Eastern seaboard states. In farming areas as well as in the towns of the Eastern states the free Negroes at various times lived in daily fear. They were beaten up and murdered; their houses, churches and schools were burnt; escaped slaves were caught and returned; free Negroes were kidnapped and sold into slavery.

Slave-owners and slaves battled for the support of the petty-bourgeoisie in town and country.* Now that slavery was no longer a closed question, the slave-owners worked through their innumerable and powerful Northern contacts to drive the free Negroes out of the United States. The slaves, learning from Turner's failure, sent a never-ending stream of representatives north to the free Negroes and through them to the Abolition movement, supplying it with revolutionary personnel and revolutionary politics. This question of fugitive slaves was the rock on which all attempts at compromise between North and South were shattered.

The first crisis of radical Abolitionism came from the farmers. In the 1830's a great revivalist movement came out of the West moving eastward to New York and Philadelphia. It embraced Abolitionism. But unlike the drunkard, the prison-inmate, the Sabbath-breaker, and the girl who had sinned, the slave was a member of a social class, a class

*The working class came in much later but when it did, its intervention was decisive.

which had signified that it stood for radical, i.e. revolutionary Abolition.

Garrison and his radicalism now personified Abolition. He beat off two attempts to supplant him by organizations with watered-down policy. His most precious support came from the free Negroes; attested repeatedly by Garrison himself and the efforts of his rivals to win them away.

The radicalism of Garrison was now a danger to social peace. The depression and the decline of the religious fervor gave conservative Abolitionists their chance. They succeeded in decentralizing the movement. They proposed to tone down "immediate" emancipation; they sought to substitute for the New England intellectuals the leadership of the regular clergy; they sought to exclude women. The unutterably degraded status of Negro women in the South, the activities of free Negro women in the North had helped to bring into the movement numbers of white petty-bourgeois women, stirred also by their own grievances. On the question of women being allowed in the movement, Garrison, the New England intellectuals, the women and the Free Negroes kept Abolitionism radical.

In 1840 James Birney split the movement. He "politicalized" Abolitionism, directing it toward New York philanthropists and other "sympathetic" bourgeois who detested radicalism. In 1840 this kind of politics was a foolhardy venture and the Liberty Party was a total failure. Garrison and the New England intellectuals, for various abstract and Utopian reasons, were militantly anti-political. In this crisis Garrison again owed his ideological and organizational victory to the support of free Negroes. They were not anti-political; many of them were actively engaged in state politics. But they rallied to the principled radical Abolitionism of Garrison.

Conflicts Among Abolitionists

However after this victory Garrison declined and, to quote a sympathetic biographer, for years seemed to live "in a sort of waking trance." In the difficult early days his intransigence had been invaluable, and had saved the movement. Now that slavery was a national issue, he had neither program nor perspective. Feeling the need for a new orientation he now preached disunion with the slave South on the ground that the Constitution was a pro-slavery document.

Others beside Garrison came forward to lift Abolitionism to a higher plane. The free Negroes began a counter-offensive to the slaveholders, raiding the South to help slaves escape. Henry Highland Garnett, a Negro who republished Walker's *Appeal*, in 1843 presented to a Negro Convention a call for slave insurrection. It was defeated by only one vote. Wendell Phillips by degrees assumed the virtual leadership of the Garrisonians. He shared Garrison's theory of disunion, but was only formally in agreement with his pacifism. He preached Abolitionism with such philosophical breadth, oratorical power and denunciation of slave-holders and their allies that the general effect was profoundly revolutionary.

But the greatest figure in this period was Frederick Douglass. In 1843 at the Negro Convention he had opposed

Garnett's call for insurrection, being still a Garrisonian. But he split with the Garrisonians and later joined the new Free Soil Party. With fierce and devastating polemic he repudiated Garrison's disunionism and defended the revolutionary and anti-slavery implications of the Constitution at a time when that document and with it the American revolutionary tradition was under fire both North and South. In 1850 came the Fugitive Slave Act over which the country seemed to explode. The fighting over Kansas, John Brown's raid, and the other revolutionary events of that period were supported by the continuous undercurrent of revolt in the South. The above is a rigidly stylized account of a highly complex movement. But this much is certain. What we are watching here is the growth of the revolutionary movement from 1800 to 1860. From Gabriel through Turner to militant Abolitionism we have one road for the abolition of slavery. The parliamentarians, the compromisers, the gradual Abolitionists, the maneuverers in Washington pointed to another road. Marxist history consists always in contrasting these two and showing how a great social conflict is finally resolved along the lines of the despised, rejected, persecuted movement and not along the line of parliamentarians and petty-bourgeois reformists. In any history of 1830-1860 the role of the Negro for purely objective and social reasons is paramount.

Now for Aptheker. Does he mention in his pamphlet on Negro Abolitionists the crisis with Birney? No. Does he mention Henry Highland Garnett? He does, once—to say that he was "present" at a convention. Does he mention the resounding split between Garrison and Douglass? Not a line, not a word. There is not the slightest hint that the Negro was anything more than an appendage, a very valuable appendage, to what Aptheker considers the Abolitionist movement to have been. His whole conception is that the Abolitionist movement was predominantly white, and Negroes joined it. In fact if you could imagine a writer being given an assignment to write about Negroes in the Abolition movement and to *exclude* every example of their *political* activity, then the result could easily be Aptheker's pamphlet.

It is possible to say that Aptheker is writing a popular account of Negro Abolitionists. But he has also written an essay "Militant Abolitionism" in his volume *To Be Free*. It is the only essay in all his writings on these subjects where he does not treat Negroes specifically. It is thirty-three pages long and has appended to it eleven pages of notes in fine print, taking up one hundred and five references from the text.

What does it deal with? Practically the whole essay treats of discussions by Abolitionist figures about the abstract question of resistance or non-resistance. At a meeting in Boston in April 1835, the question is submitted for discussion. Sides are taken. By 1841 Gerritt Smith has moved to the point of urging slaves to flee. One Spooner had a plan for slave rebellion, sent it to leading Abolitionists and received and preserved nine replies. Such and such a Negro advocated insurrection, such and such a white Abolitionist did or did not. So page after page.

We shall understand this evasive emptiness best by

examining a speech of Wendell Phillips at an Abolitionist meeting in April 12, 1852. The question was: What should fugitive slaves do when threatened with arrest. Wendell Phillips proposed: a) that unless fugitives were prepared to take the lives of any officer who tried to arrest them they should leave the United States; b) that in every town vigilance committees should be formed which "would avail themselves fearlessly, according to their best judgment, of all the means God and Nature have put into their hands, to see that substantial justice be done." Note the "fearlessly" and "all the means." The quoted section, as Phillips' speech showed, was a direct call to action.

Garrison proposed an amendment. It must be quoted in full:

Resolved, That if 'resistance to tyrants,' by bloody weapons 'is obedience to God,' and if our Revolutionary Fathers were justified in wading through blood to freedom and independence, then every fugitive slave is justified in arming himself for protection and defence,—in taking the life of every marshal, commissioner, or other person who attempts to reduce him to bondage; and the millions who are clanking their chains on our soil find ample warrant in rising en masse, and asserting their right to liberty, at whatever sacrifice of the life of their oppressors.

Resolved, That the State in which no fugitive slave can remain in safety, and from which he must flee in order to secure his liberty in another land, is to be held responsible for all the crimes and horrors which cluster about the slave-system and the slave trade,—and that State is the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Phillips, with gracious deference to Garrison—but with what Marx calls his "iron determination"—rejected the amendment and he said everything when he said that it "seems . . . too ambiguous; it contents itself with announcing an important principle, but suggests nothing, advises nothing."

What is the value of Aptheker's lengthy account of who was for resistance in principle and who against, except that he does not even understand the principled question. In that very speech Phillips said that he was an opponent of a slave revolution in the South only because he did not think it would succeed. If the hour should ever come—"God hasten it!"—when a national crisis gave the slave an opportunity, he would say to every slave, "Strike now for freedom!" The applause was "long-continued and deafening." This attitude to revolution permeates the speeches of Phillips. Garrison's resolution showed how complicated a thing was this whole Abolitionist pacifism. When he said "Immediate Unconditional Emancipation on the Soil," when his admitted aim was to goad the South into madness, slave-owners and innumerable other people understood that this program was what mattered and not Garrison's non-resistance and "moral suasion." Furthermore "moral suasion" as Garrison practiced it meant such unbridled denunciation not only of slave-owners but of all who were not for immediate emancipation that the effect was and could not have been otherwise than divisive and revolutionary. At a meeting after John Brown's death, Garrison in the course of his speech asked how many non-resistants were there in the room. Among many thousands present only two or three stood up.

Wendell Phillips said of the Abolition movement that it was the first genuine American movement and the first that spoke with a native voice—all previous American politics had borne the stamp of Europe. It was one of the most profound of the many profound observations this great revolutionary habitually made. It is fascinating to see how even while some Abolitionists theoretically enunciated and advocated "moral suasion" *empirically* the movement met every obstacle with a determination that stopped at nothing; and with casuistry and at other times with no respect for principle or logic, continually exceeded the bounds of the accepted theory.

This is one of the most difficult but one of the most important aspects of the movement. Aptheker, except for a characteristically academic footnote in *American Slave Revolts* (p. 111), has no understanding of this and he cannot even begin to probe this vital question because the most uncompromising advocates and practitioners of direct action and rebellion were free Negroes and fugitive slaves.

The Negro Movement

Aptheker knows very well that to speak of militant Abolitionism is to pose immediately the question of Negro Abolitionism. But the inescapable superficiality of his treatment is evidenced by the fact that nowhere does he treat of the great split between Douglass on one side, and Phillips and Garrison on the other. He omits the continuous conflicts between whites and Negroes. There is no word

about the fact that Garrison opposed all formation of Negro organizations and objected even to a Negro publishing a paper.

Aptheker gives no hint that the Negro Conventions were political conventions always, where the participants were aligned for and against "moral suasion," for and against the Liberty Party, the Free Soil Party, etc. In the early days the richer Negroes opposed special Negro demands and the treating of Negro problems as a Negro question; they wanted Negroes to demand equal rights as citizens. They were overwhelmingly defeated. It is these Negro organizations which, as organizations, passed the most revolutionary resolutions about resistance and rebellion, reprinted the revolutionary writings of Walker, etc.

Aptheker knows this too. But apart from a reference to the convention at which Garnett spoke (and this could not be avoided), Aptheker finds no room for this in his text. It appears only in a reference note on page 205 of *To Be Free*. This cannot be accidental.

Aptheker cannot break through the theoretical vise in which he is enclosed. He sees the Negro organizations essentially as early versions of the Stalinist Negro Congress, Southern Welfare Association, etc., which have no politics of their own but exist to corral Negroes and bring them into the popular front coalition in which the Stalinists are at the moment interested.

What then does Aptheker write about in his *Negro in the Abolitionist Movement* and why? This we shall take up in the next article.

BOOK REVIEW

Barnett's "Universe"

THE UNIVERSE AND DR. EINSTEIN
by Lincoln Barnett, William Sloane
Associates, N. Y., 1948.

There is a popular myth that only Einstein and three others in the world understand the theory of relativity. Lincoln Barnett's book, which made the best seller lists, will give substantial support to this myth, notwithstanding the publisher's blurbs to the contrary. At least, critical readers will be disappointed in their search for basic enlightenment on one of the most important theories in modern physics.

Like so many of its predecessors, this book purports to present a "picture (of the new perspective of the universe which) can be comprehended by the non-scientific layman." And indeed, a superficial reader might be fooled into believing that he has followed derivations of fundamental physical laws, with no more technical equipment being used than a

general propensity for a vague sort of "logic" and abstract philosophico-theological reasoning!

Alas, the purpose is laudable but it seems to be demonstrated again that there is no easy road to knowledge; and further, that once you let yourself believe that you have discovered such a magic road, you inevitably fall into the pitfalls of mysticism.

* * *

The *Universe* and Dr. Einstein presents an account of Einstein's (and some others') major contributions to our understanding of the universe. While it names and in part describes the content of Einstein's theories, it is filled with logical constructions which appear to deduce these theories from common sense, whereas in reality, many of these "derivations" are simply nonsensical; the book is filled with such logical "non sequiturs."

Using the same procedure, all kinds of philosophical generalizations are ar-

rived at presenting a muddle of ideas whose lineage is traceable more directly to religion than to physics. It should be said in behalf of the author, who is a journalist, that many of these notions were first perpetrated on the unsuspecting lay public by physicists themselves!

For example, the author believes that he has demonstrated that quantum physics "... demolishes two pillars of the old science, causality and determinism. For by dealing in terms of statistics and probabilities it abandons all ideas that nature exhibits an inexorable sequence of cause and effect. And by its admission of margins of uncertainty it yields up the ancient hope that science, given the present state and velocity of every material body in the universe, can forecast the history of the universe for all time. One by-product of this surrender is a new argument for the existence of free will. For if physical events are indeterminate and the future unpredictable, then perhaps..." (pp. 27, 28).

What a jumble of half-baked philosophy strutting as "popular science"!

The "Uncertainty Principle"

Roughly speaking, the "Uncertainty Principle" of Heisenberg, referred to

in the quotation above as "its (quantum physics) admission of uncertainty," states that the position and velocity of a single electron cannot be exactly determined at a given moment by a man occupied in its study, because in the process of observing it, its position and velocity are changed. How this principle disproves the existence of cause and effect (or lawfulness in nature) is yet to be demonstrated by any one of the modern mystics, from the physicist-philosophers like Jeans and Eddington, to science-speaking theologians like DuNouy, and popular science journalists such as Mr. Barnett.

It should be noted that most modern scientists search their results for possible sources of error. The statement of "limits of experimental error" in exact figures is an indication of greater, not less, accuracy in observation than in the old practice of simply stating all laws, all equations, and all figures as absolutes. The discovery of the "Uncertainty Principle" was a great step forward in defining with precision the limits of observational error in a field of investigation dealing with ultramicroscopic entities.

All the work of quantum physics has added to our body of laws about the physical universe. We are continually finding more information about what Einstein calls the "uniformity of nature." Rather than concluding that "future events are unpredictable," further developments in science constantly give us more tools (laws) with which to predict more accurately than was ever possible before.

Mr. Barnett, with a journalistic eye for the sensational, borrows more from other schools than that of Einstein in his book on Einstein's ideas, especially when he soars into the realms of philosophy. Either he is ignorant or he chooses to ignore the fact that Einstein is a strict causalist and materialist. There are only a few direct quotations from Einstein in this book, and they give the impression that the great physicist occupies himself largely with God, religion, mystical emotions, and "cosmic religious experience." It must have required truly heroic efforts of scholarship to dig these quotations out of the mass of Einstein's more serious work!

"Popular Science"

It cannot be ignored, however, that many modern physicists seem to have a dual personality in the realm of theory. (This remarkable phenomenon has socio-

logical origins which we shall discuss further below.) In their professional work as experimenters or writers of reports in top level scientific journals, every step involves the strictest rigor in thought and presupposes a monistic-materialistic lawfulness in nature. Then some of these physicists seem to be driven by a kind of social consciousness to explain in "popular" essays and books, in non-scientific terms, just what their scientific work consists of.

The code appears to be: in popular works, anything goes! Rigor is forgotten, normal scientific procedure is anathema (they don't wish to be considered snobs), wild speculation is the vogue. Idealism, agnosticism, God-seeking (none of which have any place in scientific investigation) are all in order here! Mr. Barnett catches this spirit of "popularization" with great relish, and finds it more appropriate for creating a best seller than dry "technical" talk.

Thus picking up an idea popularized by Eddington (and not by Einstein) he speaks of the alleged material emptiness of modern physical theory; what he calls "the void between science and reality" (p. 29). The same thought is repeated in other ways throughout the book. This wild assertion stems from the fact that much of our knowledge of the remote microcosm of sub-atomic particles and of the macrocosm of star-systems and the universe as a whole is expressed in mathematical formulae for which there are no simple pictorial representations in the world of our every-day experience. It is just as silly to deny the "reality" of science in these fields as to deny the reality of x-rays, radio waves, ultraviolet or infra-red rays* because we cannot see them without the aid of instruments.

Barnett describes the physicist as being "somewhat in the position of a blind man trying to discern the shape and texture of a snowflake. As soon as it touches his fingers or his tongue it dissolves. A wave electron, a photon, a wave of probability, cannot be visualized; they are simply symbols useful in expressing the mathematical relationships of microcosm" (p. 28).

The confusion of a symbol with the object represented by that symbol is quite common among primitive men and is still retained apparently, even in some sections of civilized society. The author's analogy herein employed is one which we can conveniently use to de-

monstrate the fallacy in his reasoning.

Let us assume a blind man and a snowflake. Is the snowflake's shape and texture less real because the man lacks the sense of sight? Further, is it impossible for the blind man to ascertain the shape and other qualities of the snowflake? Not at all! For example, such simple tools as a camera and photo-engraving equipment can translate the structure of the snowflake very exactly into a raised replica in steel for the blind man to feel it, measure it, and describe it in innumerable other ways.

Likewise our knowledge of the physical world is not limited by those objects which can be directly sensed by our eyes, skin, etc., nor can we doubt the reality of those sections of the universe revealed to us only by instrument or calculation, any more than the blind man would be justified in denying the reality of the snowflake's structure.

In the 1920's and '30's it was fashionable to speak of the "abstract," "empty," "shadow-world" of theoretical physics. The vivid reality of the atom bomb should render this fashion obsolete forever.

Contrary to Mr. Barnett's assertion that "Relativity does not . . . contradict classical physics" (p. 52), Einstein's relativity theory is based on fundamentally different laws from those of Newton. Any calculations made by one system will, in principle, be different from those made by the other, in spite of the fact that for velocities and masses of objects common to our every-day experience, the results will be, for all practical purposes, identical. Differences can be noticed when dealing with velocities beginning to approach the speed of light (186,284 million miles per second) and in all such cases Einstein's system has been proven to be more accurate a representation of nature than Newton's.

Nevertheless there existed before Einstein's time a principle of relativity, now known as Galilean (or Newtonian) relativity. This made compensations in measurements which accounted for commonplace differences in the measurements made by one observer moving relative to the position of another observer. Thus, before Einstein was born, a physicist could compute from measuring the varying pitch of a locomotive's whistle on a train which would pass by him at a known speed, precisely what the constant wave length of the sound would appear to the engineer of the train who hears a sound of only one pitch.

* These are some of the categories of non-visible wave-lengths of light.

Lincoln Barnett gives many examples of such every-day phenomena which he calls "paradoxes," i.e., the differences in measurements taken by "moving" or "stationary" observers. All of these "paradoxes" can be easily resolved without relativity. Nevertheless he presents Einstein's special relativity theory as an answer to such problems! The illusion is created that a logical problem is presented, discussed, and the answer found by means of a new theory. The fact that there is no connection whatever between the problems presented and the "solution" will be obvious not only to a physicist but even to anyone familiar with the elements of algebra and geometry.

Yet Einstein praises this book very highly! Why?

Research scientists have found themselves more and more isolated from the rest of humanity, at the same time that the effects of their work are having the most profound effect on social developments in all of human history!

The atomic bomb, which represents one of the highest achievements of theoretical physics, is held in the hands of a small group of capitalist politicians and militarists who, seemingly bent on proving the validity of Marxist analysis, show the only consistency in their actions to be their undeviating service in the interests of America's ruling class. In these hands, the atomic bomb is waved threateningly like a symbol of total destruction over the heads of all humanity.

The imperial lords of the atomic age no longer listen to the frantic pleas of the same scientists who put the weapons at their disposal. The physicists (and other scientists) having given the best they had to offer, are now told to shut up and keep out of politics, their pleas and criticisms stigmatized as "subversive."

League of Frightened Men

The scientists now view with genuine horror the picture of the possible fruits of their labor. They begin to see clearly that barbarism is one of the alternatives for the near future of modern society but they fail to see as realistic, the other alternative, socialism, in spite of the fact that many of them (including Einstein) are "socialists" in the sense that they understand that a socialist organization of society is preferable to capitalism. It does not occur to them to employ scientific procedure to find what laws govern the motion of human society. In their at-

tempt to stop the dread machine which is out of their control, they jump empirically from one desperate measure to another.

In 1925, Leon Trotsky remarked:

"Outstanding trained naturalists who in the field, say of physiology, would not proceed a step without taking into account rigidly tested experiments, verification, hypothetical generalization, latest verification and so forth; approach social phenomena far more boldly, with the boldness of ignorance, as of tacitly acknowledging that in this extremely complex sphere of phenomena it is sufficient merely to have vague propensities, day-to-day observations, family traditions, and even a stock of current social prejudices." (New International, Feb. 1940.)

Just as in physics, so in social science, any departure from rigorous investigation and analysis in the spirit of scientific method leads to all kinds of mystic and idealist notions. Among these notions is the utopian idea that ruling economic classes and their governmental agents can be persuaded by logical arguments or appeals to faith to act in other than their own immediate interests. And so the self-named "League of Frightened Men" appeal first to the U. S. government, then to the United Nations, each time their efforts ending in admitted failure.

And so finally after years of this aimless writhing in their cosmic agonies of guilt-feeling (for a crime that they did not commit) they turn to that amorphous mass, the "public," with books, articles, press releases and world peace conferences.

The campaign to educate the public has two aspects. First to acquaint the people with the basic ideas of modern physics* in the hope of ending the isolation of the physicists, and, second, to acquaint the people with the real dangers of modern scientific weapons, so that the "public" will now vote for the right politicians who will halt the mad dash toward species-suicide. Each of the physicists has a pet theory or two explaining a "practical" plan to estab-

* In his forward to Barnett's book, Einstein writes "It is of great importance that the general public be given an opportunity to experience—consciously and intelligently—the efforts and results of scientific research. . . . Restricting the body of knowledge to a small group deadens the philosophical spirit of a people and leads to spiritual poverty."

lish world peace (without destroying capitalism) and serve humanity. For some reason, obscure to them, none of these seem to work. Or at least the politicians show no inclination to try them out.

These scientists are like children in a row-boat trying to still the waves of the ocean by beating them down with oars.

The deep underlying social forces, rooted in the class struggle for ownership of the means of production, the essential need of American capitalism to expand by imperial conquest, the resistance of colonial peoples, the rising might of the revolutionary proletariat . . . all these appear to many of them only dimly as another "shadow world," just as removed from their every-day experience as the "shadow world" of the sub-atomic particles. They are ignorant of the fact that their own petty-bourgeois social position in society usually dooms them to blindness to the basic class struggles which are remote from their daily lives and does not equip them as leaders to guide humanity away from the path of doom.

Those who apply scientific criteria to the analysis of social problems will come to grasp the reality of this "shadow world" just as Einstein (who, in 1939, suggested the atom bomb to Roosevelt) grasped the reality of the sub-atomic "shadow world." Allied with the working class, they may even play a leading social role. The rest will have to await further successful explosions of proletarian revolution to have these realities impressed on their consciousness, just as so many had to wait for the explosion at Hiroshima to have that other "shadow world" made real.

—B. LENS

Pioneer Pocket Library

1. The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International.

This basic document was drafted by the Founding Conference of the Fourth International. 64 pages, 25c.

2. The Suppressed Testament of Lenin, by Leon Trotsky.

This document reprints Lenin's last advice to his party and explains why Stalin suppressed it. 48 pages, 25c.

Order from

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place

Problem of the Ukraine

By **LEON TROTSKY**

Trotsky's article on the Ukraine first appeared in the *Socialist Appeal* on May 9, 1939. Like so many of the writings of the great Marxist master, his analysis in this article has withstood the test of the years and the turbulent events they encompassed. Today, more than a decade later the struggle of Yugoslavia against the oppressive Great Russian chauvinism of the Kremlin confirms what Trotsky wrote in 1939.

The ruthless offensive against Tito is, in reality, only the latest and most dramatic expression of what Trotsky called the "outright strangulation of any kind of national development of the peoples of the USSR." By an ironic quirk of history, the man who made his reputation as a Marxist expert on the national question, has "solved" the problem of the national minorities by methods no Czar

would have dared to employ. During the war and since, Stalin has uprooted entire peoples from their ancestral homes and shipped them in cattle cars to the barren wastelands of Siberia. This was punishment for murmuring against the Kremlin whip and "security" against a possible revolt.

As far as the Ukraine itself is concerned, here too Trotsky proved correct if not in detail then in the essence of the matter. Hitler's first and easy victories in the war resulted not least of all from the dissatisfaction and hatred towards the Kremlin which Stalin's policy had engendered in the Ukrainian people.

Recent reports of "partisan bands" operating in the Ukraine and of groupings of anti-Stalinist Ukrainian refugees in exile indicate that the embers of the

Ukrainian problem are still glowing and that Trotsky's slogan — **A united, free and independent workers' and peasants' Ukraine** — has lost none of its timeliness.

"Only hopeless pacifist blockheads are capable of thinking that the emancipation and unification of the Ukraine can be achieved . . . by decisions of the League of Nations. . . . The program of independence for the Ukraine in the epoch of imperialism is directly and indissolubly bound up with the program of the proletarian revolution. It would be criminal to entertain any illusions on this score." The Yugoslav worker-communists would do well to ponder these lines.

A second article by Trotsky replying to critics of his program for the Ukraine will appear in the December **Fourth International**.

The Ukrainian question, which many governments and many "socialists" and even "communists" have tried to forget or to relegate to the deep strongbox of history, has once again been placed on the order of the day and this time with redoubled force. The latest aggravation of the Ukrainian question is most intimately bound up with the degeneration of the Soviet Union and of the Comintern, the successes of fascism and the approach of the next imperialist war. Crucified by four states, the Ukraine now occupies in the fate of Europe the same position that was once occupied by Poland; with this difference—that world relations are now infinitely more tense and the tempos of development accelerated. The Ukrainian question is destined in the immediate future to play an enormous role in the life of Europe. It was not for nothing that Hitler so noisily raised the question of creating a "Greater Ukraine," and likewise it was not for nothing that he dropped this question with such stealthy haste.

A Question That Must Not Be Ignored

The Second International, expressing the interests of the labor bureaucracy and aristocracy of the imperialist states, completely ignored the Ukrainian question. Even its left wing did not pay the necessary attention to it. Suffice it to recall that Rosa Luxemburg, for all her brilliant intellect and genuinely revolutionary spirit, found it possible to declare that the Ukrainian question was the invention of a handful of intellectuals. This position left a deep imprint even upon the Polish Communist Party. The Ukrainian question was looked upon by the official leaders of the Polish section of the Comintern as an obstacle rather than a revolutionary problem. Hence the

constant opportunist attempts to shy away from this question, to suppress it, to pass over it in silence, or to postpone it to an indefinite future.

The Bolshevik party, not without difficulty and only gradually under the constant pressure of Lenin, was able to acquire a correct approach to the Ukrainian question. The right to self-determination, that is, to separation, was extended by Lenin equally to the Poles and to the Ukrainians. He did not recognize aristocratic nations. Every inclination to evade or postpone the problem of an oppressed nationality he regarded as a manifestation of Great Russian chauvinism.

After the conquest of power, a serious struggle took place in the party over the solving of the numerous national problems inherited from old Czarist Russia. In his capacity as People's Commissar of Nationalities, Stalin invariably represented the most centralist and bureaucratic tendency. This evinced itself especially on the question of Georgia and on the question of the Ukraine. The correspondence dealing with these matters has remained unpublished to this day. We hope to publish a section of it—the very small section which is at our disposal. Every line of Lenin's letters and proposals vibrates with an urge to accede as far as possible to those nationalities that have been oppressed in the past. In the proposals and declarations of Stalin, on the contrary, the tendency toward bureaucratic centralism was invariably pronounced. In order to guarantee "administrative needs," i.e., the interests of the bureaucracy, the most legitimate claims of the oppressed nationalities were declared a manifestation of petty-bourgeois nationalism. All these symptoms could be observed as early as 1922-23. Since that time they have devel-

oped monstrously and have led to outright strangulation of any kind of independent national development of the peoples of the USSR.

The Bolshevik Conception of Soviet Ukraine

In the conception of the old Bolshevik party Soviet Ukraine was destined to become a powerful axis around which the other sections of the Ukrainian people would unite. It is indisputable that in the first period of its existence Soviet Ukraine exerted a mighty attractive force, in national respects as well, and aroused to struggle the workers, peasants, and revolutionary intelligentsia of Western Ukraine enslaved by Poland. But during the years of Thermidorian reaction, the position of Soviet Ukraine and together with it the posing of the Ukrainian question as a whole changed sharply. The more profound the hopes aroused, the keener was the disillusionment. The bureaucracy strangled and plundered the people within Great Russia, too. But in the Ukraine matters were further complicated by the massacre of national hopes. Nowhere did restrictions, purges, repressions and in general all forms of bureaucratic hooliganism assume such murderous sweep as they did in the Ukraine in the struggle against the powerful, deeply-rooted longings of the Ukrainian masses for greater freedom and independence. To the totalitarian bureaucracy, Soviet Ukraine became an administrative division of an economic unit and a military base of the USSR. To be sure, the Stalin bureaucracy erects statues to Shevchenko but only in order more thoroughly to crush the Ukrainian people under their weight and to force it to chant paeans in the language of Kobzar to the rapist clique in the Kremlin.

Toward the sections of the Ukraine now outside its frontiers, the Kremlin's attitude today is the same as it is toward all oppressed nationalities, all colonies, and semi-colonies, i.e., small change in its international combinations with imperialist governments. At the recent 18th Congress of the "Communist Party," Manuilsky, one of the most revolting renegades of Ukrainian communism, quite openly explained that not only the USSR but also the Comintern (the "gyp-joint," according to Stalin's formulation) refused to demand the emancipation of oppressed peoples whenever their oppressors are not the enemies of the ruling Moscow clique. India is nowadays being defended by Stalin, Dimitrov and Manuilsky against Japan, but not against England. Western Ukraine they are ready to cede forever to Poland in exchange for a diplomatic agreement which appears profitable at the present time to the bureaucrats of the Kremlin. It is a far cry from the days when they went no further than episodic combinations in their politics.

Stalin, Hitler and the Ukraine

Not a trace remains of the former confidence and sympathy of the Western Ukrainian masses for the Kremlin. Since the latest murderous "purge" in the Ukraine no one in the West wants to become part of the Kremlin satrapy which continues to bear the name of Soviet Ukraine. The worker and peasant masses in the Western Ukraine, in

Bukovina, in the Carpatho-Ukraine are in a state of confusion: Where to turn? What to demand? This situation naturally shifts the leadership to the most reactionary Ukrainian cliques who express their "nationalism" by seeking to sell the Ukrainian people to one imperialism or another in return for a promise of fictitious independence. Upon this tragic confusion Hitler bases his policy in the Ukrainian question. At one time we said: but for Stalin (i.e., but for the fatal policy of the Comintern in Germany) there would have been no Hitler. To this can now be added: but for the rape of Soviet Ukraine by the Stalinist bureaucracy there would be no Hitlerite Ukrainian policy.

We shall not pause here to analyze the motives that impelled Hitler to discard, for the time being at least, the slogan of a Greater Ukraine. These motives must be sought in the fraudulent combinations of German imperialism on the one hand and on the other in the fear of conjuring up an evil spirit whom it might be difficult to exorcize. Hitler gave Carpatho-Ukraine as a gift to the Hungarian butchers. This was done, if not with Moscow's open approval then in any case with confidence that approval would be forthcoming. It is as if Hitler had said to Stalin: "If I were preparing to attack Soviet Ukraine tomorrow I should have kept Carpatho-Ukraine in my own hands." In reply, Stalin at the 18th Party Congress openly came to Hitler's defense against the slanders of the "Western Democracies." Hitler intends to attack the Ukraine? Nothing of the sort! Fight with Hitler? Not the slightest reason for it. Stalin is obviously interpreting the handing over of Carpatho-Ukraine to Hungary as an act of peace.

For a Free, Independent Soviet Ukraine!

This means that sections of the Ukrainian people have become so much small change for the Kremlin in its international calculations. The Fourth International must clearly understand the enormous importance of the Ukrainian question in the fate not only of Southeastern and Eastern Europe but also of Europe as a whole. We are dealing with a people that has proved its viability, that is numerically equal to the population of France and occupies an exceptionally rich territory which, moreover, is of the highest strategical importance. The question of the fate of the Ukraine has been posed in its full scope. A clear and definite slogan is necessary that corresponds to the new situation. In my opinion there can be at the present time only one such slogan: *A united, free and independent workers' and peasants' Soviet Ukraine.*

This program is in irreconcilable contradiction first of all with the interests of the three imperialist powers, Poland, Rumania, and Hungary. Only hopeless pacifist blockheads are capable of thinking that the emancipation and unification of the Ukraine can be achieved by peaceful diplomatic means, by referendums, by decisions of the League of Nations, etc. In no way superior to them of course are those "nationalists" who propose to solve the Ukrainian question by entering the service of one imperialism against another. Hitler gave an invaluable lesson to those adventurers by tossing (for how long?) Carpatho-

Ukraine to the Hungarians who immediately slaughtered not a few trusting Ukrainians. Insofar as the issue depends upon the military strength of the imperialist states, the victory of one grouping or another can signify only a new dismemberment and a still more brutal subjugation of the Ukrainian people. The program of independence for the Ukraine in the epoch of imperialism is directly and indissolubly bound up with the program of the proletarian revolution. It would be criminal to entertain any illusions on this score.

Soviet Constitution Admits Right of Self-Determination

But the independence of a United Ukraine would mean the separation of Soviet Ukraine from the USSR, the "friends" of the Kremlin will exclaim in chorus. What is so terrible about that?—we reply. The fervid worship of state boundaries is alien to us. We do not hold the position of a "united and indivisible" whole. After all, even the constitution of the USSR acknowledges the right of its component federated peoples to self-determination, that is, to separation. Thus, not even the incumbent Kremlin oligarchy dares to deny this principle. To be sure it remains only on paper. The slightest attempt to raise the question of an independent Ukraine openly would mean immediate execution on the charge of treason. But it is precisely this despicable equivocation, it is precisely this ruthless hounding of all free national thought that has led the toiling masses of the Ukraine, to an even greater degree than the masses of Great Russia, to look upon the rule of the Kremlin as monstrously oppressive. In the face of such an internal situation it is naturally impossible even to talk of Western Ukraine voluntarily joining the USSR as it is at present constituted. Consequently, the unification of the Ukraine presupposes freeing the so-called Soviet Ukraine from the Stalinist boot. In this matter, too, the Bonapartist clique will reap what it has sown.

But wouldn't this mean the military weakening of the USSR?—the "friends" of the Kremlin will howl in horror. We reply that the weakening of the USSR is caused by those ever-growing centrifugal tendencies generated by the Bonapartist dictatorship. In the event of war the hatred of the masses for the ruling clique can lead to the collapse of all the social conquests of October. The source of defeatist moods is in the Kremlin. An independent Soviet Ukraine, on the other hand, would become, if only by virtue of its own interests, a mighty southwestern bulwark of the USSR. The sooner the present Bonapartist caste is undermined, upset, crushed and swept away, the firmer the defense of the Soviet Republic will become and the more certain its socialist future.

Against Imperialism and Moscow Bonapartism

Naturally an independent workers' and peasants' Ukraine might subsequently join the Soviet Federation; but voluntarily, on conditions which it itself considers acceptable, which in turn presupposes a revolutionary regeneration of the USSR. The genuine emancipation of the

Ukrainian people is inconceivable without a revolution or a series of revolutions in the West which must lead in the end to the creation of the Soviet United States of Europe. An independent Ukraine could and undoubtedly will join this federation as an equal member. The proletarian revolution in Europe, in turn, would not leave one stone standing of the revolting structure of Stalinist Bonapartism. In that case the closest union of the Soviet United States of Europe and the regenerated USSR would be inevitable and would present infinite advantages for the European and Asiatic continents, including of course the Ukraine too. But here we are shifting to questions of second and third order. The question of first order is the revolutionary guarantee of the unity and independence of a workers' and peasants' Ukraine in the struggle against imperialism on the one hand, and against Moscow Bonapartism on the other.

The Ukraine is especially rich and experienced in false paths of struggle for national emancipation. Here everything has been tried: the petty-bourgeois Rada, and Skoropadski, and Petlura, and "alliance" with the Hohenzollerns and combinations with the Entente. After all these experiments, only political cadavers can continue to place hope in any one of the fractions of the Ukrainian bourgeoisie as the leader of the national struggle for emancipation. The Ukrainian proletariat alone is capable not only of solving the task—which is revolutionary in its very essence—but also of taking the initiative for its solution. The proletariat and only the proletariat can rally around itself the peasant masses and the genuinely revolutionary national intelligentsia.

At the beginning of the last imperialist war the Ukrainians, Melenevski ("Basok") and Skoropis-Yeltukhovski, attempted to place the Ukrainian liberation movement under the wing of the Hohenzollern general, Ludendorff. They covered themselves in so doing with left phrases. With one kick the revolutionary Marxists booted these people out. That is how revolutionists must continue to behave in the future. The impending war will create a favorable atmosphere for all sorts of adventurers, miracle-hunters and seekers of the golden fleece. These gentlemen, who especially love to warm their hands in the vicinity of the national question, must not be allowed within artillery range of the labor movement. Not the slightest compromise with imperialism, either fascist or democratic! Not the slightest concession to the Ukrainian nationalists, either clerical-reactionary or liberal-pacifist! No "People's Fronts"! The complete independence of the proletarian party as the vanguard of the toilers!

For an International Discussion

This appears to me the correct policy in the Ukrainian question. I speak here personally and in my own name. The question must be opened up to international discussion. The foremost place in this discussion must belong to the Ukrainian revolutionary Marxists. We shall listen with the greatest attention to their voices. But they had better make haste. There is little time left for preparation!

April 22, 1939.

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

Books and Pamphlets on Socialism and the Labor Movement

BY LEON TROTSKY

The First Five Years of the Communist International, vol. I	384 pp. cloth	\$2.50
The Revolution Betrayed	308 pp. cloth	2.00
	paper	1.00
In Defense of Marxism	240 pp. cloth	2.00
	paper	1.50
In Defense of Russian Revolution.....	16 pp.	.15
Fascism—What It Is—How to Fight It..	48 pp.	.15
Stalinism and Bolshevism	32 pp.	.15
Leon Sedoff	32 pp.	.15
Permanent Revolution	176 pp.	2.50
Lesson of Spain—The Last Warning.....	48 pp.	.25

BY JAMES P. CANNON

American Stalinism and Anti-Stalinism ..	48 pp.	.15
The Coming American Revolution	32 pp.	.10
History of American Trotskyism ..280 pp.	cloth	2.00
	paper	1.00
Struggle for a Proletarian Party..320 pp.	cloth	2.00
	paper	1.50
The Russian Revolution	32 pp.	.10
The End of the Comintern	36 pp.	.10
Workers and the Second World War.....	48 pp.	.10
Memorial Address "To the Memory of the Old Man"	16 pp.	.10

DOCUMENTS OF THE FOURTH INT'L

Manifesto of Second World Congress of Fourth Int'l, 1948	48 pp.	.15
Only Victorious Socialist Revolutions Can Prevent the Third World War—Manifesto of 1946 World Conference of Fourth Int'l	32 pp.	.10
Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Dissolution of the Comintern	36 pp.	.10

ON THE FAMOUS MINNEAPOLIS TRIAL

Socialism on Trial—by J. P. Cannon	112 pp.	.35
In Defense of Socialism—by A. Goldman..	92 pp.	.25
Who Are the 18 Prisoners?	32 pp.	.10
Why We Are in Prison	56 pp.	.10
Defense Policy in the Minneapolis Trial—by Grandizo Munis & James P. Cannon	64 pp.	.20

PIONEER POCKET LIBRARY

No. 1—The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International.....	64 pp.	.25
No. 2—The Suppressed Testament of Lenin—with an article by Leon Trotsky.....	48 pp.	.25

ON THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT

The Socialist Workers Party—What It Is, What It Stands for—by Joseph Hansen	32 pp.	.10
The Voice of Socialism—Radio Speeches by Farrell Dobbs, Grace Carlson, J. P. Cannon.	32 pp.	.10
Stalinists on the Waterfront—by Art Preis	32 pp.	.10
Build a Labor Party Now—by Geo. Clarke	16 pp.	.10
American Workers Need a Labor Party—by Joseph Hansen	48 pp.	.15
Trade Union Problems—by Farrell Dobbs	44 pp.	.10
Maritime—by Frederick J. Lang.....	182 pp.	1.00
Jobs for All—by Art Preis	24 pp.	.10
Veterans and Labor—by Charles Carsten	24 pp.	.10
Your Standard of Living—by C. Charles.	32 pp.	.05
Wartime Crimes of Big Business—by George Breitman	16 pp.	.05
Fight the Slave Labor Law—Statement of National Committee of the SWP.....	16 pp.	.05
Resolutions of the Eleventh Convention of the American Trotskyist Movement	48 pp.	.15

THE NEGRO STRUGGLE

A Letter to American Negroes—by William E. Bohannon	16 pp.	.10
The Struggle for Negro Equality—by John Saunders and Albert Parker—3rd ed..	48 pp.	.10
Negroes in the Postwar World—by Albert Parker	16 pp.	.05
Vigilante Terror in Fontana—by Myra Tanner Weiss	24 pp.	.10

OTHER BOOKS ON SOCIALISM AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT

Rise and Fall of the Comintern—by K. Tilak	160 pp.	1.50
The Assassination of Leon Trotsky—by Albert Goldman	74 pp.	.25
Middle East at Crossroads by T. Cliff....	20 pp.	.15
From Lenin to Stalin—by Victor Serge..	112 pp.	.50
Russia Twenty Years After—by V. Serge	310 pp.	2.50
Why Did They "Confess"?—A Study of the Radek-Piatakoff Trial	32 pp.	.25
Behind the Moscow Trial—by M. Shachtman	142 pp. cloth	1.00

Order from

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.