

# political affairs

NOVEMBER 1955 • 25 CENTS



AN EDITORIAL

- [ 1 ] On the 38th Anniversary of  
the Great Socialist Revolution

EUGENE V. DEBS

- [ 4 ] On the Russian Revolution

CELESTE STRACK

- [ 7 ] Economic Laws and "Anti-  
Depression" Programs  
(A Reply to the Tabitha  
Petran Series)

PABLO M. GARCIA

- [22] The Puerto Rican People  
Against Colonialism and  
McCarthyism

BANK BREWSTER AND  
MARK LOGAN

- [31] Automation: Abundance  
for Whom? II

G. A. SVETCHNIKOV

- [43] The Struggle Against Indeter-  
minism in Contemporary  
Physics

PHILIP M. TILDEN

- [53] A Comment on the Svetchnikov  
Article

CENTRAL COMMITTEE,  
C. P. OF ARGENTINA

- [55] The Military Uprising  
in Argentina

HERBERT APTHEKER

- [63] Crusaders (*Book Review*)

## **THE EDUCATION OF JOHN REED**

**By JOHN STUART**

Representative selections from the writings of the great journalist, poet and essayist, whose writings expressed his hatred of war and the evils out of which war and oppression grew, including his first-hand accounts of Pancho Villa's role in Mexico, the Paterson silk strike, the strike of miners in Colorado, reports from the battle fronts in World War I, and of the Russian Revolution of 1917. Edited, and with an illuminating biographical essay, by John Stuart. (INTERNATIONAL.)

*Paper \$1.75; Cloth \$3.00*

## **THE FIRST PHILOSOPHERS**

**By GEORGE THOMSON**

One of England's foremost classical scholars continues his studies of ancient Greek society in a new and original study of the economic bases of early Greek philosophy, showing the part played by commodity production and the circulation of money on the growth of Greek thought and science, and the relation between ancient Greek and ancient Chinese philosophy. (INTERNATIONAL.)

*Price \$5.50*

## **THE PEOPLE'S ALMANAC**

**By ELIZABETH LAWSON**

An outstanding American historian has assembled in this lively booklet an invaluable compilation of important dates and events dealing with aspects of American history, the struggles of the labor movement, the Negro people, the Jewish community and other national groups, struggles of women and youth, and other key occasions in our national life. Profusely illustrated. Ready December 1. (NEW CENTURY)

*Price \$ .50*

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.**

*Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$2.50 a year; \$1.25 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$3.00 a year. Single copies 25 cents.*

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

## On the 38th Anniversary of the Great Socialist Revolution

### An Editorial

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION of November, 1917, marked a turning point in the history of humanity. Each year that passes enhances the perspective and makes that event stand out more clearly as the culmination of previous centuries and the beaconlight of the present and future.

The Russian Revolution initiated a new stage in history. But it soon became apparent that history was not taking that stage in one stride. The Soviet Union, comprising one-sixth of the world, remained the only country of socialism. Was the future to be one of continuous armed warfare between the two systems, as conceived in general by Trotsky and other leftist distorters of Marxism? From the outset, Lenin, the great political and organizational genius of the working class, rejected such a conception and laid down the principle of peaceful co-existence.

In 1919 he declared, "The Soviet Republic desires to live in peace with all nations and concentrate all its efforts on domestic construction." In 1922 Lenin's statement, read to the Genoa Economic Conference called by the Supreme Allied Council, declared:

While adhering to the principles of communism, the Russian delegation recognizes that *in the present historic era, which makes possible the parallel existence of the old system and the newly-born social system*, economic co-operation between the states representing these two systems of property, is imperatively necessary for universal economic construction.

Under the leadership of Stalin, the Soviet Union proceeded to carry into fulfillment Lenin's teaching that Socialism can be built in one country; and its foreign policy devoted itself to that aim. In 1927 Stalin declared: "The basis of our relations with the capitalist countries is the

allowance for the coexistence of two opposite systems. It has been fully justified in practice."

This policy of coexistence was further confirmed in the course of the Second World War. For despite the efforts of all anti-Soviet war plotters, that war was not one between the capitalist and socialist systems, but found the Soviet Union in alliance with the bourgeois democracies against the so-called "anti-Comintern" axis of the fascist and militarist powers.

Following the war, the Soviet Union re-affirmed in numerous statements of policy, even in the period before the massive re-armament of the so-called Western powers, its adherence to the policy of peace and co-existence.

Thus, the headline over a recent *New York Herald Tribune* story (October 25) by Marguerite Higgins datelined Moscow: "Reds Drop Inevitable War Theory; Moscow Line Now Favors Coexistence with West," serves as a classic example of how the press insists on putting truth through the wringer of its rigid mythology of "the Lenin and Stalin predictions of inevitability of war," and of co-existence as "the new twist in the Communist line."

Nevertheless, and despite such glaring distortions, the important thing is that more and more the bourgeois press is compelled to admit that the Big Lie of the menace of Soviet aggression has lost its force, that the policy of the Soviet Union is for peaceful coexistence.

The Geneva Conference represents a historic triumph for that policy. It is a triumph not only for the peace policy of the Soviet Union. It is a triumph for all the peoples of the world, not least the American people. For who has more to gain than the American people from agreements to seek peaceful solutions, agreements that take away the foundations of the "security" hysteria, the self-imposed isolation from the progressive currents of the world, the sacrifice of nearly all social expenditures to the insatiable appetite of the "defense" machine, and finally the menace of atomic destruction itself?

The American people played a major role in bringing about the Conference of Geneva. Their protests against the continuance of the Korean War and against the war moves of the Eisenhower Administration contributed mightily to the Administration's decision to go along with the world-wide demand to seek a relaxation of tensions.

\* \* \*

The great world-wide movement for peace has given in Geneva a classic example of the validity of Stalin's words that war can be prevented "if the peoples take the cause of peace into their own hands."

As Stalin pointed out in his *Economic Problems of Socialism*, the peoples of the world are strong enough today to prevent "a particular war," but to put an end once and for all to any danger of war, requires socialism.

It  
that  
siste  
for p  
its c  
100,0  
racie  
Chin  
quire  
of th  
by th  
ple h  
powe  
peace  
maxi  
stant  
the w  
to in  
nism  
huma  
huma  
ment  
called  
the  
which  
parati

Ben  
Engli  
Joseph  
can R  
a futu

It is because of its socialist system that the Soviet Union has been consistently and at all times a power for peace. It has now been joined in its dedication to Socialism by the 100,000,000 of the People's Democracies and the 600,000,000 of People's China. A system of socialism requires that the power be in the hands of the masses of the people headed by the working class. Thus the people have in their hands not only the power to influence the world for peace, but the power "to secure the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising . . . requirements of the whole of society." It is the power to insure the transition to Communism and to limitless progress for humanity; as Engels prophesied, for humanity to control its own development. It is the beginning of what he called "the human epoch of history," the beginning of that epoch for which all preceding ones were preparations.

\* \* \*

Benjamin Franklin, writing to the English revolutionary and scientist, Joseph Priestley, during the American Revolution, saw so magnificent a future for humanity that he "re-

gretted I was born so soon." "It is impossible," he wrote:

to imagine the height to which may be carried, in a thousand years, the power of man over matter. We may perhaps learn to deprive large masses of their gravity and give them absolute levity, for the sake of easy transport. Agriculture may diminish its labor and double its produce; all diseases may by sure means be prevented if not cured, not excepting old age, and our lives lengthened at pleasure even beyond the antediluvian standard.

It is our own manifesto of revolution, the Declaration of Independence, that insists on the right and the duty of humanity to forge such a society as will assure freedom and equality and happiness, and that insists on the reality of the pursuit of happiness and on that pursuit as the central purpose of life.

As Americans, we salute the 38th Anniversary of the great Russian revolution and hail the working class of the Soviet Union for bringing into being, in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a mighty bulwark in the battle for freedom, for equality, for peace and for socialism.

# On the Russian Revolution

By Eugene V. Debs

*This November 5th, marks the centennial of the birth of the great American Advocate of Socialism, Eugene Victor Debs. Commemorating the event, International Publishers is issuing this month a collection of his writings,\* edited by Comrade Alexander Trachtenberg, and containing a full-scale critical evaluation of Debs by the editor. In the pages that follow we bring to our readers, on this 38th anniversary of the Socialist Revolution, some of the writings of Debs dealing with that historic event. Concerning Debs' reactions to the Revolution, Comrade Trachtenberg writes:*

In Debs the Russian Revolution found an immediate and sympathetic response. He considered the Socialist Revolution "the greatest in point of historic significance and far-reaching influence in the annals of the race," and sensed the difference between the compromising Mensheviks and the indomitable Bolsheviks, who, under the leadership of Lenin, forged ahead toward the proletarian revolution. In addressing himself to the Russian Revolution on the First Anniversary of the Revolution he wrote: "The achieved glory of your revolutionary triumph is that you have preserved inviolate the fundamental principles of international Socialism and refused to compromise." When the name Bolshevik was spoken with derision among his party friends, Debs declared publicly: "I am a Bolshevik from the crown of my head to the tips of my toes." To the jury

at his [1918] trial, he defiantly declared: "I have been accused of expressing sympathy with the Bolsheviks of Russia. I plead guilty to the charge."

When the S.P. delegation visited Debs at Atlanta [Penitentiary] for the presidency, the question of "dictatorship" came up in the discussion about the Russian Revolution. Debs spoke about the "unfortunate phrase" and stated that "dictatorship is autocracy." But he immediately explained that "there is no autocracy in the rule of the masses." The political organizer in him led him also to the conclusion that "during the transition period the revolution must protect itself." To the Socialist leaders who stated that they were "for" the Russian Revolution, but "did not like certain features of it," Debs openly declared, in speaking in response to the notification committee: "I heartily support the Russian Revolution without reservations."

\* *The Heritage of Gene Debs, Selections, with a Critical Introduction, by Alexander Trachtenberg.* 64 pp., 50c.

*On the First Anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, November 7, 1918, Eugene V. Debs sent the following "Greetings to our Russian Comrades":*

Comrades of the Russian Soviet and the Bolshevik Republic, we salute and honor you on this first anniversary of your great revolutionary triumph, the greatest in point of historic significance and far-reaching influence in the annals of the race. You have set the star of hope for all the world in the eastern skies. You have suffered untold persecution, exile and misery and you have shed your blood freely all these years in the great struggle for emancipation, not only of your own oppressed people, but the oppressed of all the earth. On this historic anniversary we extend our proletarian hand to you from all directions and across the spaces and assure you of our loyalty and our love.

The chief glory of your revolutionary triumph is that you have preserved inviolate the fundamental principles of international Socialism

and refused to compromise. . . .

You, Russian Comrades of the Soviet and of the Bolsheviks you represent, are resolved that for once in history the working class, which fights the battles, sheds its blood and makes all other sacrifices to achieve a revolution, shall itself receive and enjoy the full fruitage of such a revolution; that it shall not allow itself to be used, as dumb driven cattle, to install some intermediate class into power and perpetuate its own slavery and degradation.

On this anniversary day we pledge you, brave and unflinching comrades of the Soviet Republic, not only to protest against our government meddling with your affairs and interfering with your plans, but to summon to your aid all the progressive forces of our proletariat and render you freely all assistance in our power. . . .

*The Third Anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution found Debs a political prisoner, because of his opposition to the Great Imperialist War, in Atlanta Penitentiary. It found him, too, the Presidential candidate of the Socialist Party, and as such he was allowed to issue statements from his cell. On November 7, 1920, Debs sent the following message to the Soviet Republic:*

Greetings, comrades, in your glorious celebration of the third anniversary of the Russian Revolution. The proletarian world and lovers of liberty everywhere thrilled with joy at the news of the great victory of the Russian people. The triumph of the workers' cause in Russia is an his-

toric milestone in the progress of the world and its influence for good has circled the earth and will direct the course of the future.

The emancipation of Russia and the establishment of the Workers' Republic is an inspiration to the workers of the world, and this peo-

ple's government is a bright star in the political heavens and will light the way of the world; it is the great hope of the human race and its example will lead to the emancipation of the workers of the world; all hail to those noble comrades who have carved out a people's government on an impregnable foundation of granite that shall stand for all time.

Comrades, you have weathered the storm; the faithful cooperation of comrades has been able to defeat the world-wide alliance of capitalism. I

am sure that the same spirit that conquered capitalism will develop the geniuses that will conquer the devastating diseases you inherited from capitalism in Russia and combat the present mad methods of alien capitalistic governments who seek to destroy the newly emancipated people of Soviet Russia.

Have faith, comrades, your triumph is complete. Other nations will become liberated and together shall form a brotherhood of the world.

E

(A

By

In

by

econ

Stat

Gu

pear

gro

pro

this

Thi

beca

a tr

prog

view

est

in t

with

boor

that

and

seed

parti

cons

(espe

vestr

perso

mort

the b

grou

Ho

rent

eral



# Economic Laws and "Anti-Depression" Programs

(A REPLY TO THE TABITHA PETRAN SERIES)

By Celeste Strack

IN AUGUST, a series of five articles by Tabitha Petran, dealing with the economic situation in the United States, appeared in the *National Guardian*. These articles would appear to constitute an economic background for the *Guardian's* political program, published in January of this year and entitled "Call for a Third Party." Because of this, and because Miss Petran's work reflects a trend of thought current in some progressive circles, comment on her viewpoint seems in order. The strongest parts of Miss Petran's articles, in the opinion of the writer, deal with factors underlying the present boom, and include an explanation that they are "without permanence and carry within themselves the seeds of their own end." She lays particular emphasis on the economic consequences of military spending (especially expansion of capital investment) and the enormous rise in personal debt (consumer credit and mortgage), showing that they push the boom forward while laying the groundwork for a subsequent crisis.

However, her analysis of the current situation is embedded in a general theoretical outlook, as well as a

tactical approach, which if accepted, would seriously disorient and demobilize Left and progressive forces, while reinforcing the very theoretical fallacies Miss Petran seeks to combat.

Miss Petran's starting point is a rejection of Keynesian illusions that the economic cycle can be controlled and crises eliminated through government intervention, although she does not identify these views explicitly as Keynesian. Exposure of this central proposition of modern capitalist economic theory is very much needed.

But almost immediately Miss Petran shifts her attack to progressives who believe that "government action—prompted and forced by the people—can delay a depression." She equates this with the Keynesian contention that the cycle can be controlled to eliminate crises, and claims that the progressives to whom she refers also identify the two.

The only article cited by Miss Petran in this connection is one by Mary Norris entitled "Is the Economic Cycle 'Under Control'?" which appeared in *Political Affairs*

this June. Miss Petran fails to note that the article was directed in the first place at exposing Keynesian allegations that economic crises can be eliminated through control of the business cycle. It made a sharp distinction between such illusions and the possibility of delaying the economic crisis or otherwise modifying its specific features with respect to depth, duration, and impact. It is, therefore, on this latter point that the real difference with Miss Petran devolves.\*

### MISS PETRAN'S ARGUMENT

The gist of Miss Petran's argument may be summarized as follows:

1. Major depressions are inevitable under capitalism; furthermore they cannot be delayed or modified by either government action or mass struggle.

\* Miss Petran quotes only one sentence of the Norris article, which taken alone may be ambiguous, but which was clear within the context of the article. "If war or economic crisis is to be avoided, it is necessary to compel a major change in the policies of the Eisenhower administration." Its meaning taken as part of the whole presentation was clearly that it is possible to delay but not to avoid a major crisis. This was stated unequivocally in relation to both possible paths of postponing a depression, i.e. the reactionary, permanent-arms economy of the postwar period and an alternative program devoted to raising mass purchasing power, investment in projects for public welfare, and expansion of East-West trade.

With respect to the former, the Norris article stated: "An arms economy cannot permanently avert economic crisis, for the very reason that it deepens all the basic contradictions of the economy. . . . The only way in which an arms economy can continue to stave off economic crisis is by resorting eventually to war. . . ." With respect to the latter: "Even the relatively advanced and comprehensive steps proposed in the [Communist] Party Program could not eliminate economic crisis. Why? Because these measures would not alter the basic relations of production. . . . The basic contradictions between productive capacity and the market would therefore still exist. . . ." (pp. 37, 38, 40.)

2. Projection of an anti-depression program by labor and progressive forces therefore actually spreads illusions about the possibility of controlling the economic cycle. Indeed it implies assumption of responsibility for the cycle, which is futile and dangerous since it may even lead to support of anti-labor measures (for example, wage cuts to hold down inflation).

3. A program based on expenditures of a non-military nature "of requisite magnitude" to cope with an economic crisis would "inevitably be fought out on the political field as the issue of socialism."

4. The forthcoming and relatively imminent economic crisis will bring about a rapid radicalization of the American working class. The task of progressives today is, therefore, "to keep the progressive banner aloft" and undertake the establishment of "an independent political organization" which will be ready to lead the workers when the crisis breaks out.

### EXAMINING THE ARGUMENT

Let us consider the implications of this position. At the outset, perhaps we should state explicitly that we agree with Miss Petran as to the inevitability of economic crises under capitalism. The cause of such crises is rooted in the fundamental contradiction of capitalism, the conflict between the productive forces and the capitalist relations of production.

Engels summed up the result of

this conflict, as it relates to cyclical crises, in the following words:

... the ever-increasing perfectibility of modern machinery is, by the anarchy of social production, turned into a compulsory law that forces the individual industrial capitalist always to improve his machinery, always to increase its productive force. The bare possibility of extending the field of production is transformed for him into a similar compulsory law. The enormous expansive force of modern industry, compared to which that of gases is mere child's play, appears to us now as a necessity for expansion both qualitative and quantitative, that laughs at all resistance. Such resistance is offered by sales, by the markets for the products of modern industry. But the capacity for extension, extensive and intensive, of the markets is primarily governed by laws which work much less energetically. The extension of the markets cannot keep pace with the extension of production. The collision becomes inevitable, and as this cannot produce any real solution so long as it does not break in pieces the capitalist mode of production, the collisions become periodic. (*Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, p. 63.)

In this article, however, we are concerned with a different, although related question, *i.e.*, does the inevitability of crises under capitalism mean that there is no possibility of delaying a specific economic crisis, no hope of mitigating its effects on the masses? Does it mean that the labor movement and its allies are helpless when faced with the threat

or actual onset of depression? Such a view would be sheer fatalism which neither facts nor theory can justify.

Here Stalin's observation on the nature of economic laws is pertinent.

... the laws of economic development ... are objective laws, reflecting the processes of economic development which take place independently of the will of man. Man may discover these laws, get to know them, and relying upon them, utilize them in the interests of society, impart a different direction to the destructive action of some of the laws, restrict their sphere of action, and allow fuller scope to other laws that are forcing their way to the forefront; but he cannot destroy them or create new economic laws. (*Economic Problems of Socialism*, pp. 8-9.)

The law of cyclical development is such an objective economic law, which cannot be abolished until the capitalist system is eliminated. But this does not mean that the workers and masses of the people must stand helplessly before it today. Struggle to "impart a different direction to the destructive action" of this law and to limit its "sphere of action" is both possible and necessary.

Why has this struggle assumed particular importance in the present generation? Primarily because objective, material developments have made it an urgent issue. The most significant of these were noted in the Norris article and included the following:

First, a "tendency toward deeper crises, longer depressions, limited and insecure periods of recovery and boom" was brought about by the onset of the general crisis of capitalism at the time of World War I.\* This was dramatically illustrated in the Great Depression of the thirties, which dragged on, despite the New Deal, until the outbreak of World War II. In the post-war decade, that experience has not been forgotten by the working class and masses of the people, who have retained a deep concern over the possibility of another deep and protracted depression.

Second, the general crisis has given impetus to the development of state monopoly capitalism. "Government economic measures have been used to stimulate recovery, to delay the outbreak of acute crisis, and to prepare for or conduct war." The ideological expression of this trend is Keynesian economic theory, which big business has consciously espoused, and which it utilizes as an instrument for the further development of government intervention in its own interests.

Third, as a result of the foregoing "a new level has been reached in the relation between economics and politics in which the two are far

\* The general crisis of capitalism is a crisis of the capitalist system as a whole, expressed in both economic and political spheres. It is especially marked by the fact that "capitalism no longer represents the *sole* and *all-embracing* system of economy" (Stalin). It occupies an entire epoch in history from World War I on, and has of course been deepened by the results of World War II, which have further narrowed the confines of capitalism.

more intimately interconnected than ever before. Government economic policy is a major political issue and mass struggles around it may have a determining influence on the specific timing and exact nature of various phases of the cycle."

#### THE POST-WAR U.S. ECONOMY

How has the post-war economy of the United States reflected these tendencies? This country has experienced no major crisis in the last ten years. But there were three economic declines, in 1945, 1949, and 1953-54 respectively. Why did none of these develop into a severe crisis? Was it simply because, as Miss Detran implies, the basic economic forces which produce cyclical crisis had not yet ripened? Or has government intervention played the main role in delaying an acute crisis? Or did both play a role?

During the decade there have undoubtedly been economic factors—apart from government intervention—which militated against an immediate crisis. These appear to have their greatest importance in the years following World War II. The critical post-war underproduction in Europe opened the door to a stream of American products. Deferred consumer purchases and delayed capital replacement and investment buoyed up the domestic market. These factors played a major role in pulling the economy out of the initial post-war decline, and in sparking the up-

turn  
ing-  
had  
spend  
per c  
never  
pre-w  
figure  
comp  
large  
paid  
grant  
entire  
one t  
so fir  
By  
ing fr  
condi  
1919  
follow  
amon  
"exp  
Europ  
Of col  
grams  
the er  
of the  
world  
progra  
ism ca  
policy  
Who  
stepped  
the col  
an up  
1950 se  
the K  
swer to  
spendi  
1953-  
granted

turn of 1947 and 1948. Yet even during these years, government measures had a significant impact. Military spending, though down almost 75 per cent from its war time peak, nevertheless remained far above the pre-war level. The lowest post war figure was about 15 billion in 1947, compared to 2.3 billion in 1940. A large part of American exports were paid for by government loans or grants to other countries. (Over the entire post-war decade, approximately one third of U.S. exports have been so financed.)

By 1948, much of the impetus arising from special post-war economic conditions was weakening, and in 1949, a decline occurred. There followed the Marshall Plan which, among other things, was a means of "exporting depression," as many European commentators observed. Of course the Marshall Plan and programs which followed it, reflected the enormous economic dominance of the United States in the capitalist world; at the same time, these were programs which American imperialism carried out through government policy and government agencies.

Whether the Marshall Plan and stepped-up military expenditures for the cold war could have maintained an upturn after late 1949 and early 1950 seems questionable. At any rate, the Korean War provided the answer to any possible decline. Military spending soared to \$51.5 billion in 1953. Rapid tax writeoffs were granted covering over \$30 billion

worth of new capital investment. Even so, a slump occurred in the consumer goods field in the very midst of the war; it was met by relaxation of credit controls.

Following the Korean War, the Eisenhower Administration countered the slump of 1953-54 with a series of measures of the trickle-down variety. The main elements of the present boom have all been stimulated, to one or another degree, by government policies. Construction has received its main impetus from public construction and from housing, the latter being guaranteed by the government on a vast scale through V.A. and F.H.A. mortgages. These constitute over 50 per cent of current home mortgages being written. Private capital investment has been maintained at a high level by continued large scale arms spending, which has run at a rate of over \$40 billion in 1954 and 1955, and by varied tax bonanzas to big business, including a permanent rapid tax writeoff. Consumer purchases, especially the peak in auto sales, have been largely increased through the highest level of consumer credit in history. While this is not underwritten by the government, it has been encouraged through Federal Reserve policy.

This is not to overlook other factors that have affected the current situation. The Norris article previously cited pointed to the upturn in production in Western Europe which began during the recent U.S.

slump as an element helping to restrict the scope and consequence of the latter.

#### GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION AND CRISIS

But in the last half of the post-war decade especially, government intervention has played an increasing role in delaying the outbreak of acute crisis. Miss Petran feels that government measures had effect only because the three post-war declines were mild. It seems more likely that it was the other way round, at least in the case of the last two downturns.

It does not follow that such policies can continue indefinitely postponing a major crisis. Here we agree with Miss Petran that "they contain the seeds of their own end" and indeed aggravate the basic contradiction leading to ultimate crisis. This is particularly evident when one considers the enormous increase in productive capacity, coupled with the undermining of present and future consumer income through taxes, inflation, consumer debts, and mortgage payments.

But the point which progressives must understand is that *acute crisis has been delayed in recent years largely through government policies in the interests of big business.* Such government intervention has helped guarantee the largest profits in history, with over \$40 billion predicted for 1955 alone. At the same time it has laid the basis for placing the full

load of future crisis on the backs of the people. About the only government measures which do not go in this direction are those inherited from the New Deal, primarily social security and the farm subsidy. The latter, of course, is proving entirely insufficient to meet the growing farm crisis.

Is there another way to postpone acute crisis, an alternative to military spending, credit expansion, and enormous subsidies to finance capital? Miss Petran's answer is no. But this is a very urgent question which cannot be so easily dismissed at a time when the Geneva conference has opened up fresh possibilities for world peace and thus for a reduction in armaments. Part of the reactionary resistance to the Geneva agreements and their implementation undoubtedly stems from monopoly concern over the effect on profits of possible cuts in military spending. Moreover, in the event of an economic downturn, the clamor from big business for a larger arms budget would mount, increasing the danger of new war provocations.

#### A PEACETIME ECONOMIC PROGRAM

*Labor and its allies can provide an alternative by fighting for a peacetime economic program.* To be effective, such a program should have three broad phases: (1) Measures to increase the real income of

the  
and  
incl  
nort  
of a  
revis  
rich,  
so f  
spon  
peace  
hosp  
proj  
pansi  
east-  
est u  
tial.  
Sul  
woul  
with  
pandi  
also v  
on th  
presen  
A p  
been  
States  
the N  
inade  
pressio  
a maj  
much  
and a  
Ever  
basic c  
tween  
tion w  
the pr  
as tho  
limit.  
win a  
pressio

the masses, especially the workers and working farmers. This would include wage increases, ending the north-south differential, guarantees of a decent income for farmers, tax revision to place the tax load on the rich, expanded social security, and so forth. (2) A vast government sponsored investment program of peacetime construction for schools, hospitals, libraries, power and water projects, roads, and the like. (3) Expansion of foreign trade, especially east-west trade which offers the largest untapped foreign market potential.

Substantial steps along these lines would tend to postpone acute crisis without resorting to constantly expanding military expenditures; they also would help to limit its impact on the masses, in direct contrast to present government policies.

A program of this scope has never been put into effect in the United States. The closest approach was the New Deal, which proved wholly inadequate to overcome the long depression of the thirties. To postpone a major crisis today would require a much larger, more comprehensive and advanced program.

Even this could not eliminate the basic cause of crisis, the conflict between capitalist relations of production which restrict the market and the productive forces which expand as though there were virtually no limit. Should labor and its allies win adoption of extensive anti-depression measures of the sort outlined

above, this contradiction would continue to operate. One expression of it, under such circumstances, would probably be a marked reduction in private capital investment as the various measures adopted cut into profits. This might be an important factor marking the onset of crisis; but it would also precipitate vital economic and political battles which would influence the depth, duration, and impact of the downturn.

What is involved, consequently, is a struggle to "impart a different direction to the destructive action" of the law of cyclical development, and an effort to "limit its sphere of action." If this struggle is seriously undertaken by the labor movement and its allies, it can influence the specific form taken by the law of cyclical development.

#### EVALUATING ECONOMIC PROGRAMS

It follows that we cannot accept Miss Petran's negative evaluation of the anti-depression programs labor is beginning to advance, even though they do not as yet include all the points which Left and progressive forces advocate. She sees only the Keynesian illusions which reformist and social-democratic labor leaders spread in connection with these programs. But the specific demands they embody constitute a basis for mounting broad economic and political struggles against the interests and policies of monopoly capital.

The working class has always sought to "restrict the sphere of action" of economic laws governing its exploitation. Labor's fight for higher wages, shorter hours, and against speedup has limited the impact of the basic law of capitalism, the law of surplus value, and today, of maximum profits.

The struggle for labor's emerging peace-time economic program can similarly limit the impact of the law of cyclical development. Early expressions of this program were the struggle for relief, for work projects, for unemployment insurance and social security, all of which were aimed at cushioning some of the worst consequences of depression.

Today labor also advocates measures which would tend to delay acute crisis. The C.I.O., for example, advocated the following at the time of its analysis of the 1955 economic outlook (*Economic Outlook*, Dec. 1954):

1. Gains in wages and working conditions and the adoption of guaranteed annual wage plans.
2. Tax policy designed to strengthen consumer buying power.
3. Two million new housing units a year.
4. Improved social security.
5. National health program.
6. Improved unemployment compensation system.
7. Increase in federal legal minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour.
8. Improved agricultural support programs.

9. Government aid to small business.
10. Special assistance for chronically distressed areas.
11. Expanded government aid for public service.

While this does not include some of the points which Left and progressive forces advocate, such as expanded East-West trade, it is certainly a program around which united action can be developed. Furthermore, the projection of such demands reflects a greater maturity on the part of the American working class, a growing determination to find a way out of the capitalist dilemma of war or crisis. And the fight for this type of program no more implies assumption of responsibility for the economic cycle than the struggle for higher wages means that workers assume responsibility for their own exploitation.

#### KEYNESIAN MISCONCEPTIONS

True, Keynesian conceptions have been injected into these programs, as is evident in material issued by both the C.I.O. and A. F. of L., and even by some independent, progressive-led unions. For example, the following paragraphs from a C.I.O. publication, "Maintaining Prosperity," are thoroughly Keynesian in outlook:

Sharp swings in the business cycle are not inevitable. Over the years we have learned to steer a truer course in economic development.



As our country enters upon a new economic era, the tools for abundance are at hand. . . . With wise judgment and broad social vision great increases in wealth are possible for all the American people.

It is to this objective that government must direct its policies. For although it remains true that in the American economy the greatest burden of adjustment falls upon business, labor, and agriculture—government's obligation to help support a growing economy is also critical. The day of laissez faire has long since passed.

Failure to utilize our great resources to their fullest extent would be not only a loss for the American people, but around the world its impact would be even more disastrous. A depression would impair our foreign trade and seriously undermine the economic and military strength of the entire free world. A dynamic American economy is one of the pillars of the total strength of the free world. . . .

Here is expressed the Keynesian proposition that economic crises can and must be eliminated through government action in order to preserve the capitalist system. We must, however, make a clear distinction between this fallacy and the concrete economic program put forward by the unions. In the course of struggle for its specific anti-depression demands, the working class will learn to discard such illusions, and will discover what can be won within the present economic system and what cannot.

The same type of problem exists in the fight for virtually any major demand advanced by the working

class. Examples abound in the economic field. For instance, faced with the demand of workers for higher wages, social-democratic and reformist labor leaders try to promote bourgeois wage theories, based on tying wages to the cost of living, or to increased productivity. However, these same leaders are often compelled to conduct struggles in the course of which their pro-capitalist ideology is discredited. The experience of G.M. workers with their last five-year contract is such a case.

The struggle for an anti-depression program or, more aptly put at the present time, a peacetime economic program, is, therefore, the arena in which the influence of Keynesian illusions on the workers can best be overcome, with the conscious help of Left forces. Miss Petran's approach, however, would not help to free the labor movement from this ideology. Indeed, such a placing of the issue tends to reinforce the influence of Keynesism, since the latter at least purports to do something about depressions. Offered only a choice between Keynes' viewpoint and that of Miss Petran, most workers would probably adopt the former, not because of its false theories about saving capitalism, but because it appears on the surface to offer a line of action to prevent crises. On the other hand, acceptance of the latter would tend to demobilize the workers from struggle today, since this view holds that nothing can

really be achieved in the anti-depression fight. Here we have a classic illustration of the way in which a "Left" distortion simply feeds the Right opportunist line which it claims to fight.

#### THE FIGHT AGAINST KEYNESISM

Two things are required to combat the influence of Keynesism in the labor movement: (1) Participation by Left forces in united struggle with all those ready to support the emerging anti-depression program of labor, regardless of their ideological views and (2) patient explanation of the fallacies in Keynesian economics, and of the fact that capitalism must be abolished if economic crises are to be permanently eliminated.

Such an approach is in harmony with the position taken by Marx himself, when faced with an analogous problem. In combatting the "iron law of wages," a theory which held that it was impossible for workers to win any increase in real wages, Marx wrote:

... the very development of modern industry must progressively turn the scale in favor of the capitalist against the workingman, and ... consequently the general tendency of capitalistic production is not to raise, but to sink the average standard of wages. ... Such being the tendency of *things* in this system, is this to say that the working class ought to renounce their resistance against the encroachments of capital and abandon their attempt at making the best of the occasional chances for

their temporary improvement? If they did, they would be degraded to one level mass of broken down wretches past salvation. ... By cowardly giving way in their everyday conflict with capital they would certainly disqualify themselves from the initiating of any larger movement.

At the same time ... the working class ought not to exaggerate to themselves the ultimate working of these everyday struggles. They ought not to forget that they are fighting with effects, but not with the causes of those effects; that they are retarding the downward movement, but not changing its direction; that they are applying palliatives, not curing the malady. ... They ought, therefore, not to be exclusively absorbed in these unavoidable guerrilla fights incessantly springing up from the never-ceasing encroachments of capital. ... They ought to understand that, with all the miseries it imposes upon them, the present system simultaneously engenders the *material conditions* and the *social forms* necessary for an economic reconstruction of society. (*Value, Price and Profit*, p. 61.)

#### ON POLITICAL STRUGGLE

Despite her conviction that anti-depression programs are false and illusory, Miss Petran subsequently holds that an economic program based on the people's needs, of " requisite magnitude" to affect the course of economic cycle, would "inevitably be fought out on the political field as the issue of socialism." A contradiction is evident in Miss Petran's position at this point, since she implies that a large enough peacetime program could to some

degre  
How  
her c  
gle u  
Mi  
on th  
cialis  
still r  
be fo  
social  
gle w  
tion  
the n  
ducte  
econo  
with  
full w  
labor  
stood  
the r  
scious  
progr  
gating  
pressi  
succee  
Deal  
compa  
under  
beginn  
tation:  
War  
pressio  
The  
and c  
gram  
with  
is no  
and o  
fight  
ground  
What

degree affect the economic cycle. However, our concern here is with her conception of the political struggle involved.

Miss Petran points to the attack on the New Deal as "creeping socialism" to prove that a demand for still more extensive measures would be fought out on the grounds of socialism. But was the political struggle waged by the democratic coalition of the New Deal era, against the most reactionary interests, conducted around this issue? True, the economic royalists charged Roosevelt with promoting socialism, knowing full well this was not the case. The labor movement and its allies understood this as a maneuver to becloud the real issues. They fought consciously for a domestic economic program of reforms aimed at mitigating the worst effects of the depression on the masses, and in fact succeeded in modifying the New Deal in a more liberal direction, as compared to its initial orientation under the N.R.A. They were also beginning to learn some of the limitations of this program, when World War II put an end to the long depression of the thirties.

The fight for a more advanced and comprehensive economic program today will undoubtedly be met with the same charge. But there is no reason to suppose that labor and other democratic elements will fight it out on the ideological grounds selected by big business. What is again involved is a fight for

concessions to be wrung from monopoly capital through economic and political struggle. Certainly the content of even the most advanced economic program being put forward today does not require a change in the economic system. Therefore it does not involve socialism any more than does the demand of the American people for peace, although both issues do include the need for accepting the principle of peaceful coexistence of socialist and capitalist countries.

Furthermore, in the course of struggle for a peacetime economic program, the working class will learn more about the limits imposed by capitalism and, with the help of Left forces, can take important steps toward a socialist outlook.

It is possible that Miss Petran also had another point in mind, namely that the working class would find it impossible to wrest concessions of this type from monopoly capital without precipitating a struggle for political power, for a socialist state. To project this as a political necessity for enactment of even the most extensive anti-depression measures is wholly incorrect. The developing democratic coalition which must wage the fight for such a program is not socialist in nature and may for quite a period represent something considerably short of even a people's front type of alliance. How much of the potential peacetime economic program can be won now, and in the future, will depend upon the breadth

and fighting effectiveness of this coalition, and upon the total relationship of forces in both the domestic and international arena. If world peace can be maintained, and democratic liberties re-won and safeguarded, then achievement of such an economic program is not impossible. Its full realization would, of course, require very considerable strengthening of the democratic, pro-peace forces in this country, and substantial changes in the character of Congress and the Administration. However, important concessions can be won even prior to such changes, if a serious struggle is mounted.

#### ECONOMIC OUTLOOK AND POLITICAL TACTICS

This leads us to the final question dealt with by Miss Petran, that is, the relation of the economic outlook to the political tactics progressives should adopt today. What Miss Petran envisages is the onset of a severe economic crisis in the relatively near future (a year or two) accompanied by the rapid radicalization of the American working class, including its readiness to fight out its demands in terms of socialism. To prepare for this development, Miss Petran calls upon progressives to establish an independent political organization which will be prepared to take over the leadership of the working class when the crisis breaks.

First a few words about the economic outlook (which the writer will not attempt to deal with extensively

in the present article), as it relates to tactics.

Elements of a major crisis have undoubtedly been accumulating throughout the post-war decade. However, economists of the Left have several times predicted its relatively imminent onset, only to find that the decline which took place was something short of a major crisis. The main, although not the only point overlooked was the immediate effect of government intervention. With the passage of time the fundamental contradictions which produce crisis are deepening, aggravated by the policies of the present Administration. The chief palliative which big business has employed up to now—military spending for hot and cold war—may face reduction if the potentials of Geneva are realized. Monopoly's other main shot in the arm—credit inflation—may be reaching a saturation point. And so far, of course, the first steps toward enactment of labor's anti-depression program still remain to be won. Under these conditions, the likelihood grows that any "mild" decline may develop into sharp crisis and depression.

However, this does not mean that no avenues remain for influencing the specific course of economic events in the next two years (the period to which Miss Petran refers). Certainly the Eisenhower Administration will do its best to postpone any economic downturn until after the 1956 elections by whatever measures it can still muster. Of great importance

will  
and  
their  
It m  
timi  
will  
stre  
worl  
poli  
ly c  
and  
stan  
prog  
poss  
crisi  
it on  
ran's  
still  
ened

Ho  
were  
it de  
Miss  
Two  
respe  
Fir  
flow  
that  
radic  
ing o  
to h  
samp  
letter  
comm  
Petra  
19, 19

Dur  
popul  
and n  
tempt

will be the degree to which labor and its allies unfold a struggle for their peace-time economic program. It must be emphasized that the exact timing and nature of an acute crisis will be determined not only by the strength of the economic forces at work, but also by the economic and political struggle between monopoly capital and the forces of labor and the people. Under these circumstances, it does not appear sound for progressives to orient on only one possibility, i.e., the onset of severe crisis in the next year or two. Should it once more be postponed, Miss Petran's approach would leave them still waiting around for the threatened deluge.

However, even if an acute crisis were to break out in the near future, it does not follow that the tactics Miss Petran advocates are correct. Two points should be made in this respect.

First, very wrong conclusions can flow from Miss Petran's implication that acute crisis will result in rapid radicalization of the American working class to the point of readiness to fight in terms of socialism. A sample of this is to be found in a letter written by a *Guardian* reader, commenting enthusiastically on Miss Petran's articles. She wrote (Sept. 19, 1955):

During economic crisis, the whole population moves to solve its problems and needs; and repression, always attempted, meets tremendous resistance

and has little success. Civil liberties are born and nurtured in turbulent times not because they are the principal issue of the period, but because the people must have them and the struggle generates them.

Probably the writer was thinking of the New Deal. But she forgot that the depression of the thirties also spawned Hitler and the fascist axis. The onset of a sharp economic crisis in today's world scene would undoubtedly give fresh impetus to reactionary drives toward war and fascism, and the need for maximum unity to avert a repetition of the German, Italian, and Japanese experiences of the thirties would be correspondingly great. The Left would not contribute to such unity if it viewed the immediate issue as socialism. Furthermore, ideas like that expressed above are very much akin to the concept, "the worse for the workers, the better for us," which reaction falsely ascribes to Communists and Left forces. At root this viewpoint holds that workers learn only from defeats, not from victories; and that therefore the working class will move only if the capitalist world falls down around its ears. It does not see that the working class can advance organizationally and politically in calmer periods of history as well, and is strengthened through winning immediate victories, limited though they may be. It essentially reflects, therefore, the impatience of the petty bourgeoisie.

### THE MAIN POLITICAL PROBLEM TODAY

Second, the policy Miss Petran advocates does not come to grips with the real political problem facing progressives and Left forces in the United States today, a problem which would still require solution in the event of a crisis in the near future. What is this historic problem? Not the task of gathering the progressives *themselves* into a third party—with or without socialist orientation—but the problem of helping the working class finally to achieve its own political party in alliance especially with the working farmers, and the Negro people. This cannot be done by premature formation of a party which as matters now stand would inevitably lack a real labor base.

The independent political action with which progressive and Left forces should be concerned today is the *independent political action of the labor movement*, as an initial and essential step toward the eventual formation of a new political party. Since the labor movement is still largely oriented to support of the Democratic Party, the starting point for such political action is in most cases the development of a struggle to influence that party with respect to policies and candidates, as contrasted with the widespread tendency to trail uncritically in the wake of Democratic leaders and candidates. It is not necessary to repeat here the points made in this respect by

John Swift in *Political Affairs* for April, 1955.

We are concerned in this article with the relation between this historic task and the fight for a peacetime economic program. The class nature of the domestic economic policies pursued by the Eisenhower Administration is quite clear to American workers. This is appreciated by the leadership of the Democratic Party, which has seized on it as a key issue both in the 1954 elections and in preparation for 1956. However, while Democratic leaders have attacked the policies of the present Administration, and have tackled some specifics (scuttling of public power projects, the farm crisis, the minimum wage level) they have failed to advance an over-all peacetime economic program as an alternative to the arms and inflation policies of the present Administration. This, of course, is because most national Democratic leaders have been reluctant so far to take a stand for peace—even in words. Consequently, in the economic field their program continues to include as a central demand, an increase in military spending.

### LABOR'S MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY

A major responsibility facing the labor movement, therefore, is to develop a real struggle for its economic program, and to place maximum pressure on both Democrats and Re-

publicans on this matter, with special attention to the Democratic Party. A growing number of unions are beginning to move in this direction; but there is still an unsatisfactory and dangerous situation in the top ranks, when it is possible for a national figure like George Meany to advocate openly a pro-war policy of the Knowland type. When such a position as his—denouncing Geneva and its implications—can be taken by the head of the A. F. of L., then labor's own economic program is jeopardized.

The fight for a peace-time economic program is thus one of the avenues through which Left forces and progressives generally can help to develop independent political action by labor. It points up both the

character of the Republican policies and the deficiencies of the Democrats and emphasizes the need for labor's political independence. At the same time it helps prepare the working class and its allies for the problems they will face in the event of a major depression. Preparation for future struggle cannot consist in gathering progressives tightly together into a valiant band that will keep its banner flying with the hope that the mass of workers will rally to it tomorrow. It must be found, rather, in fighting together with the majority of American workers today, for the demands they now support, and through the channels they presently utilize while simultaneously pointing to the next steps needed to achieve these demands.

# The Puerto Rican People Against Colonialism and McCarthyism

By Pablo M. Garcia

*Member, Central Committee, C.P. of Puerto Rico*

IT WAS SIX o'clock in the morning when on October 20, 1954, nine men and women were arrested in Puerto Rico and a man was arrested in New York. Two hours later, another Puerto Rican was kidnapped in Mexico on orders of the F.B.I. and delivered to them in Texas.

While on the one hand the United States Government joins the governments of England, France, and the Soviet Union in Geneva, and declares itself in favor of easing international tension, on the other, within the U.S., the government continues the persecution of those citizens and organizations that have struggled for a long time in favor of the preservation of peace, the Constitution, democratic rights, and the establishment of the Geneva spirit.

In its campaign of war and fascism, emphasized by the McCarthyite elements in the U.S. Government, particularly the Department of Justice, the imperialist authorities have continued and have intensified their measures of repression and militari-

zation in the United States and in Puerto Rico.

The excuse for the arrest of the eleven Puerto Rican Smith Act victims was an alleged conspiracy to teach and advocate the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force and violence. The Smith Act was being put in operation by the U.S. authorities.

Bail was set at \$25,000 and \$28,000 by the U.S. Commissioner and later was lowered by the U.S. Federal District Court to sums ranging between \$20,000 and \$10,000. These excessive sums, in a country whose standard of living is so low that according to government figures the average weekly income of a worker is \$13.00 for men and \$8.00 for women, and where the average yearly income per family is far below \$2,000, tend to show the purpose of jailing the accused before their conviction.

Until the day of the arrests, the Puerto Rican counterpart of the Smith Act, widely known as Gag Law 53, had been used for repres-



sive purposes by the local authorities, acting as agents of the imperialist government.

#### PUERTO RICAN POLITICAL PRISONERS

No Puerto Rican had ever been indicted in the Federal District Court for Puerto Rico for alleged violation of the Smith Act. However, over fifty Puerto Rican political prisoners are now jailed in the United States, many of them convicted in the Federal District Court for Puerto Rico, for violating federal statutes such as the Military Service Law. A group of them was tried in New York or Washington for participation or alleged connection with the attempt against Congress.

At present, there are nearly one hundred political prisoners in Puerto Rico convicted for alleged violations of Gag Law 53 and other local criminal statutes.

The Government of the United States and the Puerto Rican colonial government have been able to provoke these patriots into violent actions through persecution and the creation of situations that made them desperate. They were led into terrorist activities that can in no way benefit the movement for national independence as a whole. It proceeded to jail many Nationalists, including their chief, Dr. Pedro Albizu Campos, condemning them to serve prison terms ranging from ten

years to life, and to create a climate of hysteria that would allow the government to jail anyone, no matter what his ideology might be, who distinguishes himself in the just struggles for national independence, peace, democracy, and better conditions of living.

On two occasions the Puerto Rican Government tried to jail most of the eleven Puerto Rican Smith Act victims arrested by the F.B.I. last year. It went as far as arresting some of them but was unable to proceed, and had to set them free. The Government failed miserably on those occasions because many sectors of Puerto Rican public opinion, including the Independentist Party and such conservative papers as *El Imparcial*, expressed themselves against such persecution, and because international public indignation was felt by the government through letters, cables, messages, and resolutions.

They also failed because the Party to which the accused belonged or had belonged, the Puerto Rican Communist Party, could not be provoked. On those occasions the Puerto Rican Government tried to use the activities of other Puerto Rican patriots as stepping stones in order to attribute force and violence to the Puerto Rican Communists, but that was too big a bite for public opinion to swallow.

The Communist Party has made very clear, through words and deeds, that it believes in the process of con-

vincing the masses of the necessity of obtaining our national independence and of establishing a social system that will not allow the exploitation of man by man. But this political and social system will be established in Puerto Rico only if and when the majority of the people want it.

#### THE SMITH ACT IN PUERTO RICO

Having failed in their repressive action against these defendants through the Puerto Rican government, the United States Government decided to act directly and nakedly; it proceeded to order the arrest and trial in the Federal District Court for Puerto Rico of the eleven Smith Act victims.

It decided, by making another example of Puerto Rico, to show the rest of Latin America how Communists and other opponents of imperialism should be dealt with.

A Smith Act case, so common in the United States in these days of violent persecution of innocent and patriotic people, is to be tried soon in Puerto Rico.

Eleven innocent men and women are accused of an alleged violation of a thought-control law. They are accused not of committing any act of violence, not of actually teaching or advocating, but of "conspiring" to teach and advocate such actions at

some unpredictable and remote date.

The reactionary interests who would export from the U.S. and import into Puerto Rico the McCarthyite persecution are confronted, however, with certain factors that make their task difficult.

This trial is not a popular one. Many people ask themselves: If the local authorities after jailing the Communists ordered their release, without even holding a trial, how can the Federal Government now make us believe that they are guilty of the same or similar charges?

The ever growing struggle of our people for national independence contributes to the difficulties that the imperialists are having in obtaining the support of the people for their campaign of repression.

The U.S. Government has not been able to create in Puerto Rico the climate of hysteria that it uses at home as a basis for the support of its repressive waves. The size of our country, which makes it relatively easy for people to know the alleged conspirators and compare their daily actions with the accusations hurled against them, has contributed towards preventing the development of hysteria.

The support that we will have from the American people who have had to confront the McCarthyite forces, when they learn of our case, will also create difficulties for the imperialists and their agents.

U.S.  
IN

T  
inclu  
who  
partl  
will

contr  
them  
ment  
gover  
estab  
based

As

Puert  
ism,  
comp  
sions  
Rican  
ernor  
Audi  
premi

Th  
U.S.

der t  
partic  
the r  
co; th  
to th  
peopl  
indep  
excha  
cially

low  
tions,  
nomic  
for th  
bor n  
the v

## U.S. IMPERIALISM IN PUERTO RICO

The people of the United States, including the many honest people who still differ from us wholly or partly on many important issues, will be astounded when they hear, contrary to what has been told to them, how, instead of respecting elementary principles of representative government, the United States has established a regime in Puerto Rico based on force and violence.

As a result of the struggle of the Puerto Rican people against colonialism, the U.S. Government has been compelled to make certain concessions such as allowing the Puerto Rican people to elect their own governor, who in turn can appoint the Auditor and the Justices of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

These limited concessions of the U.S. Government were made in order to confuse world public opinion, particularly in Latin America, as to the real political status of Puerto Rico; they were made in order to try to thwart the rising spirit of our people in their struggle for national independence. They were made in exchange for guarantees that especially favorable conditions, such as low wages, loans and tax exemptions, be provided for further economic penetration by U.S. capital, for the continued division of the labor movement, for the repression of the valiant combatants for national

independence who expose the colonial system and the U.S. war plans and who condemn the existence of the numerous U.S. naval, air and army bases in our country.

These concessions, however, do not change fundamentally the colonial status of Puerto Rico, nor do they change the basic elements of force and violence that characterize the colonial regime of the United States in Puerto Rico.

Let us examine where, how, by whom and against whom force and violence is being used.

The U.S. invaded Puerto Rico in 1898. It has been here since. Through the Paris Treaty, Puerto Rico came to be a possession of the United States although Puerto Rico was not, as the autonomous regime existing here at that time required, a party to the treaty by which it was "transferred" to the United States.

Is that not an act of force and violence?

For many years the U.S. Government put into practice the teaching of all subjects in the English language, starting from the second grade of elementary school. That meant that arithmetic, history, geography, etc., had to be taught in English, not in Spanish, our native tongue. Children 8 and 9 years old, who had not had time to master their own language, were compelled to do all their studies in a language which they could not understand.

Our national heroes were ignored by the school authorities. Students knew more of Benedict Arnold, a traitor to his country, than of such Puerto Rican national figures as Betances, Pachin, Marin, de Diego and many others, and of such patriotic feats as *El Grito de Lares*.<sup>\*</sup> Our people were in fact prevented from learning of Eugenio Maria de Hostos, Puerto Rican patriot, sociologist, educator, well-known throughout Latin America for his important contributions to the cause of the people.

The valiant and militant struggle of the Puerto Rican people in general and particularly of intellectuals, teachers and students, led in 1948 to the recognition by the U.S. Government that teaching should be conducted in Spanish, leaving English as a compulsory additional course for every student.

But at the same time that this victory was obtained, the government succeeded in smashing the university strike, expelling many students and professors, and wiping out the principle of autonomy both in the university and the Student Council.

As a result, however, of these valiant struggles, the U.S. Government has been compelled to recognize at least partially, that Puerto Ricans have their own language and

their own culture and that we will never allow others to impose upon us a language and a culture foreign to us.

Such government cultural policy constituted a subtle and an open use of force and violence directed against our youth and intended to cut all ties of our generation with our past so as to facilitate the objective of domination.

Congress has sole power over Puerto Rico. It approves laws and applies them here at its will. Puerto Rico is not represented in Congress, nor does it participate in the election of the President of the U.S. who signs such laws. It is in that perspective that the application to Puerto Rico of the Selective Service Law, the Smith Act, the Taft-Hartley Law, the McCarran Law, etc., must be analyzed. Naturally, the minimum wage approved by Congress for our brother workers in the U.S., which would benefit Puerto Rican workers, the majority of whom earn less than the minimum paid in the U.S., is not applied. This in spite of the fact that the cost of living is 25 per cent higher in Puerto Rico than in the U.S. It is because of this difference in the cost of living that the Federal Government pays to its employees in Puerto Rico 25 per cent more than it pays to similar federal employees in the United States.

Our youth is compelled by the U.S. Government to enter the army,

<sup>\*</sup> Literally, the cry of Lares, having reference to the revolutionary attempt to set up an independent Puerto Rican republic, announced in the city of Lares, Sep. 23, 1858—ed.

thus i  
taxati  
abhor  
tionar  
is not  
but th  
childr

If ta  
is tyra  
in Pu  
as one

The  
the ar  
Rico i  
prohib  
from r  
produc  
U.S. m

Puer  
all its  
produc  
tablish  
and im  
of tran  
interest  
thorize  
such tr

IMPER  
"JUS

Many  
preme  
judges  
Govern  
cuit Co  
the U.S.  
the dep  
tem on  
The

thus imposing upon us a system of taxation without representation, so abhorrent to the American Revolutionaries, in which the currency used is not precisely the "yankee dollar," but the life and the blood of our children.

If taxation without representation is tyranny, is not the U.S. conduct in Puerto Rico to be characterized as one of force and violence?

The U.S. Government determines the amount of sugar that Puerto Rico is allowed to produce and it prohibits Puerto Rican industrialists from refining 90 per cent of our sugar production so that refineries in the U.S. may benefit from that business.

Puerto Rico is compelled to buy all its products from and sell all its production to the U.S. at prices established by the latter. All exports and imports must be made in means of transportation owned by the U.S. interests or by such corporations authorized by said government to do such transporting.

#### IMPERIALISM AND "JUSTICE"

Many of the decisions of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, whose judges are now appointed by the Governor, can be revised by the Circuit Court of Boston and later by the U.S. Supreme Court. This shows the dependency of our judicial system on the colonial power.

The U.S. District Court, where

we are to be tried, is a court established here by the Government of the United States. The Puerto Rican people, not having any representation in the executive or legislative branches, have nothing to say in the appointment of the Federal Judge, the District Attorney or any of the functionaries of the Court.

Although Puerto Rico is a Spanish-speaking community, the federal law establishes that to be a member of the panel or jury list, a person must have a thorough knowledge of the English language. This requirement automatically excludes the overwhelming majority of the Puerto Rican people, who, as a matter of fact, do not know English. Such a requirement operates so as to reserve the right and duty of jury service to the upper social strata.

As a result of this, the list of 1450 names from which was drawn the Grand Jury that ordered the indictment in our case, had, besides excluding the majority of the Puerto Rican people from the possibility of participating, the following unrepresentative composition: 787 were industrialists, government employees and professionals; 224 were clerical workers and housewives; 22 were workers and farmers. The occupations of 270 persons were not specified. The residences of these people were equally unrepresentative of our country—over 92 per cent were from the San Juan area, less

than 8 per cent were from other parts of the island.

The trial itself will be conducted in English in spite of the fact that English is not our language and that many of the accused cannot speak a word of it. This will be worse than being tried in absentia.

How should this be characterized? Is not this an evident case of force and violence against a whole people?

If sentenced to more than one year, the accused will be punished not only with the prison term that the law may establish but also with banishment since federal sentences that exceed one year must be served in a federal prison. There is no federal prison in Puerto Rico. It will be practically impossible for any of the accused to see his parents, his wife and children until his prison term has been served.

Is not this unjust punishment and a further act of force and violence?

### "BLOWING HOT AND COLD"

The U.S. Government, the federal and local authorities, claim that Puerto Rico is no longer a territory, a colony.

It has been alleged by sectors of the labor movement that Puerto Rico, no longer being a territory, such laws as the Taft-Hartley Act are not applicable. But the Taft-Hartley Law is applied to Puerto Rico and not only to industries en-

gaged in interstate commerce but to all industries whether or not they are engaged in such commerce.

Without taking a position on whether that law should apply to industries not engaged in interstate commerce, the government insists that even though Puerto Rico is no longer a territory, certain laws like the Taft-Hartley, the Smith Act and other repressive laws are applicable by virtue of an alleged "covenant" between the U.S. Government and the people of Puerto Rico.

This is what North Americans call "blowing hot and cold." While on the one hand both the government of the U.S. and the Government of Puerto Rico, being controlled by the rich, by the capitalists, by the exploiters of the people, claim this is no longer a possession, on the other they both agree that repressive laws must be made applicable to Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico is no longer a colony for them but they take care to forge their "conviction" when it is a question of safeguarding their selfish interests.

The Independentist, the Nationalist, the Communist, the Statehood Parties and many sectors in the Popular Party now in power, insist that Puerto Rico is still a colony, that no commonwealth exists in Puerto Rico. How can it be alleged that Puerto Rico has the political status of a commonwealth when the U.S.

impo  
its fo  
lation  
and

THE

It i  
the e  
ism v  
action  
again  
organ

Wh  
to jai

rectin  
the d

for wh  
A car  
struct  
found  
Rican  
vera  
cause

Upo  
gar m

McCar  
wife,  
dren,

last tw  
the Pu  
the Go

tes all  
that th  
nist Pa

selfish  
depend  
Juan

sugar

imposes upon us its laws, its courts, its foreign policies, its wars, its regulations on production, its commerce and its prices?

### THE FORTHCOMING TRIAL

It is with this as background that the eleven new victims of imperialism will be brought to trial. The action is not one directed exclusively against the accused or against their organization.

When the U.S. Government tries to jail Juan Santos Rivera, it is directing its action towards preventing the development of the struggles for which he has always been known. A carpenter, founder of the Construction Workers Union and also founder and President of the Puerto Rican Communist Party, Santos Rivera has remained faithful to the cause of the Puerto Rican people.

Upon jailing Ramon Mirabel, cigar maker—already victim of the McCarran Law, under which his wife, and with her their two children, have been deported—for the last two years General Secretary of the Puerto Rican Communist Party, the Government of the U.S. persecutes all those who have come to realize that the small but militant Communist Party defends honorably and unselfishly the cause of our national independence.

Juan Saez Corales, laborer in the sugar fields, the best known labor

leader in our land, for many years Secretary General of the General Confederation of Workers when it embodied the majority of Puerto Rican organized workers, is another of the victims. By persecuting him, the imperialists persecute all those who are waiting for the moment when it will be feasible to give all their support to one of the best exponents of the noblest traditions of our people.

Among the others arrested there are the following:

Jorge W. Maysonet Hernandez, leader of the movie operators and member of the Central Committee of the Puerto Rican Communist Party.

Cristino Perez Mendez, leader of the powerful movement of the unemployed in 1948, leader of the construction workers and of the tenants' movement in the government housing projects.

Eugenio Cuebas Arbona, one of the leaders in the struggle against the imposition of the English language in the schools and leader of the Puerto Rican youth movement.

Cesar Andreu Iglesias and Consuelo Burgos, who in the past made contributions in the development of the Puerto Rican Communist Party but who two years ago were removed from their positions in the Central Committee.

Although we have already had expressions of solidarity from organi-

zations in the United States, for which we are grateful, in order to guarantee justice for the Eleven Smith Act victims and for the other Puerto Rican political prisoners, we call on the people of the United States to give us ever greater aid by supporting through all the means of

expressing solidarity, our struggle for the preservation of our democratic rights, our national independence movement, our judicial struggle and the cause of peace and freedom all over the world, for the success of the spirit of Geneva in international and domestic affairs.

By

Aut  
new  
ques  
ists  
geoi  
deve  
of t  
The  
wea  
"the  
thro  
pie  
the  
heig  
the  
who  
O  
lists  
Rask  
of A  
ting  
Prof  
most  
divic  
in a  
cal i  
heig  
Bu  
bake  
post-  
put  
ing

\* T  
Octobe



# Automation: Abundance For Whom?\*

By Frank Brewster and Mark Logan

AUTOMATION WITHOUT A DOUBT OPENS new frontiers of abundance. The question is for whom? The economists and propagandists of the bourgeoisie speak with reverence and devout faith of the shiny possibilities of the new productivity potential. They enjoy speaking of the great wealth which can be produced as "the pie," and preach that only through greater productivity can the pie become larger and in turn can the worker get a bigger piece. That heightened productivity is making the pie bigger is well known. But who gets the pie is less well known.

One thing is certain, the monopolists are getting plenty of it. A. H. Raskin writes in the *N.Y. Times* of August 7, 1955: "Industry is getting its share of the prosperity pie. Profits are far ahead of last year for most corporations, stock prices and dividends are booming, investments in automation and other technological improvements are paying off in heightened productivity. . . ."

But what of those who make and bake the pie? The fact is that the post-war disproportion between output and real wages has been growing over many years.

According to the Labor Research Association study, *Trends in American Capitalism*, output per worker has increased from 100 in 1899 to 215 in 1946, while real wages only increased from 100 in 1899 to 161 in 1946, with the result that the share of the worker in his own output declined by 25%. And since 1946, the trend has been accentuated. A 1952 Department of Commerce survey states that the average annual rate of increase in real product per man hour since 1947 has been in excess of 3% through 1951—well above the twentieth-century rate as a whole. A CIO study, issued in 1953, places the annual rise at over 4% from 1948 through 1949 and at over 5% in 1950.

## WHERE THE MONEY GOES

What is happening to the harvest of this fabulous leap forward in productivity? On the morning after the new wage contracts were signed in General Motors and Ford, loud huzzas went up in the editorial columns of the monopoly press over the big slice of pie the auto workers were getting. Leaving aside the fact that the gains were highly exaggerated in such editorials and that what was obtained was forced by the

\* The first half of this article appeared in our October issue.—Ed.

strength of the union and grass roots strike movements of hundreds of thousands of workers, let us see whether the workers received a slice or what amounts to a few crumbs.

According to figures released by the United Automobile Workers, General Motors set aside \$36.2 million during the first quarter of 1955 for bonuses to be paid GM executives. This was equivalent to 15.7 cents per hour worked by all the GM hourly paid workers in the U.S.A., or about three-quarter of the cost of the recent contract gains. GM profits before taxes for the first quarter amounted to \$675 million; this was equivalent to almost three dollars an hour (\$2.98 to be exact) worked during the same three months by all the 400,000 GM hourly paid workers in the U.S. How many GM workers get \$3.00 an hour? If the payroll had been 10% higher during the first three months, GM's profit would still have been \$634 million dollars.

Thus it is quite clear the harvest of greater productivity and greater intensity of labor is going to the few, and the trend is ever more in that direction. Increased productivity has served to reduce the worker's share of the national product while profits for the capitalists have reached fantastic heights.

#### FORMULA FOR DEPRESSION

Where is all this leading? The inescapable conclusion is that automation plus intensified exploitation is

a formula for depression. The policies of the employers are aggravating all tendencies that generate severe economic smash-ups. The fact that there is a temporary upsurge in employment is making it possible for the employers to momentarily obscure what is shaping up for the not too distant future.

What is happening to the labor force in most industries, including those that are still experiencing important growth in production? Gabriel Kolko in the *New Republic* (July 14, 1955), states:

Until 1919 industry had absorbed labor faster than it had displaced it. But the decade following 1919 saw, for the first time in American history, a net decrease in the number employed in manufacturing despite a huge expansion in actual production. Because of the depression, it was not until 1939 that our nation's output actually passed its 1929 level. Yet the number of unemployed was already eight million greater. Only about five million of this number represented new additions to the work force; at least three million had been displaced by "technological efficiency" and productivity was at a much lower rate during the depression. Similarly, though the index of industrial production for November 1954 was the same as for November 1953, a million and a half more workers were unemployed. At least half of these were displaced by technological progress.

Production has been rising in the last ten months but the picture has the same basic nature. Let us take

steer  
ton  
first  
the  
year  
In  
"Th  
the  
oly  
mix  
deve  
W  
take  
dred  
doub  
it is  
sorp  
expe  
mati  
Unie  
come  
ance  
of pu  
the f  
esses  
Com  
has t  
equip  
month  
It i  
farms  
place  
posit  
histor  
has b  
the s  
prop  
cities  
ever  
prive

steel for example. Five million more tons of steel were turned out in the first three months of 1955 than in the corresponding period of last year, but with 40,000 fewer workers.

In the words of Matthew IX, 37: "*The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few.*" Under monopoly capitalism this seems to be a mixed blessing, if not an ominous development.

Where is the slack going to be taken up? Though clerks and kindred workers have more than doubled in the last forty-five years, it is unlikely that much more absorption of surplus workers can be expected in white collar jobs. Automation has also invaded the offices. *Univac* is only the best known newcomer to office automation. Insurance companies, billing departments of public-utility companies, are among the first to institute automatic processes in place of clerks. Chicago's Commonwealth Edison Company has this summer installed automation equipment to turn out its 900,000 monthly bills.

It is common knowledge that the farms will not absorb workers displaced from industry. Just the opposite is true. Through most of the history of American capitalism there has been a steady dispossession of the smaller farmers. As capitalist property relations developed in the cities as well as the countryside, an ever greater mass of farmers deprived of land went to the factories

to sell their labor power. As mechanization came to the countryside and the agrarian crisis became chronic, large scale capitalist farms survived and grew in size while smaller family-worked farms tended to go under.

Thus the farm population today represents only about 13.5% of the total population, and government figures show how precipitate is this continued trend. Between 1940 and 1945 the number of persons living on farms fell by more than five million. And since 1950, the farm population dropped another 3 million.

#### NEW JOBS FOR OLD JOBS?

The answer usually advanced is that we have nothing to fear because new technological advances fostering new inventions create new branches of industry, and create new demand for consumer goods as well as for producer goods, thus assuming a process of uninterrupted, continuous production. It is contended there are no real grounds to worry about over-producton and economic crisis. David Sarnoff, Chairman, Radio Corporation of America, writes in *Fortune Magazine* (Jan., 1955): "The era of automation is upon us—eventually many new jobs will be created for every job cancelled." Of course, eventually can be a long way off, and there are solid reasons to make the prediction highly unlikely in any case—unless labor intervenes.

Mr. Sarnoff ignores the experiences of 1929, which also culminated a period of not inconsiderable technological advances, including the mass assembly line production of automobiles, radios, etc.

The theories of the David Sarnoffs and the bourgeois economists (John K. Galbraith, Sumner H. Slichter, etc.) stubbornly ignore the devastating fact that the ratio of effective demand relative to total production capacity is decreasing, and must, therefore, at a certain point give rise to relative overproduction and crisis. Only the hypodermic injections of World War II, the cold war economy, and the war in Korea, etc., have delayed major economic collapse in recent years. And even these "cushions" brought little stability.

The Sarnoffs and the Slichters undoubtedly count on the fact that production and employment is again on the rise and that this may obscure the fundamental situation. But the true outline of what is shaping up cannot long be concealed.

Much of the growth in productive facilities is an outgrowth of the stimulus of the war economy, the

Korean war and the cold war. The manufacturing plants of this country are producing 38% more goods than in 1947. But there are wide variations in the growth trends.

Aircraft, for example, one of the main merchant-of-war industries, increased its production by 417% since 1947. (Output of aircraft is now down from 1954 and will probably continue downward.) As for many consumer goods industries, the picture is quite different. Though the population since 1947 has increased 14.7%, production of processed food is up 7.9%, while leather is down 17.3% and wool textiles has declined 29.9%.\*

It is quite obvious from all this that unless the purchasing power of the producers is increased considerably and unless the production of consumer goods can be greatly expanded, the economy is headed for a major crisis. The growing disparity between production capacity and purchasing power in this very year of boom cannot be talked away.

*US News and World Report* published (March 11, 1955) some revealing facts in this regard:

Item	Capacity	Expected Output (1955)
Automobiles	9 million cars	6.6 millions
Steel	125.8 million tons	107.4 million tons
TV Sets	12.4 million sets	9.2 million sets
Refrigerators	177% of 1947-49	78% of 1947-49
Electric Ranges	166% " "	92% " "
Vacuum Cleaners	136% " "	73% " "
Furniture	132% " "	115% " "

\* *US News and World Report* (July 8, 1955) based on Federal Reserve Board data.

All this comes down to one basic fact. It is not the machines or productivity that causes the danger of crisis, it is capitalism and capitalism's way of life.\*

The Program of the Communist Party declares:

Modern industrial production under capitalism is a vast social process, but it is operated for the private enrichment of the few who own and not for the good of the many who produce. It is this contradiction that Socialism will resolve because in a Socialist society, the industries will be the property of the whole people, and the product of industry will go to the whole people in the form of continually rising living standards. Socialism alone would utilize to the fullest the immense scientific and technical know-how of the American people, including atomic energy.

However, the Program emphasizes that the issue for our country at the present time is not Socialism or Communism. The immediate task before our people is to win a lasting peace, to restore the Bill of Rights, to win full equality for the Negro people, and to achieve some security by attempting to weaken the grip which the monopolies have on our country.

\* "The last cause of all real crises always remains the poverty and restricted consumption of the masses as compared to the tendency of capitalist production to develop the productive forces in such a way that only the absolute power of consumption of the entire society would be their limit."—Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, Kerr edition, p. 568.

## IN THE SOCIALIST LANDS

While engaged in the immediate tasks at hand, the American people are following with considerable interest economic and industrial development in the socialist countries. Not the least of the consequences of the beginnings of the break-up of the cold war is the wider opportunity to get at some of the facts.

The recently concluded Atoms for Peace conference in Geneva laid to rest two favorite—though contradictory—libels of the anti-Soviet pundits. For years Americans have been assured that: (1) Socialism dooms the Soviet Union to "technological backwardness"; and (2) Soviet technology is geared to the construction of an aggressive war machine powerful enough to be launched against the "technologically superior" capitalist nations.

At Geneva, in the glare of worldwide attention and publicity, the true facts of advanced Socialist technology and its peaceful application could no longer be hidden by "expert" distortion. Even so tried and true a Soviet-baiter as Seymour Freidin reported (*New York Post*, August 19, 1955), the estimate of an American scientist at Geneva that "if they [the Soviet scientists] so chose, all new data on pure physical research might well be a Soviet monopoly." It was a \$50,000,000 cyclotron nearing completion in the Soviet Union

that called forth this estimate. One need hardly be an expert in nuclear physics or in economics to realize that such an achievement in the peaceful application of atomic energy could never be attained by a country short on technology or long on aggressiveness. But let Freidin sum it up: "Any remaining illusions that the Russians are incompetent in the realm of research and science vanishes in Geneva. . . . They know their mathematics; they have . . . done research that matches anybody's and they are very much in the picture on the latest developments."

The economic strength of a country can be gauged in part by its advanced science. And Soviet science stands forth today as a mighty symbol of a powerful socialist economy.

That such a powerful economy must include both totally and partially automated industries and factories is almost axiomatic. But we need not speculate on the existence and development of automation in the Soviet Union.

According to Academician I. Artolevsky of the Soviet Union (*New Times*, No. 4, 1954):

The Soviet Union produces up-to-date automatic machines and control instruments; it has machine lines and even whole factories which operate automatically (producing motor parts, ball bearings, anchor chains, etc.). These plants are the prototype of the industries of the future Communist society.

And even Harry Schwartz of the *N.Y. Times* (ideological dean of those whose professional activities are devoted to twisting, concealing and falsifying the facts about the Soviet Union), wrote (Aug. 21, 1955):

A technological revolution appears to be in the making for Soviet factories in the next few years. . . . Automation of production is apparently to play a large part in the planned technological requirement of Soviet factories.

The growth of mechanization and automation in the Soviet Union is reflected in production figures for the last quarter of a century: between 1929 and 1953, industrial output in the Soviet Union increased sixteen-fold. In the short span between 1947 and 1953 alone, despite the ravages of World War II, production tripled. What is more, labor productivity of industrial workers was 6% higher in 1953 than in 1952.

Increased industrial output and particularly a rise in labor productivity are not much cause for rejoicing among workers in capitalist countries. They have little to show for it. In the Soviet Union, however, real wages of factory and industrial workers in 1953 were more than 13% higher than in 1952. Farmers, too, increased their real income by 13%. During the same period 7,500,000 factory and office workers acquired skills or were upgraded to more skilled positions through training.

These figures can only hint at the

multi-faceted advances in Socialist society on all levels—production, culture, art and science—in the last quarter century. But the few facts above do demonstrate that the Soviet people have nothing to fear—as do workers in capitalist countries—from the rapid growth of automation in their country. On the contrary, they look forward to its development with the eager anticipation of a people supremely confident in the strength of their chosen economic path.

All of this gives a hollow sound to a recent pronouncement by Gilbert Burck in *Fortune Magazine* (Jan., 1955) that, "it is theoretically possible, to be sure, that Russia may yet find the key to rising productivity within the rigid framework of its despotism." Mr. Burck concedes, not without concern, that "no nation on earth is more productivity-conscious than Russia." But he falls back on hoary arguments to "prove" that the Soviet Union is doomed to low productivity. Socialist society, *Fortune* assures us, suffers from a "lack of incentives that appeal to man's legitimate desires," "the frozen status of the workers," etc. Of course, a sixteen-fold increase in industrial output and a growth of real wages measured by leaps and bounds might demonstrate that "man's legitimate desires" are met quite well by Socialism, without benefit of monopolies and astronomical monopoly profits. And it might just be that the

7,500,000 Soviet workers upgraded in one year do not feel themselves in a "frozen status."

Mr. Burck and *Fortune* notwithstanding, Soviet socialist economy is rapidly catching up with the industrial might of the United States. The leaders of the Soviet Union, in their writings, have never stinted in their praise of technical achievement in this country. At the same time they show supreme confidence in the superiority of the socialist over the capitalist system and have often expressed their willingness to let the decision rest with history. Indeed, this is the cornerstone of the Soviet policy of peaceful coexistence.

The fact is that while the Soviet Union was multiplying its production sixteen times between 1929 and 1953, U.S. production rose 225%, or just more than one-eighth of the Soviet rate. While Soviet production tripled between 1947 and 1953, U.S. production increased 34% or slightly over one-tenth the Soviet rate.

As the working class and people move in the direction of challenging and curbing the monopolies, and seek through struggle to reap some of the fruits of automation in the United States, their understanding can be immeasurably deepened by a knowledge of and exchange of information with the countries of Socialism.

#### PROGRAM AND POLICY

The Program of the Communist

Party asserts that we American people are proud of our inventive genius, our technical knowhow, and of our country's tremendous industrial machine. The American working class has little in common with the Luddite movement of the early 19th century in England which attempted to destroy machinery, instead of directing its energies against the exploiters and the system which caused their misery.

For all the boasting propaganda of our ruling class, our nation has far from realized the full potentialities of existing industrial techniques. This is also true with regard to automation. Under monopoly capitalism not everyone can automate. The extremely high initial cost of automatic control systems prevents their installation by small firms. Most of the smaller companies (including the not-so-small corporations, as the example of the Studebaker plants given above) are stuck with outmoded equipment.

Employers have received direct assistance from the government in the form of tax amortization to the tune of 30 billion dollars with which much of the modern plant and equipment installed over recent years has been financed, but this was chiefly enjoyed by the largest monopoly corporations. State monopoly capitalism is not interested in advancing industrial techniques in general, nor does it give impartial treatment. The Cadillac Cabinet in

particular has been interested in preferred treatment for the billion dollar corporations.

But whether the huge sums needed come from government coffers or from direct gross profits, the great capital accumulation needed for automation comes out of the hide of the workers—through taxes, through speed-up, and generally through robbing the worker of the fruits of his toil.

In short, the chief reason for the productivity drive is the securing of maximum profits. Today's monopolies find the drive for maximum profits a necessity if they are to survive in the competition between the giants at home, and in the struggle for re-division of the restricted capitalist world market (a restriction which is in part self-imposed by the embargoes on trade with the Socialist world).

#### THE TRADE UNIONS AND AUTOMATION

This is the picture which the propagandists and ideologists of monopoly would conceal with their talk of "Western miracle" and "emancipation." However, the "captains of industry," momentarily riding high on the crest of a very precarious rise in production, fear that donning the threadbare mantle of generous benefactor of humanity may not work much longer. The tremors in the



economic picture are signalling the end of the masquerade.

Where they can't get labor leaders to echo their line, they attempt to silence them as scare-mongers and doom-criers. *Collier's* magazine (May 13, 1955) paraphrases the argument made in all the press of the ruling class:

A century ago men stoned factories because a single machine promised to do the work of a hundred men. Today the doom-criers are trying to spread the same kind of panic because automation is promising machines that will do the work of a thousand, or ten thousand, men.

Where these arguments won't suffice, they are coupled with red-baiting, hearings by committees of Congressional vigilantes, and the whole arsenal of monopoly attack.

They would like to efface the memory of 1929. But the lessons of the 1929 depression have not all been lost on the labor movement. There is growing understanding that the purpose behind these attacks is to compel labor to "keep hands off" automation; and to warn labor that the monopolies will brook no interference with their drive for maximum profits.

Most of the labor movement has correctly stated that the issue is not whether new technique is desirable but whether the workers will reap its fruits.

The statements of various unions,

expressed in such journals as the *American Federationist*, *Butcher Workman*, *United Mine Workers Journal*, etc., would indicate they do not vary in content from the thought expressed by Walter Reuther, President of the C.I.O., that: "Our struggle is not to stop the machines. Our struggle is to see to it that the workers get the benefit of these better machines and the efficient techniques that develop in industry." (*CIO News*, Sept. 13, 1954.)

Unfortunately it cannot be said that all the lessons of 1929 have been drawn by the labor movement. Not all labor organizations have begun to shape policies to meet the challenge of automation, and only a few trade unions have as yet adopted a militant program based on a class awareness of their membership's best interests.

Most spokesmen for the corporations are in truth quite pleased with the performance of large sections of the trade union movement as regards automation and productivity. *Fortune* magazine (Jan., 1955) in a bit of careful double-talk puts it this way:

We have already noted big labor's power to restrain output and keep down productivity, and that U.S. labor has not generally abused that power... that American labor, unlike British and European labor, has not habitually exercised its monopoly power [!] to inhibit change.

What *Fortune* magazine is really expressing is approval for those policies of class collaboration which in the name of labor-management cooperation by "good business-like unionism" accepts not only automation but with it speed-up, unemployment, wrecked wage structures, crippled seniority systems, etc.

Nevertheless, the widespread fear and dissatisfaction of the great mass of rank and file trade unionists is breaking through and finding expression in the policies of some unions. The extent of the average shop worker's concern is so marked that a General Electric vice-president, Arthur Vinson, was compelled to admit that ". . . According to one survey, nearly three-fourths of the working population believe automation will result in layoffs and unemployment."

Struggles, developing at the shop level, have begun to shape a program with which to meet the challenge of automation. The elements for such a program around which a united labor movement could be rallied already exist. Most notably the U.A.W., which has made the greatest advances in this direction, adopted a resolution on Automation and the New Technology at its last convention, which calls for:

*the upward revision of wage rates based on new classifications—*

*contract clauses to provide for training and re-training at company expense of workers who now master new skills—*

*for the right of inter-plant transfers based on seniority in multi-plant corporations; preferential rehiring of laid-off UAW members—*

*short-term contracts so that union can keep abreast of various developments under automation—*

*the winning of the shorter work week—*

*achievement of guaranteed employment.*

The independent United Electrical Workers has advanced a similar program. In the A. F. of L., Carl Huhndorff, Research Director, I. A. of M., writing on automation in the *American Federationist*, May 1955, calls for: higher wages, shorter hours, more adequate pensions and greater social security benefits. He also calls for termination pay, greater unemployment benefits, retraining for the better jobs, getting rid of the piece-work system and the junking of some present job evaluation systems.

Coming more and more to the fore in all these programs is the struggle for the shorter work week with no reduction in pay. This issue gives every promise of emerging in the near future as the number-one demand of the labor movement. Not so long ago, Walter Reuther opposed the fight for the shorter work week and branded it a "red" issue; today his position has been reversed, undoubtedly spurred by the pressures from UAW's militant rank and file membership, and

sparked by the Ford River Rouge local.

### COMMUNIST PARTY PROPOSALS

Communist Party leaders have made proposals, in addition to the above, such as:

*cutting speed-up by making company slow down lines and machines, contract guarantees that grant increased fatigue time, longer rest periods, wash time and paid lunch periods—*

*a working shop steward for every 20 workers, besides full-time district committeemen, to enforce the measures proposed by the union at the grass roots level of the union—*

*increasing available amount of jobs, by transferring government war appropriations to peacetime projects—  
increasing foreign trade with the Soviet Union, China, and East Europe, based on peaceful coexistence.*

The issue of trade with the Socialist countries is assuming far-reaching importance.

A decisive question facing the labor movement is the position of the Negro worker under automation, North and South. The fear and concern over the consequences of automation displayed by the white worker are felt by the Negro worker with double force, and with good reason.

The general policy of discrimination practiced by the employers against the Negro worker will only be intensified unless a program is ad-

vanced to take into account the special effect of the new technology on the conditions of the Negro workers in the shops and factories (such as the mastering of new skills, training and retraining, upgrading, seniority rights, wages, etc.).

Such questions as doing away with industrial pirating (runaway shops), the wage differential between North and South, and the organizing of the unorganized in the South also take on new meaning.

The labor movement, which has taken some important steps forward in the understanding and struggle for Negro-white unity and class unity against the monopolies, must, under penalty of suffering severe reverses, pay special heed, propose special measures, to meet the needs of the Negro workers under the new conditions. Simultaneously, only the strengthening of the class unity of Negro and white workers within the labor movement can meet the challenge of automation effectively.

Thus, labor's responsibility, in its own self-interest, to develop a new stage in the struggle to wipe out every form of discrimination, must become a key objective.

### CONCLUSION

While there is not yet today an all-inclusive economic program on automation, the elements of the program given here must become the property of every worker in the labor

movement. This program calls for a maximum united struggle and is on the order of the day.

The struggle to curb the cruel consequences of automation in monopoly's drive for maximum profits cannot be confined to the economic front alone. The role of the monopoly government and particularly the policies of this Administration demand a strengthening of the independent political role of labor, and require that the labor movement

throws its full weight into the 1956 election struggles.

The Communist Party will strive to instill a consciousness of these supremely important tasks among all workers. It will enhance its vanguard role by assisting the labor movement to develop militant class policies in the struggle to increase the purchasing power of the people and to curb the power and profits of the trusts.

By

THE  
the  
que  
arot  
stru  
teria  
phy  
the  
mot  
Qua  
proc  
ism  
prin  
New  
on t  
tum  
up b  
and  
stru  
agai  
theo  
class  
T  
of C  
met  
phys  
a m  
ques  
Mech

• T  
1954;

# The Struggle Against Indeterminism in Contemporary Physics\*

By G. A. Svetchnikov

THE PROBLEM of causality is one of the most important methodological questions in Quantum Mechanics around which an especially sharp struggle has developed between materialism and idealism. The idealist physicists consider the break-up of the mechanistic concepts of matter, motion and causality to which Quantum Mechanics have given rise, proof of the refutation of materialism in general and of the materialist principle of causality in particular. New indeterminist conclusions based on the data of contemporary Quantum Mechanics are being snatched up by all the reactionary philosophers and are being used by them in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism, against dialectical materialism—the theoretical banner of the working class movement.

The indeterminist interpretation of Quantum Mechanics immediately met with a rebuff on the part of the physicists and philosophers who take a materialist position. Around the question of causality in Quantum Mechanics arose a bitter, uncompro-

ming struggle which has not abated for one moment, between materialism and idealism.

An attempt is made in this article to throw light on the struggle of a section of progressive scientists abroad against the indeterminist ideas in Quantum Mechanics.

## VIEWS OF SOVIET PHYSICISTS

A significant section of the progressive scientists of Bulgaria, Poland, France and other countries connect up the materialist interpretation of Quantum Mechanics with conceptions of the *quantum aggregate* being developed by Soviet physicists and philosophers.

At the basis of the conceptions of the quantum aggregate lie the following postulates:

1. Quantum Mechanics constitutes a statistical theory of mass microphenomena. The state of motion of the aggregate of micro-particles is reflected in the wave function.
2. The particles which make up the quantum aggregate are an indivisible unity of corpuscular and wave

\* Translated from *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 6, 1954; abridged text.

properties that exists in reality.

The consistent execution of these principles, taken together, establishes a basis for the materialist interpretation of Quantum Mechanics.

The theory of statistical aggregates which asserts that contemporary Quantum Mechanics is a statistical theory of the motion of the aggregate of microscopic particles inflicts a decisive blow against the "complementarity principle" according to which Quantum Mechanics is the theory of the measurement of individual microscopic objects. It refutes that subjective-idealist position of the complementarity principle according to which *not the objectively existing microscopic particles* are the subject of Quantum Mechanics *but their interaction with an apparatus*.

The theory of quantum aggregate developed by D. I. Blokhintsev\* permits us to interpret the *correlation of uncertainties*. The correlation of uncertainties is not the result of the "uncontrollable" influence of the macroscopic measuring instrument on the micro-particle as is asserted by the complementarity principle, but the *reflection of the qualitative peculiarity of the quantum aggregate* as compared to the classic aggregate, an aggregate of macroscopic bodies (e.g., the aggregate of pellets falling from one height with a single initial velocity). This qualitative difference

between the aggregate of micro-particles and the aggregate of macroscopic bodies is conditioned by the *specific nature of the micro-particles* which, in contradistinction to the macroscopic bodies, have both corpuscular and wave properties simultaneously.

The consistently developed conception of quantum aggregates, including within itself the cognition of the reality of the corpuscular-wave properties of the microscopic particles, permits us to solve the problem of causality in Quantum Mechanics, from the dialectical-materialist position.

#### SOME CRITICISMS

A section of Soviet physicists has been speaking out in criticism of the quantum aggregate conception. Academician V. A. Fok considers that the wave function in Quantum Mechanics concerns not the aggregate but the individual micro-particles. The state of the individual micro-particle is characterized in Quantum Mechanics by the probability of the behavior in one way or another of the particle under every possible kind of outside influence. The outside influence is understood to be, in particular, that influence exerted by the apparatus on the micro-particle when a specific physical quantity is being measured. Probability of behavior is understood to be probability of such a nature that under outside influence (e.g., the influence of a measuring

\* Prof. Blokhintsev is Scientific Director of the first atomic power plant in the USSR, and was prominent at the recent Geneva Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.—Ed.

apparatus) the quantity being measured takes on different meanings. According to V. A. Fok the object of study of Quantum Mechanics is not the micro-particle by itself, but the micro-particle *in interaction with macroscopic conditions, e.g., the measuring apparatus*. V. A. Fok calls his point of view concerning the physical purpose of the wave function, "the point of view of real quantum conditions."

#### THE STRUGGLE AGAINST IDEALISM

The struggle being conducted in the Soviet Union against idealism in contemporary physics, has great international significance. . . .

The correlation of uncertainties, in the opinion of Polikarov [Bulgaria], makes the point that micro-particles possessing at one and the same time corpuscular and wave properties should not be considered tiny globules having coordinates and momentum at the same time. The assumption of the simultaneous existence in the micro-particles of coordinates and velocities, involves the acceptance of the classical conception of the particle, and is a typical mechanical "survival" according to which these particles are nothing but extremely tiny globules. Such an identification of the microscopic particles with the tiny globule, says Polikarov, is used by these idealists for the "refutation" of materialist teachings on causality. . . .

A. Polikarov, E. Eilstein [Poland], A. Datsev and the Czechoslovak writer R. Richta repeatedly stress that a consistently materialist treatment of Quantum Mechanics is possible only from a dialectical materialist position.

However, a consistent application of the general principles of dialectical materialism to the solution of the concrete methodological problems of contemporary science is not always achieved even by the authors of the best of the works on the philosophical questions of contemporary natural science. Thus, for example, Polikarov is not successful in consistently pursuing the materialist point of view on the *correlation of uncertainties*.

On the one hand, he notes quite correctly that the correlation of uncertainties is the peculiar expression of the unity of wave and corpuscular properties of the micro-particles. On the other hand, in expounding the correlation of uncertainties he makes use of the hypothetical experiment of Heisenberg and maintains, in the spirit of the complementarity principle that "with each measurement there takes place a change in the status of the system beyond any calculation. . . ."

The Bulgarian theoretical physicist, Asen Datsev, having identified electrons with the tiny globules that have both coordinates and velocities simultaneously, is obliged to expound on the correlation of uncertainties in the spirit of Bohr and Heisenberg

as a result of the influence of the apparatus on the micro-particle. . . .

Not wanting to fall into agnosticism, Datsev is obliged to consider that the correlation of uncertainties is a temporary difficulty. The time will come when we, asserts Datsev, shall be able simultaneously to measure accurately both the coordinates and the velocities of micro-particles and express their motions in the form of Laplace determinism. . . .

#### THE WORK OF DE BROGLIE AND BOHM

Works of recent years bear witness to the broadening of the front of the struggle of materialism against idealism in contemporary physics in France and other countries. The facts likewise speak of the elements of disintegration noted in the Copenhagen School [Bohr, Heisenberg]. Highly symptomatic are the recent statements of Louis de Broglie, the well-known French physicist and one of the founders of wave mechanics, who had for 25 years taken the position of the Copenhagen School. In his latest works he speaks out in criticism of the idealism of the Copenhagen School.

The works of the French physicist Vigier and of the American physicist David Bohm have served as a direct stimulus to convince De Broglie of the need to reexamine his former, idealistic views on Quantum Mechanics.

In his article in the American

physics magazine *The Physical Review*, Bohm criticizes the methodological line of the Copenhagen School in Quantum Mechanics. He is correct in thinking that the positivism of Mach engendered the interpretation of Quantum Mechanics accepted by the majority of theoretical physicists abroad.

Bohm speaks out against indeterminism in Quantum Mechanics and for the recognition of the objectivity of the atomic processes and their causal bonds. He criticizes the idealist interpretation and develops a determinist conception on the quantum processes expressed by De Broglie as far back as 1927 in the form of the hypothesis of the "dual solution." Bohm writes: "In contrast to the usual [*i.e.*, indeterminist] interpretation, this alternative interpretation permits us to conceive of each individual system as being in a precisely definable state, whose changes with time are determined by definite laws, analogous to (but not identical with) the classical equations of motion" (*The Physical Review*, January 15, 1952, p. 166).

Bohm is endeavoring to find a new law for the motion of micro-particles. With this as his objective he is attempting to present the wave function as the reflection of the motion of particles in a combined field which contains both ordinary and a quantum mechanical potential, while bringing into realization a specific quantum state.

In  
mag  
of  
Fro  
min  
ister  
the  
exp  
mic  
ing  
mor  
mea  
dete

DE  
IN

U  
Boh  
the  
tatio  
stem  
but  
reali  
a rel  
arran  
pre-c

De  
dema  
ideal  
Bohm  
it co  
crete  
conce  
corre  
for a  
tum  
and  
leads  
denia



In the second article in the same magazine, Bohm presents his theory of the processes of measurement. From the point of view of determinist conceptions, he proves the existence of "hidden" parameters, with the help of which it is possible to express the motion of each individual micro-particle. Each particle, according to Bohm, has both position and momentum but we cannot as yet measure them simultaneously and determine the trajectory.

#### DE BROGLIE REJECTS INDETERMINISM

Using the works of Vigier and Bohm as a base, De Broglie came to the conclusion that every interpretation of the physical theory must stem not from preconceived notions but from real facts, *i.e.*, objective reality. The interpretation should be a reflection of the facts and not an arrangement of them according to a pre-conceived scheme.

De Broglie clearly condemns and demands a re-examination of the idealist, indeterminist position of Bohr and Heisenberg, believing that it contradicts the traditional, concrete (*i.e.*, spontaneous-materialist) conception of physics. De Broglie correctly substantiates the necessity for a re-examination of the Quantum Mechanics suggested by Bohr and Heisenberg, in that it logically leads to subjective idealism, to the denial of the objective existence of

physical reality. The interpretation of Quantum Mechanics, suggested by Bohr and Heisenberg, writes De Broglie, "logically leads to its own type of subjectivism, akin to idealism in the philosophical sense, and seeks the refutation of the existence of physical reality independent of the observer. . . ."

In applying materialism to physical theories, De Broglie also takes a position in favor of the knowability of the micro-processes. He stresses the fact that the quantum theory has helped man make more profound his cognition of phenomena on an atomic scale. He speaks optimistically of the possibility of deepening the cognition of phenomena that flow into the fields of the atomic nucleus, meson fields, etc. At the same time he speaks out against the dogmatization of the fundamentals of Quantum Mechanics peculiar to Bohr and Heisenberg. He discards the conception of "pure chance," that is, change having no objective cause and takes a sympathetic attitude to the scholars of the classical epoch who took the position of determinism on phenomena of nature. The position held by Louis De Broglie in Quantum Mechanics is basically materialist and, assuredly, progressive as compared to the philosophical position of Bohr and Heisenberg. . . .

The switchover of physicists abroad, who formerly shared the views of the Copenhagen School, to

the materialistic position takes place gradually and is accompanied by various kinds of reservations. It seems to us that De Broglie's position on a number of questions is being justifiably criticized by progressive French writers.\*

#### SOME CRITICISMS OF DE BROGLIE

His point of view on chance, for example, arouses opposition. De Broglie, following Laplace's lead, considers that chance phenomena are a result of our ignorance of all the causes and the circumstances of a given process. As soon as we become cognizant of all the causes and the circumstances, the phenomenon ceases being chance. This point of view is incorrect and was in its time criticized by Engels.

It is impossible to agree with De Broglie and Bohm who have not yet completely freed themselves of the interpretation of quantum phenomena in the spirit of the Bohr complementarity principle and consider that the statistical character of Quantum Mechanics is a consequence of the uncontrollable influence of the macroscopic apparatus on the micro-particles.

Finally, it is impossible to accept the point of view of De Broglie who states that if Vigier's works on the basis of the determinist point of view

relative to Quantum Mechanics (based on the working out of the first variant of the theory of the pilot-wave) does not lead to positive results, then it is necessary to return to the "purely chance" (*i.e.*, essentially, the indeterminist) point of view.

Independently of Vigier's attempts, we have full grounds for asserting that the methodological position of Bohr and Heisenberg on Quantum Mechanics is idealistic, anti-scientific, and in the interests of science should be discarded—the sooner, the better.

Despite the well-known limitations of the position of De Broglie and Bohm, on the whole, their attempts at a materialistic elucidation of the bases of the quantum theory makes possible the liberation of the most advanced foreign physicists from the influence of the idealistic conceptions of the Copenhagen School and therefore is progressive and worthy of support on the part of the scientists of the materialist camp.

It is interesting in this connection to clear up the attitude of the various social forces of France at the present time, to De Broglie. A number of influential people who are in leading positions in government affairs have been victimizing this outstanding scientist and have been organizing persecution of him, refusing him the means for the creation of a national institute of theoretical physics, removing him from work in "The European Center for Research on

\* See the article by Vassails in the magazine *La Nouvelle Critique*, No. 43, 1953.

Atomic Energy," while the leaders of the Copenhagen School, Bohr and Heisenberg, occupy leading posts there. The attitude of the French Communists to De Broglie is different. In the last two years there have been several articles in the progressive French magazines *La Pensée* and *La Nouvelle Critique*, hailing and positively appraising De Broglie's stand against indeterminism in Quantum Mechanics. While supporting De Broglie's materialist declaration, French progressive scientists at the same time are helping him in a friendly manner to free himself definitely of the idealistic ideas of the Copenhagen School. . . .

#### MATERIALIST FRENCH PHYSICISTS

In capitalist countries there is a fairly large group of scientists fighting against idealism in physics, from the position of dialectical materialism. First of all we need to assign the progressive physicists of France to this group. In this group, in addition to the world-renowned scientist, progressive figure and fighter for peace, Frederic Joliot-Curie, are Irene Curie, Vassails, Eugène Cotton, Schatzman, Vigier, Renier, Charles and others.

Eugène Cotton, Gérard Vassails and Jean Charles hold to the point of view of those Soviet physicists whose views have been most fully expressed by D. I. Blokhintsev in his

work, *Fundamentals of Quantum Mechanics* (1949). . . .

Vigier has been attempting to construct an electron model that would make possible the simultaneous determination of position and momentum. He does not share the point of view of those Soviet physicists who, it seems to us, correctly consider that it is impossible to construct mechanical electron models *since the electron is not a mechanical but a physical formation representative of the dialectical unity of corpuscles and waves*. . . .

Eugène Cotton and Gérard Vassails, it seems to us, evaluate De Broglie's position on Quantum Mechanics correctly. They consider that De Broglie's position on Quantum Mechanics is completely materialistic but is of a narrowly limited, mechanistic character. "Lorentz and De Broglie," writes Cotton, "have also risen up against these idealistic distortions of Quantum Mechanics but they often fall into a narrowly mechanistic point of view." (*La Pensée*, No. 50, 1953, p. 96). Eugène Cotton correctly stresses that we must not spread the concept of mechanical causality in the field of quantum processes. "Determinism is no longer, for example, the same for electrons that it was for macroscopic bodies owing to the impossibility of isolating the micro-systems observed, from their surroundings." (*ibid.*, p. 99) . . .

Thus there are two basic directions in the materialist camp of the progressive scientist-physicists of France. To the first we can assign Pierre-Jean Vigier and Evry Schatzman; to the second—Eugène Cotton and Gérard Vassails. Scientists of the first trend connect the further growth of Quantum Mechanics on a materialist base with the working out of De Broglie's hypothesis, called by him the theory of "dual solution" and with the statement concerning the motion of the micro-particles according to laws analogous to the Newtonian laws. The adherents of the second materialist direction acknowledge the position of De Broglie and Bohm as limited though materialist. The scientists who hold to this point of view consider that the working out of the problems of Quantum Mechanics should be guided in the direction pointed out by the Soviet physicists and consequently guide themselves by the principles of Marxist dialectics on the qualitative peculiarity of the forms of motion of matter. Despite the difference between these fundamental points of views, the progressive physicists of France lead in the main to: the recognition of the materiality of quantum processes and the objectivity of their conformity with natural law and also to the recognition of their knowability. Both these trends among the progressive physicists of France direct the spearhead of their struggle against

the idealistic position of the Copenhagen School. . . .

#### SOME TRENDS IN THE UNITED STATES

In the U.S.A. there are also scientists fighting against idealism in contemporary physics. In the October, 1953, issue of the magazine *Political Affairs*, there is an article by the American scientist, Philip Tilden, "Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* and the Crisis in Physics Today." After setting forth a Leninist analysis of the crisis in physics, the author goes over to an elucidation of the situation in physics today. Pausing at Quantum theory, Tilden correctly notes that the subsequent change in the notion of matter and its motion that Quantum Mechanics brought about was interpreted by a section of physicists as a result of ignorance on their part of materialist dialectics, as a denial of the existence of matter and objective causality and conformity to natural law. "Faced with the contradictions between Quantum Mechanics and the theories of Newton and Maxwell," writes Tilden, "Bohr and Heisenberg identify Newtonian Physics with materialism, and therefore conclude that no precise, causal materialist explanation of sub-atomic phenomena is possible." Tilden quite correctly stresses that at the base of the indeterminist conclusions of Bohr and Heisenberg lies the identifi-

cati  
ing  
tern  
stat  
dial  
corr  
cove  
tion  
of n  
H  
not  
deve  
diale  
latio  
plem  
hand  
sayin  
(the  
calce  
ciple  
conse  
exhib  
hand  
of un  
attrib  
natur  
temp  
tion  
future  
autho  
istic c  
ing n  
level  
tainti  
terpre  
nite p  
above  
The  
opinic

pen-  
sci-  
m in  
Octo-  
azine  
article  
p Tild-  
Em-  
is in  
forth  
sis in  
to an  
physics  
theory,  
e sub-  
on of  
Quant-  
it was  
physicists  
ir part  
denial  
objec-  
ity to  
e con-  
m Me-  
Newton  
"Bohr  
Newtonian  
d there-  
causal  
atomic  
en quite  
base of  
ons of  
identifi-

cation of the materialist understand-  
ing of causality with Mechanistic De-  
terminism. Therefore the author  
states that only from a position of  
dialectical materialism is it possible  
correctly to evaluate the new discov-  
eries in Physics which revolution-  
ize our old, mechanistic notion  
of matter and motion.

However, the author himself is  
not always successful in consistently  
developing the point of view of  
dialectical materialism on the corre-  
lation of uncertainties and the comple-  
mentarity "principle." On the one  
hand, Tilden is absolutely correct in  
saying that Heisenberg's formulation  
(the correlation of uncertainties,  
called by him the uncertainty "prin-  
ciple") represents the "inescapable  
consequences of the new properties  
exhibited by matter." On the other  
hand, the author robs the correlation  
of uncertainties of objective content,  
attributing it not to the objective  
nature of the micro-processes but to  
temporary difficulties of our cogni-  
tion which will be overcome in the  
future. We cannot agree with the  
author either when he puts the ideal-  
istic complementarity principle, hav-  
ing no physical content at all, on a  
level with the correlation of uncer-  
tainties, which although falsely in-  
terpreted by Heisenberg, has a defi-  
nite physical sense as pointed out  
above.

The author has not expressed an  
opinion on the latest works of De

Brogie and Bohm in which they  
prove the possibility of a causal ex-  
planation of micro-processes with  
the aid of mechanical determinism.  
Tilden closes his work with the state-  
ment that only from the position of  
dialectical materialism is a correct,  
scientific general conclusion from  
the data of contemporary science  
possible. Not wishing to take under  
consideration dialectical materialism  
and not being in a position correctly  
to evaluate new scientific discoveries,  
many Western scientists have fallen  
easy prey to idealistic philosophical  
systems put into circulation by con-  
temporary Machians. Only a few  
have begun to apply serious efforts  
to the reformulation of Quantum  
Mechanics along materialist lines.  
"However, this trend," concludes  
Tilden, "is bitterly attacked by the  
bulk of the physicists who have come  
to maturity under the influence of  
one or another of the prevailing  
idealist philosophies of science.  
Philosophical idealism in physics as  
well as in biology is official dogma  
and it requires courage as well as  
insight for scientists to criticize the  
prevailing idealist interpretation of  
Quantum Mechanics." Tilden thus  
stresses the point that the formation  
of materialist bases for Quantum  
Mechanics comes about as a result  
of a fierce struggle against the pre-  
valence of idealism in physics today.

An analysis of the struggle of pro-  
gressive scientists in capitalist coun-

tries for a materialist interpretation of Quantum Mechanics once again shows the weakness of the position of mechanical materialism in the struggle against contemporary idealism in physics. Under present conditions, mechanical materialism, denying the qualitative peculiarities of the forms of motion of matter and of causal bonds, reduces all forms of motion of matter to *mechanical* motion, and is utilized by the idealists in physics in the struggle against the materialist world-view. To over-

come idealism in physics with the same weapons it uses in the struggle against materialism, is impossible. Only from a position of dialectical materialism recognizing not only the material nature of the world and its knowability, but the qualitative peculiarities of the different forms of motion of matter and the corresponding forms of the causal bonds in conformity with natural laws, is it possible to conduct a successful struggle against idealism in physics today.

B  
tr  
st  
ch  
co  
re  
sc  
pu  
kn  
sa  
ca  
en  
be  
tio  
wh  
qu  
by  
Fr  
gro  
Va  
atte  
cha  
Boh  
Fol  
Me  
teria  
I  
writ  
pres  
mak  
V  
repr  
void  
\*  
\*  
of Q

# Comment on the Svetchnikov Article

By Philip M. Tilden

The article by G. A. Svetchnikov reveals the existence of two modern trends in the struggle against indeterminism in Quantum Mechanics. As a result of the cold war, which has until very recently almost abolished cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union and with progressive opinion in other foreign countries, American scientists are nearly completely ignorant of Soviet theoretical work in this sphere. Thus, the obviously important work of the Soviet scientist, D. I. Blokhintsev, *Fundamentals of Quantum Mechanics*, which was published in 1949, and is referred to by Svetchnikov, has been virtually unknown in this country. The writings of the French scientists, Cotton, Vassails, and Charles, in support of Blokhintsev, have gone unreported in American scientific journals. On the other hand, the work of the American scientist, David Bohm, and of the French scientists, Vigier and De Broglie, have been commented upon in isolation from the work of the other scientists mentioned.\*

Svetchnikov makes clear that the idealist tenets of Bohr and Heisenberg, which have dominated the field of Quantum Mechanics since its inception a quarter of a century ago, are now being challenged in a fundamental way by outstanding physicists in the Soviet Union, in the People's Democracies, in France, and by at least one major American scientist.

The first of the two trends dealt with by Svetchnikov is that of a Soviet group led by Blokhintsev and supported in France by Cotton, Charles, and Vassails. This group is viewed by him as representing the most promising attempt to apply the principles of dialectical materialism to Quantum Mechanics. The second trend, represented in the writings of the American, Bohm, the French scientists, De Broglie, Vigier, etc., and the Soviet scientist, Fok, is welcomed by him as a sincere effort to combat idealism in Quantum Mechanics, but suffering, he thinks, from tendencies toward mechanical materialism.

In the article by Svetchnikov mention is made of the work by the present writer published in the October, 1953 issue of *Political Affairs*. While expressing agreement with many of the points raised in that article, Svetchnikov makes some criticisms which should be discussed.

We agree with Svetchnikov that Heisenberg's correlation of uncertainties represents an objective fact, whereas Bohr's complementarity principle is devoid of physical content and represents pure idealism. It must be admitted,

\* See, for example, Henry Margenau, "Advantages and Disadvantages of Various Interpretations of Quantum Mechanics," in *Physics Today*, October, 1954.

however, that certain imprecise formulations in my article gave ground for the impression that I was placing these two concepts on the same footing. I did not make sufficiently clear that while the so-called uncertainty principle represents philosophical idealism, the correlation of uncertainties is based upon objective facts, and stands independently of Heisenberg's idealist interpretation of it. Heisenberg utilizes the "correlation of uncertainties" as the basis for denying, not only the existence of simultaneous particle position and momentum for microparticles, but for denying the *objective existence* of the phenomena represented by the particle. This viewpoint is based on the operationalist principle that what cannot be measured does not exist.

Svetchnikov points out that our article failed to deal with the work of Bohm, De Broglie and Vigier. The work of the last two was not available to us when the article was written. Because of space limitations I decided at that time not to go into Bohm's theories although I was greatly interested in them.

Scientific progress has been severely handicapped by political repression in our country. It was David Bohm, the brilliant young American scientist referred to by Svetchnikov, who re-awakened the interest of De Broglie in seeking a new materialist interpretation of Quantum Mechanics. But Bohm was unable to find professional employment in this country.

One of the main "charges" in the notorious security hearings against J. Robert Oppenheimer was the fact he had recognized Bohm's exceptional promise as a scientist and had recommended him for a position at Princeton. Though appointed, Bohm was not permitted to remain at that university and had to go to Brazil to find employment. Bohm's work has also been subjected to several politically biased attacks in letters to the *Physical Review*.

It is to be hoped that the improved atmosphere created by the Four-Power Geneva Conference, and so quickly extended to the scientific field by the conference on the peaceful use of atomic energy, also held in Geneva, will develop fully and rapidly in our country.

Under such circumstances we can well expect to see the work of the Soviet physicists and of Bohm, De Broglie, and Vigier properly assessed without political bias. We are sure American physicists would welcome it if organizations like the American Physical Society would invite these scientists, together with those of contrary views, like Bohr and Heisenberg, to debate the issues.

The duty falls upon progressive scientists of every political affiliation to fight against political criteria for judging scientific theories. If this struggle is waged, it may yet come to pass that a Bohr, a Blokhintsev and a De Broglie or Bohm may debate together at a meeting under the auspices of American scientists.



# The Military Uprising in Argentina

By the Central Committee, C. P. of Argentina

*On September 23, 1955, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Argentina made public an analysis of the events of the preceding weeks. We are happy to bring to our readers the complete text of this very significant document.—Ed.*

ON SEPTEMBER 18 the Communist Party published an appeal to the people, urging them to intervene to obtain a cease-fire and contribute to ending the civil war, which was creating havoc.

"The Communist Party," said the appeal, "has been warning against the dangers of a civil war, and has persistently explained under what conditions a development of democratic co-existence can be guaranteed. It told the government that the indispensable conditions were establishment of all democratic guarantees, freedom for political prisoners, withdrawal of the projected contract with the Standard Oil Co. and assurances that the parties and social and cultural organizations could seek together and on an equal footing the most equitable solutions to the problems of the country and the people. It told the opposition democratic sectors, which had been seduced by the false mirage of a *coup d'etat*, that this was not the way, that violence and civil war could only lead to anarchy and dicta-

torship, and that instead they should orient themselves upon a regime of democratic co-existence.

"Neither one nor the other listened to the Communist Party's words. The Communist Party in itself did not have sufficient strength to determine the victory of democratic co-existence. Further, thanks to the government's persistence in its anti-democratic stands and to the decision of those groups favoring a *coup d'etat*, the country has been drawn into a bloody and destructive civil war."

The country is now in a new political situation brought about by the military uprising of September 16. After several days of civil war, the rebellious forces won, the Peron government was deposed and in its place a provisional government has been installed. But how much death and destruction there has been! According to incomplete data, there have been more than 7,000 killed and tens of thousands wounded. The present government will be the third military government since 1930: The

first one on September 6, 1930; the second on June 4, 1943 and now that of September 23, 1955.

The events of September 16-22 are characterized by deliberate conduct of both sides—Peronist government and rebellious military sectors—aimed at impeding popular participation in the solution of the country's political problem. If the insurrection was purely military, so too was the Peronist government's resistance conducted exclusively on a military plane. This is particularly strange on the part of the Peronist government, inasmuch as a few days earlier it had threatened the putschists with arming the people in order to break them up and burden them with the consequences, satisfying the justified labor and popular demands for better living and working conditions, land for the peasants, democracy and national independence. But at the decisive moment, General Peron did not turn to the people for anything or indicate what was to be done.

As our Party has repeatedly stated and states now, without the people's participation in the determination of the country's political and social course, the results can never be favorable for the people. This latest experience has demonstrated irrefutably to the people, and first of all to the working class, that they can only depend on themselves, on their own strength, their independent organization and on their party, the Communist Party, as guide and lead-

er in the struggle for their immediate demands and for their social and national liberation.

\* \* \*

Our party, which was persecuted as no other and fought as no other against the corporative-fascist type state, and against Peron's dictatorial methods, warned the people that if democratic co-existence were not established between Peronists and the opposition, there would be a *coup d'etat* and a civil war. This has been demonstrated by events.

Now since the victory of the military insurrection, the policy of democratic co-existence is still entirely valid. Only this policy can keep a new dictatorship from replacing the old one and allow Argentinians to solve their problems without outside interference and for the good of the people and the nation.

General Lonardi, president of the provisional government, has in various public statements promised to "reestablish the rule of justice," respecting those laws which safeguard it and revising those which oppose it. He has pledged to "reestablish immediately the rights of assembly, association and press," urging the citizens to "express freely their opinions and take part in politics according to their ideas and sentiments, and with the assurance that this will not put them in jeopardy, even should they be government employees." He has promised to "maintain and improve the workers' legitimate gains."

In  
Revol  
doza  
is no  
any d  
must  
social  
cratic  
nation  
Gen  
to res  
elimin  
the e  
lish u  
trade  
rency  
limit  
ing o  
count  
throu  
devel  
turnin  
And,  
electi  
But—  
in no  
count  
the p  
the la  
Th  
the p  
has n  
gram  
ises a  
one p  
which  
hopes  
woul  
demo  
and—  
gener

In accord with this promise, the Revolutionary Command of Mendoza asserted that "the revolution is not for the employers and that any dismissal intended as a reprisal must be considered as an attack on social justice and on the democratic essence of this movement of national liberation."

General Lonardi also promised to respect freedom of conscience, to eliminate political discrimination in the educational system and re-establish university autonomy; to assure trade-union freedom; to fight currency inflation and bureaucracy; to limit public expenditures. Regarding oil, he gave assurances that the country would sink the wells for itself through the Y.P.F. [government oil development corporation] without turning them over to foreign firms. And, finally, he promised to call free elections within a reasonable time. But—a significant fact—he referred in no way to the problems of the countryside, and particularly not to the peasant demand for stability on the land through agrarian reform.

These are the first declarations of the provisional president; as yet he has not made known his explicit program. These democratic-type promises are made with the aim—on the one hand—of pacifying those sectors which supported the *coup d'etat* in hopes that the new government would bring about changes of a democratic and progressive character; and—on the other hand—to pacify generally the working masses who

not only were not willing to accept a narrowing of their social gains, but who already under the former regime were demanding new gains in order substantially to improve their living and working conditions.

The masses, influenced by Peronism and those who gave their allegiance to the victorious military movement—that is to say, the immense majority of the people—not only do not want to go backward toward the past, but want to march forward, toward progress, social well-being, democracy, national independence and peace. The new rulers must reckon with this fact whether they want to or not.

\* \* \*

On the other hand, the present government is not a homogeneous government. As always when there is a heterogeneous movement, so now it is possible to discern that in the movement which culminated in the events of September 16th, dissimilar tendencies, aims and programs are brought together. Together with those who want a really democratic and progressive regime are those who opposed Peron because—according to them—he did not adequately defend the interests of the oligarchy, big capital and imperialist monopolies. Together with those who stood against Peron because his social demagoguery aimed at diverting the working masses from the path of independent struggle in defense of their interests are those who feared that Peronism's social demagoguery would prepare the

ground for the advance of Communism. Together with those who were against Peron for having inaugurated an unprecedented period of clericalism which jeopardized freedom of conscience are those who opposed him because he did not make enough concessions of privileges to the Church and fully build a clerical-fascist type state, and these forces now are pressing the provisional government to submit to the high clergy. Alongside those who opposed Peron because he was getting ready to hand over the oil to Standard Oil are those who reproached him for giving away too little.

All the above determines the government's instability and shows that if the democratic forces (parties, unions, cultural organizations, student centers, social groups) immediately make their weight felt on the provisional government, they can prevent it from going completely to the Right and can wrest from it the democratic concessions the people demand.

This is all the more necessary since the evidence shows that the land-owning oligarchy, big capital, the high clergy and Yankee imperialism were the initiators of the *coup d'etat* which gave birth to this government.

\* \* \*

Even though the provisional government has just declared that it will establish a democratic regime, the fact remains—underlined by experience—that only the action of the

united democratic forces can determine the course of events in their favor. To this end, it is necessary that these forces be vigilant and demonstrate from now on, as the Communist Party is doing, that they intend to support any step taken by the new authorities in the indicated direction, and to fight any reactionary measure.

Thus, the labor and popular forces, political parties and social and cultural groups, without exception, all who are devoted to democracy, must establish unity of action and, through this, see to it that the new authorities:

Immediately lift the state of siege and internal war and abrogate Law 4144 and all laws and decrees which are contrary to the rights of man and citizen;

Administer exemplary punishment to those who tortured and murdered Dr. Inganilella and the instigators of that crime;

Dissolve the sinister Special Section and arrest and try torturers like Lombilla (Buenos Aires Province), Gonzalez (Federal Capital), Solveyra Casares (who was assigned to the national presidential office), Amoresano (San Luis), Bergallo (Chaco) and others;

Assure full political freedom and the rights of political parties, trade union and social organizations, without restriction or discrimination;

Assure the reinstatement of workers, employees, professionals, professors, teachers, students, judges, mem-

bers  
victim  
for  
Inc  
war  
Giv  
for th  
social  
In  
tional  
Est  
Churc  
Churc  
Col  
and  
Cal  
time-  
pared  
partie  
cratic  
incorp

The  
necess  
of a  
pede  
tators  
new  
guara  
sibilit  
demo  
and e  
Per  
corpo  
not a  
out  
rights  
tions  
and t  
cial g  
can p

bers of the armed forces who were victimized by the previous regime for their democratic ideas;

Indemnify the victims of the civil war for material losses;

Give up persecution of Peronists for their past or present political or social activity;

In educational matters, insure rational and lay teaching;

Establish a concordat with the Church on the basis of separation of Church and State;

Conduct a foreign policy of peace and friendship with all peoples;

Call general elections within a short time—elections which must be prepared for under the control of all parties and conducted under a democratic coalition government which incorporates all progressive forces.

\* \* \*

These minimum guarantees are necessary for the re-establishment of a democratic regime and to impede the establishment of new dictatorships and the breaking out of new *coups d'état*. Without these guarantees there is or can be no possibility for our nation to follow a democratic and progressive course and establish political stability.

Peron, with his highly centralized corporative fascist-type state, could not avoid an armed uprising. Without political liberties and equal rights for all; without the conditions under which the working class and the people, the parties and social groupings which represent them can propose democratic and progres-

sive solutions to the country's economic, social and political problems—and without unity of action to put these solutions into practice—the threat of social upheaval, political instability and chaos is inevitable.

Thus it is up to the working class, in the first place, to unite solidly, now more than ever, in their trade unions; and the labor movement and the democratic parties have the job of fighting unitedly in defense of their gains and social rights and to inaugurate a period of democratic co-existence.

Therefore, just as yesterday under the Peronist government we demanded freedom for all and defended the right of Catholic citizens not to be subjected to a system of political discrimination—so today, under the new government, we demand the same rights for Peronist citizens, inasmuch as it would serve the country ill to establish a policy of proscriptions which would divide Argentines into children and step-children. Therefore we condemn energetically the verbal and armed assaults with which common people have been victimized by “good people” allied to the government and by political and military forces for the “crime” of having demonstrated their support for the deposed government. We also condemn the attacks on Peronist party and trade-union headquarters.

\* \* \*

As for the workers who trusted Peron and who now feel defrauded,

they should reflect profoundly on the reasons why, after first urging them to struggle, Peron thrust them aside when the *coup* occurred rather than calling them to struggle in the front ranks and giving them the means to do so, and depended instead for the government's defense on the armed forces—which he thought were loyal to him. This was not accidental. As representative of the interests of the exploiting classes, Peron, who governed with social demagoguery, feared that if the working class once took to the streets it would put its own imprint on the struggle, directing its action against those principally responsible for their poverty and that of the nation: the landowning oligarchy and the imperialist monopolies.

This lesson must be assimilated by all workers: the working class must not depend on a man, a "savior," a "father of the poor," but on itself. As a result of the dependence of the CGT [trade union center] on the Peronist state, the workers remained unarmed and inactive at the very moment their participation in developments was most necessary. The strength of the working class lies in its fighting unity, in its class independence and in the leadership of its party, the Communist Party.

The workers, whose imposed leaders first paralyzed them and then abandoned them—a terrible betrayal—must now resolutely consolidate in the factories, shops and all places of work through local commissions

and committees of struggle. Peronists, Communists, Radicals, Socialists and non-party forces must remain united in their trade unions, winning trade union independence and democracy, electing workers loyal to their class, and defend the trade unions and the CGT against the attacks of those who—on the pretext of "cleaning out" union bosses and "establishing morality" from the outside—propose to divide the unions and the central organization. In this regard, we condemn the attacks on trade-union headquarters carried out by certain anti-Peronist political groups in order to take them over. The motto must be:

Workers' and trade-union problems shall be resolved by the workers themselves through their own organizations and through the practice of trade union democracy. The CGT does not consist of the sell-out bosses imposed by the leading circles of Peronism but rather of the unions themselves which, once they have achieved independence from the state and the employers, must play their role as real defenders of the interests of the working class and the people in the fight for bread, land, social well-being, democracy, national independence and peace.

\* \* \*

Because the previous government arrived at no progressive solution of the country's economic problems—the need for agrarian reform; the dependence of our industrial and

econ  
ist m  
cris  
rialis  
this.  
genti  
Lond  
rose  
than  
revea  
nopo  
to co  
to th  
coun  
the s  
a gr  
tion,  
the c  
wors  
ing o  
and  
On  
ernm  
self a  
and  
as co  
an a  
of a  
ever  
peopl  
tion f  
poses  
to fo  
not o  
ing o  
Oil b  
enter  
the Y  
try a  
assur  
duce

economic development on imperialist monopolies—the latent economic crisis is bound to worsen. The imperialists hope to take advantage of this. The fact that the sale of Argentina securities went up on the London market and that the peso rose on the New York market, thanks to the recent national events, reveals that the imperialist monopolies expect the new government to conduct a policy more amenable to their rapacious demands on our country's economy. Such a policy, at the same time as it would open up a greater colonization of our nation, would lead to an aggravation of the economic crisis and a constant worsening of the living and working conditions of our working class and our people.

On the other hand, the new government has hardly established itself and already the big landowners and big capitalists—who regard it as completely theirs—are launching an anti-labor offensive. Thus unity of action is more necessary than ever to stop the exploiters of our people and the despoilers of our nation from achieving their sinister purposes. Unity of action is necessary to force the provisional government not only to reject the proposed turning over of Argentine oil to Standard Oil but also to any other imperialist enterprise, and to exploit it through the YPF; to protect national industry and favor its development; to assure adequate prices for farm produce and guarantee stability of farm-

ers on the land through agrarian reform; to adopt effective measures against the high cost of living; not to intervene against the workers and employees in their struggle for wage and salary increases in order to catch up with living costs and to establish a sliding wage scale; to increase taxes on huge fortunes and ease the burden on small shop-keepers and industrialists; and to undertake other measures of a progressive character.

As to foreign policy, the provisional government must be made to establish diplomatic and commercial relations with all the countries of the world in accord with the principles of peaceful co-existence established at the Geneva Conference and to form closer ties with those countries which establish relations on the basis of mutual benefit and non-interference in internal affairs.

\* \* \*

With the provisional government resulting from the armed uprising, one period in our country's political life has closed, and another has opened. Where are events leading? The working class, the people, the democrats want it to follow a truly democratic path. To this end, they require full liberty, a democratic coalition government and free elections to determine the country's fate. So that their aspirations may be realized, as our party has declared repeatedly, there must be formed a National Democratic Front (anti-oligarchy, anti-imperialist and pro-peace) which brings together all Argentine pa-

triot. The working class and the advanced forces of all social sectors must press for this idea.

The advanced elements must understand that only by swelling the ranks of the Communist Party, which is their party, will it be possible for the party to accomplish the task of uniting in action all

democratic and national forces in order to end the cycle of coups and counter-coups and open the road to progress, social well-being and peace. That membership in the Communist Party take on a mass character is at the present moment vital for the future of our working class and of our people!

CRU

By H

Crusa

Her

Me

poet

west.

profou

water

its pe

In l

tells

consum

evoked

conve

sense

it.

Cru

tive o

del's p

died i

who d

stemm

revolu

from

from

land.

Her

in T

Minne

and se

torn f

ests, th



## Book Review

### CRUSADERS

By Herbert Aptheker

*Crusaders*, by Meridel Le Sueur. Blue Heron Press, New York. \$1.50.

Meridel Le Sueur is the historian, poet and story-teller of our Northwest. Deep are her roots there and profound is her love of its soil and waters, and great is her devotion to its people.

In her latest book, *Crusaders*, she tells us of those roots, and in her consummate artistry as a writer, evokes her love and devotion and conveys to her readers a pulsating sense of her land and those who work it.

*Crusaders* is a prose-poem descriptive of the lives and times of Meridel's parents, Arthur Le Sueur, who died in 1950, and Marian Le Sueur, who died in 1954. And they in turn stemmed from French and Irish revolutionists and political refugees, from English indentured servants, from Indians fighting to hold their land.

Her parents' parents were pioneers in Texas, Oklahoma, Iowa and Minnesota, making the soil fruitful and seeing the product of their toil torn from them by the Big Interests, the bankers and speculators—

those "creative personalities" of a latter-day and corrupt historiography.

Her mother and father were teacher and lawyer and they fought to bring learning and justice to the exploited and harassed. They were part of the Populist movement and of the founding of the Socialist Party. They toured with and agitated for Debs, and sold the *Appeal to Reason*, helped start the *Little Blue Books*; Arthur was the first Socialist mayor of Minot, North Dakota back in 1912.

They fought against the Great Imperialist War and stood firm then to the ideals of Socialism and of international brotherhood. And to the end of their days—through the red-hunting hysteria of the '20's and the depression of the '30's, through the icy terror of the Cold War years, they stood firm, too, and brought strength and confidence not only to their children and grand-children, but to thousands of compatriots who will never forget them.

There is no improving on Meridel Le Sueur's language:

They wore the country on each foot.  
They salted it with their sweat, changed

it with their labor, and had little more than six feet for their bodies. They kept alive the dignity of dissent and the right to impose upon it change; the cry for justice.

And they were such fragrant and happy and alive people. So good to be with, full of zest and fun and ideas and challenges. Again, Meridel says it best:

They lived upon the storm, were refreshed by disaster, cut their teeth upon loss, walked out like David for the fight, laughed at the puny merchants with jaundiced eye on profit, broke all indictments and injunctions against thought, or assemblage, asked for amnesty from all verdicts of madmen and assassins, shook the prairies with gigantic laughter at the corporations'

laws against majority or minority thought.

Here is a magnificent chunk of Americana; here is a book that will make its readers better understand American men and women and will help guard its readers against ever underestimating them, ever sneering at them, ever doubting their basic passion for freedom and independence.

Soured and calculating, guileful and predatory Nixons and McCarthys and Eastlands would make the Le Sueurs un-American, would have them register as "alien-inspired enemies." The Le Sueurs are as un-American as the Mississippi, as indestructible and as irresistible. And, even better, they are changers, builders—they are, indeed, crusaders.

*Just Out!*

## **WOMEN AGAINST SLAVERY**

By **SAMUEL SILLEN**

AN EXCITING CHAPTER of our country's past comes alive in these sketches of women who fought against Negro slavery. Here is a story of inspiring heroism and courage. In the face of violent insult and abuse, American women, Negro and white, took their stand in the struggle to end what Walt Whitman called "our basest outrage." And in this fight, women forged new weapons for achieving their own rights.

It is a dramatic story with a varied cast of characters. We meet here the heroic ex-slaves Harriet Tubman and Sojourner Truth; the novelists Harriet Beecher Stowe and Lydia Maria Child; the colorful frontier journalist Jane Swisshelm; the South Carolina Abolitionist sisters, Sarah and Angelina Grimke; the noble Quaker Lucretia Mott; the Negro poet Frances Ellen Watkins Harper; woman's rights leaders like Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucy Stone, Susan B. Anthony; and others.

These remarkably compact and vivid sketches are not "fictionalized." They are based on the actual speeches, letters, and diaries of the subjects, and all the incidents are real.

The Abolitionist women take on new grandeur in these pages. And their fight for full freedom and justice has a pointed meaning for every liberty-loving American today.

*Paper \$ .75; Cloth \$ 1.50*

**MASSES & MAINSTREAM • 832 Broadway, New York 3**

*A Happy Publishing Event!*

Announcing for November Publication

# **I SPEAK MY OWN PIECE!**

**AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF "THE REBEL GIRL"**

**By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn**

Here at last is the long-awaited autobiography of America's greatest living woman who, to the undying shame of our nation, will reach her 65th birthday on August 7 behind the iron bars of a prison cell. Compressed into the record of this one lifetime—very far from ended—is a history of the labor and socialist movements of the past fifty years, told with all the drama, warmth, intimacy and authority of a first-hand participant and central character.

Just scanning through the more than ninety chapters is an exciting experience: "First Speech—1906"; "I Mount the Soap Box and Get Arrested"; "James Connolly—Irish Socialist"; "The I.W.W. 'Stirreth Up the People'"; "I Met Tom L. Johnson"; "Mother Jones—Labor Agitator"; "My First Conspiracy Trial—1910"; "Giants of Labor—Haywood and Debs"; "The Lawrence Strike of 1912"; "The Ettor-Giovanitti Trial"; "The Paterson Silk Strike—1913"; "William Z. Foster and Tom Mann—Syndicalists"; "Labor Defense in 1913-1914"; "Joe Hill—Martyred Troubadour of Labor"; "The Mooney Frame-Up"; "The Everett Massacre"; "Frank Little Lynched"; "The Palmer Raids"; "Charles E. Ruthenberg—Most Arrested Man in America"; "The Legion Attacks—Centralia, 1919"; "The Irish and Soviet Republics"; "When Americans First Heard of Lenin"; "1919 and the Great Steel Strike"; "Sacco and Vanzetti."

Thousands of individuals, groups and organizations, who love and revere this noble daughter of the American working class, by helping to spread her book far and wide, can make it a powerful weapon for the freedom of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and all others imprisoned for their political views and activities.

An M & M Book • Popular \$1.75; Cloth \$2.75

**PLACE YOUR ADVANCE ORDER TODAY**

*at your local bookshop or*

**MASSES & MAINSTREAM • 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.**

...  
k  
t  
;  
;

d  
o  
ne  
ir

Y.