Albert Einstein, the prophet that the scientists have come to say on atomic power and the future. His long article, appearing in a recent issue of the New York Times Magazine, Dr. Einstein wrote eight words only, eight words that made sense to the social scientist. Those words were: "To-day we must abandon collaboration and secure cooperation." This phrase would seem to have been determined for Einstein by the trend of State controls to an all-over Receivership of the State on behalf of the property owners of the capitalist class—a liberation of capitalist forces against the working class.

Editor S.S.R. The many, many words that surrounded this statement, and that purported to show how cooperation could be secured, echoed—in substance—the similar words of other socially minded physicists, chemists and mathematicians who have been rushing into the arena with realism toward the newly dramatized social problem.

"Future thinking must prevent war."

"...as Mr. Baruch wisely said, it is a problem not of physics, but of ethics."

"...it is easier to denature aluminum than it is to denature the evil spirit of man." "If Germany has not won a victory, the tragedy for the human race might have been averted."

"...saying that we place too much faith in legalisms, treaties and mechanizations."

"...we will not change the hearts of other men by mechanisms but by changing our hearts and speaking bravely."

Slowly Social Thinking Caused by Failure to Admit Class Issues

These extracts from Dr. Einstein's article give the "substance" of his view of the social problem and its "solution.

True, he did touch upon United Nations endeavors, and suggested greater efforts away from war and toward a supranationalism. But he failed utterly to recognize the capitalist (private and State) factors that make the U.N. what it is and that promote chauvinism and national rivalries. His avoidance of the capitalist class and of the Socialist solution, and his concern with "ethics," "hearts," etc., that are but effects of the capitalist cause, indicate a failure to analyze as complete as that of persons who resort to religious mysticism as balm for their wounds caused by the effects of class-ridden society.

We are not "picking on" Dr. Einstein. He is not the only one of the physical scientists who possess social consciences are equally frustrated. They lack the knowledge of science necessary to an understanding of society and its problems.

Physical Scientists Don't Always Think Scientifically

As we stated before, the theory that scientists from the physical fields can solve social problems is plausible, but not necessarily true. No matter how great their genius, physical scientists are subject to the same limitations as "ordinary mortals" in subjects outside of their particular fields. An Einstein, entering the field of social science, is as lost as any other man who touches a subject in which he has no basic knowledge and training.

Physical scientists are as confused as men of other professions and trades in political and social thinking. Some are conservatives, while others are liberals, still others they are Socialists. Some are Fascists, others accept the limited political democracy of capitalism as the "highest" ideal, still others are as apolitical as the disillusioned, and unlitghtened, worker who is "against politics" while he lends tacit support to the politicians in charge of the operations of the capitalist State.

Examples of "Scientific" Confusion

Examples may be cited on the "outside thinking" of scientists. Sir Oliver Lodge, the physicist, was a passionate believer in spiritualism. Sir James Jeans, the astrophysicist, is a mystic in his social thinking. Max Planck, the inventor of the quantum theory, though a major scientist, is an apologist for the frightened workers. So is the non-Fascist Albert Einstein himself, who, like so many of the major scientists, claim, or have claimed, to be Socialists. Harold Urey, discoverer of the hydrogen atom, and Sir James Jeans, two of the major workers on atomic fission, once followed the Socialist party line, and still consider themselves liberal. But Einstein, as far as known, has never considered himself a Socialist, and in his book he turns the statement against himself that he is a Socialist in the purely political sense. Einstein is in the broadest sense a liberal—"we will not change the hearts of other men by mechanisms but by changing our hearts and speaking bravely."

The Shepherds' Counsel to Labor

The New York Herald Tribune reports from Rome, November 15, that the Pope said: "...the courageous employment of one's own or borrowed capital are bases for the social process of 'rehabilitation.'" Simple, hard-working, thrifty and pious lives have long characterized good farmers.

Simple, hard-working, thrifty and pious lives for farmers and workers? Why not for priests and Pope?

From The New Brotherhood, issued by Paul Reclus, 18th Street, New York 10.

Cash Wanted

The Socialist Foundation needs funds to carry on its educational work. If you think us worthy, let us have your donation. Manager. P.O. Box 573-D, Melbourne.

SOUTHERN SOCIALIST REVIEW

STALIN, TROTSKY AND LENIN

The alleged purpose of Trotsky's biography of Stalin is to show "how a personality of this sort was formed, and how it came to power by usurpation of the right to such an exceptional role (XIII)." The real purpose of the book, however, is to show why Trotsky lost the power position he temporarily occupied and why his rather than Stalin's name should follow Lenin's. Prior to Lenin's death it had always been "Lenin and Trotsky;" Stalin's name had invariably been near or at the end of any list of prominent Bolsheviks. On one occasion Lenin even suggested that he put his own signature second to Trotsky's. In brief, the book helps to explain why Trotsky was of the opinion that "he was the natural successor to Lenin," and in effect is a biography of both Stalin and Trotsky.

Because of the "gigantic factory of lies" which was organized by the Kerchinski, "little is known of the character-forming years of Stalin," writes Trotsky. "Many years did not succeed completely. The basic warp of his narrative, Trotsky points out, is "grandiose, directorial, moral and other objective sources. He has not, he says, "looked over a single fact, drawn on memories, on his own interest in the benefit of Stalin (XII)."

He admits, of course, that some of his "objective sources" are not really objective, but he increases their objectivity by interpolating one or another episode from his "personal reminiscences." The "memoirs," on which he relies, are "undoubtedly prejudiced," as they are written by Kerenski and other "enemies of the revolution." But Trotsky thinks he knows "how to find the kernel of truth" in these sources. This kernel may be seen from the following:

Out of Trotsky's book, Stalin emerges as the man in whose "spiritual life, the personal, practical aim always stood above the abstracted theoretical, and the will was immeasurably greater part than the intellect (19)." The main spring of his personality is "easy of all real life more than to drown in a rank higher than he (336)." He measures "every situation, every political circumstance, every condition by one criterion—usefulness to himself, to his strength for power, to his retention for fight over others (386)."

By his "very nature," Trotsky relates, Stalin "had always been a passion of little culture, an opportunist and double-dealer. He is lazy, crude, sly, cruel, etc."

*Stalin: An appraisal of the man and his influence. Edited and translated by the Russian by Charles Mennell. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1946. (416 pp.; $6.00)—The first 396 chapters and the appendix at the back of the book, Trotsky wrote and revised himself. The last four chapters, consisting of notes, extracts, documents, and other raw materials, have been edited.

**The numbers in parentheses refer to pages in Trotsky's book.
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PAGE SEVEN

The Revolution of... 

...and Trotsky was not only a shrewd thinker, he was also a master of tactics. He was a master at laying traps and at winning over those who were not his own. He was practical, realpolitik, and he knew how to use these qualities to his advantage. In fact, Trotsky was one of the few revolutionaries who could be described as a strategist.

Stalin is not only a shrewd thinker, he is also a master of tactics. He is a master at laying traps and at winning over those who are not his own. He is practical, realpolitik, and he knows how to use these qualities to his advantage. In fact, Stalin was one of the few revolutionaries who could be described as a strategist.

As far as the machine is concerned, Trotsky cannot help but defend it, being himself one of its creators. What he regrets is not the existence of the machine, but the fact that it was not foolproof against political upstart of the type of Stalin. That the political machine created by the Bolsheviks was incapable of doing other than serve the dictatorial rule of the Party and, within the Party, the absolute rule of its leader, is of no real concern to Trotsky. Here, too, as in other respects, he holds that it is not the function of the Party to be the sole arbiter of truth, but also who does it (408).

The dictum of Trotsky's springs from necessity. His own past incorporates that type of policy which at a later date was given the derogatory name of Stalinism. All beginning of course, and the Bolsheviks of Lenin and Trotsky differs from present-day Stalinism in this as in that, but Trotsky's totalitarianism at least in its organizational aspects, resulted from Lenin's and Trotsky's organizational and tactical in-novations which were dressed up as the "dictatorship of the proletariat," and were executed by its vanguard, the Bolshevik party.

That there is nothing in the arsenal of Stalinism that cannot also be found in that of Lenin, and to be attested to by the earlier writings of Trotsky himself. For example, Trotsky, like Stalin, introduced the policy of "socialist principle." He, too, was convinced that "one serious social task will be laid upon the Labor State, the right to lay its hands upon the worker, who refuses to execute labor power." It was Trotsky who wrote "it is the responsibility of the leadership to stress the "socialist character" of inequality, for, as he said, "the tasks of the general strike will be as many as there are, the right to lay its hands upon the worker, who refuses to execute labor power." It was Trotsky who wrote "it is the responsibility of the leadership to stress the "socialist character" of inequality, for, as he said, "the tasks of the general strike will be as many as there are, the right to lay its hands upon the worker, who refuses to execute labor power." It was Trotsky who wrote "it is the responsibility of the leadership to stress the "socialist character" of inequality, for, as he said, "the tasks of the general strike will be as many as there are, the right to lay its hands upon the worker, who refuses to execute labor power." It was Trotsky who wrote "it is the responsibility of the leadership to stress the "socialist character" of inequality, for, as he said, "the tasks of the general strike will be as many as there are, the right to lay its hands upon the worker, who refuses to execute labor power." It was Trotsky who wrote "it is the responsibility of the leadership to stress the "socialist character" of inequality, for, as he said, "the tasks of the general strike will be as many as there are, the right to lay its hands upon the worker, who refuses to execute labor power." It was Trotsky who wrote "it is the responsibility of the leadership to stress the "socialist character" of inequality, for, as he said, "the tasks of the general strike will be as many as there are, the right to lay its hands upon the worker, who refuses to execute labor power."
Trotsky's defence of Bolshevism primarily concerns his opposition to Stalinism with his Leninism. The organisations of Trotsky's 'Fourth International' have been described as a Lineman manner, yet they are not expected to suffer the fate of Stalin's party. However, there is a difference between Lenin and Stalin, but in spite of all of Trotsky's efforts, it is not possible to find significant points of political difference between the two. Aside from Trotsky's assertion that when he was at the height of his power, he was forced to annul the dangerous character of Stalin and tried to oppose him, Stalin appears throughout the biographical as the greatest follower of the master. In fact, it is Lenin himself who pushes his pride higher and higher in the party hierarchy.

If Trotsky 'did not notice Stalin even among the second-rate members of the Central Committee of the Party' (184), nevertheless it was Lenin who put him there. 'Greedily, Lenin seized upon the capable and energetic Stalin and helped to advance his candidacy at the Duma elections (195). Lenin, Trotsky explains, was 'advancing Stalin, the splendid Georgian', as he once called him, because of his enthusiasm for people's will and work unceasingly, or perhaps simply successful in carrying out an operation assigned to him, and because Stalin's Fyodorovian dullness, stubbornness, and to a certain extent his slyness, as attributes necessary in the eyes of Trotsky's theory of the bourgeoisie, began to feel sure that Russia was theirs for keeps; the fight for the plums of the revolution and for its more general and more serious stage. All adversaries in this struggle stressed the fascism-like character of the unsolved internal friction between the workers and peasants, the economic, political, and military backwardness of the country as a whole, and the constant danger of attacks from the outside. But the consistency of doctrine and the fear that all sorts of arguments could be raised. The power-struggle within the developing revolution was expressed in policy-proposals either for or against the interests of the peasants, either for or against the organisation of factory councils, either for or against an offensive policy on the international front. High-sounding theories were expanded with regard to the extinction of the peasantry, the relationship between bureaucracy and revolution, the question of party generations, etc., and reached their climax in the Trotsky-Stalin controversy on the 'Permanent Revolution' and the theory of 'Socialism in One Country'.

It is quite possible that the debaters believed their own phrases, yet, despite their theoretical differentiations, whenever they acted upon a real situation they all acted alike in order to further their own needs, they naturally expressed identical things in different terms. If Trotsky went forward to all fronts, in fact—he merely defends the fatherland. But Stalin 'is attracted by the front, because here for the first time he could work with the most finished of all the administrative machines, the military machine (384), for which, by the way, Trotsky claims all credit. If Trotsky pleads for discipline, he shows himself an iron hand; if Stalin pleads for the same, he deals with a "heavy hand."

Trotsky's bloody suppression of the Kuznetsov Rebellion (1937), Stalin's suppression of the Georgian independence movement, are in the same manner of Russian Tsarist rides roughshod over the rights of his own people as a nation (389).'

vice versa, suggestions made by Trotsky are called false and counter-revolutionary by Stalin; the latter made a basis in the union. Leningrad, under Stalin's auspices become an additional proof or the great leader's wisdom.

To understand Bolshevism, and in a narrower sense Stalinism, it is not enough to recall the old and often silly controversies between Stalinists and Trotskyites. After all, the Russian Revolution embraces more than just the Bolshevik Party. It was not even initiated by organised political groups, but by the spontaneous outburst of the masses to an unattainable and apparently endless misery connected with the breakdown of a already precarious economic system in the wake of an unsuccessful yet wars. The February upheaval "started" with hunger riots in market places, protest strikes in factories, and the spontaneous declaration of all the soldiers. But all spontaneous movements in modern history have been setting off at time and again. As soon as the collapse of Czarism was imminent, organisations came to the fore with directives and definite political goals.

If prior to the Revolution Lenin had nothing to do, a revolution rather than the spontaneous, it was because of the kind of Russian conditions, which gave the spontaneous manifestations a far more radical character. Even the politically advanced groups offered only limited programs. The industrial workers desired capitalistic reforms similar to those enjoyed by the workers in more capitalistically advanced countries. The petty-bourgeoisie and important layers of the peasant class wanted a Western bourgeois democracy. The peasants desired land in a capitalist agriculture. They were not as progressive for Czarist Russia, these demands were the essence of the bourgeois revolution.

The new liberalistic February government attempted to continue the war. All promised reforms within the Russian Empire that comprised one-sixth of the terrestrial globe was decided between amazingly small forces on both sides in both directives as well as in the two capitals (290). The Bolsheviks did not try to restore the old conditions in order to reform them, but declared themselves in favor of the concrete results of the conceptually backward spontaneous movement: the ending of the war, the workers' control of the industry, the expropriation of the
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ruling classes and the division of land. And so they stayed in power. The backwardness of the Bolsheviks in the revolutionary movement made it impossible to achieve this goal.

The theme of the document is the role of the Bolsheviks in the Russian Revolution. The Bolsheviks emerged as the most powerful force in the revolution, despite their relatively small number. They were able to seize power because of the weaknesses of the other political parties, including the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries.

The Bolsheviks' success was due to several factors. First, they were able to present a clear and consistent revolutionary program that appealed to workers and peasants. Second, they were able to maintain discipline among their rank and file, which allowed them to coordinate their actions effectively. Finally, they were able to win the support of the armed forces, which helped them to seize power.

The Bolsheviks' victory was a turning point in Russian history. It marked the beginning of the Soviet Union and the spread of socialist ideas around the world. The document also suggests that the Bolsheviks' success was due to their ability to adapt to changing circumstances and to learn from their mistakes.

Overall, the document provides a comprehensive overview of the Bolsheviks' role in the Russian Revolution. It highlights their success and the challenges they faced, and it offers insights into the broader historical context of the time.
The totalitarian rule of the party had set the goal from the outset, which included the division of the opposition into two groups. One group, the so-called "enemies of the people," had to be destroyed. The other group, the "enemies of the state," was to be isolated and later to be eliminated.

Lenin's Bolsheviks were accumulating power, which its control over the police grew. The Bolsheviks issued the "counter-revolutionary" activity of all non-Bolshevik labor organizations, as they maintained, could not, of course, explain their growing power after the crushing of the various non-Bolshevik organizations. Neither could it explain Lenin's trust upon the enforcement of totalitarian principles in the Russian organizations of the Communist International.

Unable to blame non-Bolshevik organizations entirely for Lenin's dictatorship, Trotsky saw himself as a defender of those who attempted to prove that the present totalitarian regime of the U.S.S.R. is due, "to the only nature of Bolshevism itself," that they forget the previous war, "which lasted only two years." He claimed that the Bolsheviks were behind the policies of the Civil War, along with the entire group that later elected him to establish his personal dictatorship of the C.C., which was followed by the domination of the Bolshevik workplace by the Bolsheviks, who, as a result, had to turn to their own defense by establishing their own organizations.

Trotsky, in his view, saw the Bolsheviks as the only ones who could win a bloody civil war. He described the conditions of the civil war as "insurmountable," and accused Lenin of being responsible for this condition. Trotsky claimed that Lenin's policies were responsible for the civil war, and that Lenin's policies were responsible for the loss of the revolution.

Trotsky's ideas were not accepted by Lenin, who believed in a different path. Lenin's policies were seen as the only way to win the civil war, and Trotsky's ideas were dismissed as unrealistic.

Trotsky was arrested in 1929 and died in 1940, after being exiled and confined to a remote village.

The Soviet Union, under Stalin, continued to develop and grow, and the country became a major power in the world. The Stalinist regime was characterized by repression, forced labor, and the suppression of all dissent. The Soviet Union became a major player on the world stage, and its influence extended far beyond its borders.

The Soviet Union's policies were seen as threatening by many, and the country was often at odds with the United States and other Western nations. The Soviet Union's policies were also criticized by some for their brutality and their disregard for human rights.

The Soviet Union's policies were not without their successes, however. The country was able to achieve rapid industrialization, and its people enjoyed a high standard of living. The Soviet Union also played a key role in World War II, and its policies were seen as playing a key role in the defeat of Nazi Germany.

The Soviet Union's policies were not without their critics, however. The country was often seen as a threat to world peace, and its policies were often criticized for their brutality and their disregard for human rights.
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It has been a particularly unhappy experience for me to witness the changes in subject matter and focal concern in Soviet political writing in the last five years. The next generation of some important subjects of deliberate intervention in social and political life have indeed been conducted by the radicals but lack the critical awareness of the previous decades. The fact that the State capitalism and fascism did not, and do not grow everywhere, is a fact that Trotsky made perfectly clear. It would be easy to restate the basic argument in the form of a “method” of political action; and some implications of the revolt among radicals against the method are evident. In the second part of the book we describe briefly some of the principal patterns of revolt among the major social classes, which are relevant to socialist politics. And, thirdly, we discuss specific areas for political action based on the prevailing analysis, and contrast them with the obscure political notions of the “anti-Marxists” writing in the “New Roads” series.

I—SCIENTIFIC METHOD: A TOOL FOR RADICALS

During the war years we heard a great deal about the technological utilization of scientific methods by the natural scientists on behalf of the war effort. The atomic bomb was the super-duper culmination of a whole series of military devices developed in Allied laboratories. People who disliked war on any grounds could not help but observe the service of the scientists, and some drew the inference that not only methods but also goals can be justified by the needs of the ruling classes, but that even the scientific method, the procedural knowledge and, of course, the real knowledge of science, is politically reactionary. If it is not explicitly reactionary, it can be at least implicitly so. In this respect, the atomic bomb is a clear example of how the scientific method can be utilized for the purposes of the ruling class. And, of course, the scientific method is valuable, not only for those who benefit from its results, but also for those who oppose the ruling classes. The scientific method is valuable for all those who want to know about society. The power of knowledge lies in the hands of knowledge.

The attitudes of workers at their jobs have been investigated with a view to establishing the bases for management manipulation of worker attitudes. Extensive inquiries are being conducted into the psychological factors that may influence in public opinion measurement and control devices. Among the anthropologists, the latest tendency toward “applied anthropology” means precisely the appropriate arrangement of the cultural forces to control the behavior of the working class. In the peaceful administration of their affairs by officials who equipped with information more useful to them than to manipulate their charges.

SCIENCE AND Politics

A Materialist Analysis

The following essay was started by a young nuclear physicist in Chicago, and other collaborators in presenting it in the form it now appears. It was submitted to Dwight Macdonald for publication in Politics, but, as we understand, it was rather contemptuously rejected; maybe, the criticism was too good, as it did not come from professional writers. The publication of it has been delayed, as it was first intended to appear in a New York magazine as the publication of that periodical is delayed I have been given the green light to go ahead and print. Politics is the name of monthly magazine edited and published in New York by Dwight Macdonald.—Editor S. S. P. 1

The above Review appeared in Politics.