

C. L. R. James: Herbert Aptheker's Invisible Man

Anthony Flood

Introduction

In Africana studies, Cyril Lionel Robert James (1901-1989) and Herbert Aptheker (1915-2003) have earned a secure place. Contemporary scholars are grateful to both men for their pioneering work in the field of slave revolts. What scholars virtually never even mention, however, let alone explore, is Aptheker's life-long practice of rendering James invisible. It is highly improbable that Aptheker did not know either of James or of his noteworthy study of the Haitian Revolution, given that the latter event was directly related to the slave revolts that Aptheker studied. As I will show, Aptheker's neglect of James was not an anomaly, but symptomatic of an ideology that rationalized extreme oppression.

1. Perfect Strangers?

Both Aptheker and James made significant contributions to African American historiography long before that field was academically secure. Although they weren't exactly neighbors, these two Marxist-Leninists lived and worked for years in the same city. James, born in Trinidad, was based in New York City for most of the fifteen years he spent in the United States (1938-1953). From January through April of 1939 he toured the United States, speaking at Socialist Workers Party events, after which he traveled to Mexico to confer with Leon Trotsky on matters of interest to African Americans.¹ James was also absent from New York for a few months in 1948 when he visited Reno, Nevada.² Aside from his service in the United States Army from 1942 to 1946, Aptheker lived in his native Brooklyn until he moved to San Jose, California in the late 1970s. Both men had organized sharecroppers. In 1940, as Secretary of the Abolish Peonage Committee in Oglethorpe County, Alabama, Aptheker was instrumental in a movement that led about thirty persons out of peonage.³ In 1941, James helped organize a strike of Local 313 of the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America in the Bootheel of Missouri.⁴

And so one might reasonably expect to learn that Aptheker not only looked up to James, but also looked him *up*. Aptheker's senior by fourteen years, James had gotten his major historical work *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution* (hereafter, *Black Jacobins*) to press in 1938, seven years before

Aptheker submitted his doctoral dissertation.⁵ And yet although Aptheker generally made the acquaintance of Black scholars whenever he could, there is no evidence that he ever tried to make James's.

But the expectation that Aptheker would have admired James presupposes a freedom that is psychologically impossible for the Stalinist that Aptheker was.⁶ This bias could not be laid at the feet of either the government or politically nervous academic institutions. It was self-imposed. Central to Aptheker's worldview was the claim that the Soviet Union incarnated the Marxian socialist idea. Central to James's outlook was the denial of that claim, which James elaborated upon in *World Revolution* in 1937, just as Aptheker was wrapping up his Master's thesis.⁷ Aptheker's later support for the Soviet Union's violent suppression of the Hungarian revolution would not comport well with his reputation as a partisan historian of uprisings, but his pioneering work on American slave uprisings and his editing of W. E. B. Du Bois's papers and correspondence may have covered a multitude of such sins of commission. For some scholars, it seems even to have covered Aptheker's neglect of James and *Black Jacobins*. Aptheker ignored a ground-breaking study of the slave rising that inspired many of the uprisings he studied. Having labored to increase the visibility of African Americans, he had ironically rendered James an invisible man.

2. Haitian Inspiration: The German Coast Uprising of 1811

For a thesis on Nat Turner's 1831 Southampton, Virginia slave insurrection, Columbia University awarded Aptheker a Master's degree in history in 1937.⁸ A year later, the Dial Press released *Black Jacobins*. Like Aptheker's thesis, dissertation, and many early monographs, James's *Black Jacobins* dealt with a slave rebellion. Unlike the revolts Aptheker studied, however, the San Domingo/Saint Dominique Revolution (hereafter, SDR) actually overthrew the slave regime and led to the founding of a republic, Haiti. Aptheker referred to the significance of the SDR many times. In 1941, for example, he noted that with "the eruption of the Haitian Revolution many people felt called upon to declare their attitude towards it, and some, who gloried in the American and French Revolutions, found it but consistent and logical to welcome that which occurred in the West Indies."⁹ Over fifty years later he sounded the same note: "In other writings I observe that the years of the Haitian Revolution produced in the United States a number of speeches and essays justifying the uprising [i.e., the SDR] on the grounds of the immutable rights of all human beings to their freedom."¹⁰

In 1811, twenty years after the SDR, upwards of 500 armed slaves in and around New Orleans were involved in the largest slave uprising to date in the United States, the “German Coast Uprising” (GCU). Aptheker discussed it and its SDR context in his dissertation, *American Negro Slave Revolts*, but did so without citing the most significant and then-recent study of the SDR. The only time Aptheker ever cites James is when he lists in his dissertation’s bibliography James’s *A History of Negro Revolt*, an issue of a 1938 London periodical.¹¹

Daniel Rasmussen refers to the SDR throughout his *Uprising*, the first book-length study of the GCU.¹² He commented that “Aptheker devoted a short paragraph to the 1811 uprising,” but in fact Aptheker devoted two paragraphs to it in a 1937 article and three pages in his 1943 dissertation.¹³ Rasmussen does not claim to have discovered documents unavailable to researchers like Aptheker in late 1930s and early 1940s. Given the centrality of the GCU to the governance of the slave territories during the antebellum years, it should have dominated Aptheker’s interest. The Louisiana Purchase was one consequence of the defeat of Napoleon’s army at the hands of *Toussaint L’Ouverture* and of the Corsican’s consequent exasperation with his New World colonies. Not only was slave-based sugar production relocated from San Domingo/Haiti to Louisiana, but so were many particular slaves. The SDR-inspired rebellion in New Orleans in 1811 is causally related to the rebels’ knowledge of Napoleon’s defeat twenty years earlier. *Black Jacobins* supplied a rich context for the uprisings Aptheker studied, yet he did not draw upon it.

Aptheker joined the Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA) in August, 1939, a year after *Black Jacobins* was published, shortly after the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact—virtually because of it, as he used to tell the story.¹⁴ But in 1938 he was not yet formally under Party discipline: he was as politically free as he ever would be to elaborate upon the GCU and avail himself of the concordant research that *Black Jacobins* offered. Unfortunately, he was ideologically apparently bound over to Stalinism long before he exchanged two quarters for a Party membership card.¹⁵

3. The Invisible Man Speaks

In two essays published in late 1949, James, writing under the pseudonym “J. Meyer,” severely criticized the Stalinist line on Black history, of which line Aptheker was the “faithful disciple.” If *Black Jacobins*, published by Dial, could not elicit a comment from Aptheker, these small-press polemics had little chance of provoking a reaction from him, even had he known the identity of “J. Meyer.” For Aptheker it would have

been enough to know that the writer was a Trotskyist who, therefore, according to the informal Stalinist jurisprudence of the day, had no rights a Stalinist was bound to respect. Aptheker preferred to debate Arthur Schlesinger about his book *The Vital Center*.¹⁶ Aldon Lynn Nielsen suspects that at least some of what James wrote about Aptheker was “no doubt unfair to the facts of Aptheker’s texts,” but no scholar has yet measured the degree of alleged unfairness. James’s harsh criticism “render[s] in sharp contrast the difference James perceives between Stalinist historians and the Marxist mode of historiography.”¹⁷ Let us hear James him at length:

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

The man who carried out the line in regard to Negro history was Herbert Aptheker. In popular pamphlets Aptheker demonstrated many of the elementary facts, to a large degree suppressed, of Negro revolutionary struggle in the United States. Aptheker has also published a book and a collection of articles where the same subjects have been treated with a more scholarly apparatus. Altogether his writings have been the most effective weapons in the Stalinist propaganda armory among radicals, Negroes and Negro intellectuals in particular. Presumably among all intellectuals, the two books pass as Marxism. Yet, in the work of a dozen years, Aptheker has never once stepped outside the bounds of the limits prescribed by Stalinism for Negroes-as-manpower, as shock-troops and as deserving of “recognition.” So organic to present-day Stalinism is this attitude and so Stalinized is Aptheker that he can find in his quite extensive explorations only what fits this pattern, infinitesimal as it may be; and is blind to everything else, though it shouts for notice without benefit of research.¹⁸

James mentions Ernest Kaiser’s contemporary review of the “Aptheker-[Gunnar] Myrdal Controversy” in *Phylon* as evidence that [James writes] “Negro intellectuals and historians are indirectly and directly aware that something is wrong with the method and results of Aptheker’s ‘Marxism.’” But, James holds, “they will need to grapple seriously with Marxism to penetrate to the corruption behind the facade of class struggle, conflicts of social systems, panegyric to Negro heroism, etc. with which

Aptheker generously sprinkles his writing.”¹⁹ According to James, “Aptheker . . . sees the Negro organizations [in the abolitionist movement] essentially as early versions of the Stalinist Negro Congress, Southern Welfare Association, etc., which have no politics of their own but exist to corral Negroes and bring them into the popular front coalition in which the Stalinists are at the moment interested.” James then drives a wedge between his view of the role of Blacks in the abolitionist movement and Aptheker’s:

Aptheker sees the slaves, the mass, on the one side and the Abolitionists on the other. He faithfully follows the Stalinist line of viewing the Negroes as manpower and shock troops. . . .

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

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

In the next installment of his critique, James turns up the heat:

Just as the Stalinists view the function of the Negroes (and the proletariat) today as being one of abandoning all independent political activity and being simply “anti-fascist,” following docilely behind the CP, so it is sufficient that the Negroes in those days were “anti-slavery,” following docilely behind the Abolitionists.

Is this [“a call to an anti-Colonization mass meeting in Boston”] all that Negroes wrote about in a paper [the *Liberator*] that lasted from 1831 to 1864? . . . Aptheker’s account . . . represents as vicious and

subtle a piece of anti-Negro historical writing as it is possible to find and infinitely more dangerous than the chauvinism of the Bourbon historian. . . . We cannot go here into the history of the Abolition movement. But enough has been said to show the political mentality of a writer who in this mass of material selects a call for a meeting as typical of thirty-five years of Negro contributions to the *Liberator* and finds that Negro parsons giving invocations, Negro boys singing, and old Negro women blessing Abolitionism are the most characteristic aspects of Negro contributions to the struggle.

This is no ordinary, racial prejudice. It is something far worse. It is a political method which compels the writer to place the Negroes in a subordinate category and at whatever sacrifice of historical fact keep them there. . . . Any history of the Civil War which does not base itself upon the Negroes, slave and free, as the subject and not the object of politics, is *ipso facto* a Jim Crow history. . . .

. . . While it is possible formally and for special purposes to separate Negroes from whites, any account either of whites or Negroes in the Abolitionist struggle is totally false unless it shows this integration. Aptheker, while perpetually talking about the “united struggles” of Negroes and whites, destroys this precious heritage.²⁰

Harsh? Yes. But unfair or untruthful? If so, Aptheker arguably should have answered such a challenge to his scholarship and moral sensibility—not to mention his Marxism. I leave it to others to arrive at that measured judgment. But when will they get around to it?

4. The Neglect's Facilitators

Several historians, most of them admirers of both Aptheker and James, have either barely noticed or avoided the question of Aptheker's neglect of James. I will first consider Eugene D. Genovese, John M. Bracey, and Robin D. G. Kelley and then, in a roundtable discussion, Manning Marable, Eric Foner, and Jesse Lemisch. I will then take up the special case of W. E. B. Du Bois.

Eugene D. Genovese

When he was still a Marxist, the late Eugene D. Genovese once referred to the “criminal exclusion of Aptheker and other Communists from the universities.”²¹ He elaborated upon this charge: “The Academy effectively excluded Aptheker, not simply

because he is a Marxist and a political radical . . . but because he is a Communist. . . . By excluding him and depriving him of a graduate seminar . . . the Establishment sought to arrest the development of his point of view. . . . For a long time, and to some extent even now, he could be treated as a nonperson, with his work sometimes cited and more often mined, but not seriously discussed.”²² James, who was also ignored and excluded, also produced works under difficult circumstances, including detention on Ellis Island, where he wrote an acclaimed book on Herman Melville.²³ Yet Genovese did not ask whether Aptheker, because he was a Stalinist, treated James as a nonperson, because he was a Trotskyist.

Aptheker and James seemed irreconcilably opposed, but a precondition of reconciliation is critical engagement. James sought the latter; Aptheker avoided it; Genovese apparently noticed neither fact. Such inattention might explain Genovese’s uncritical mention of the two men in the same paragraph:

. . . Aptheker has been cautious about arguing that the slave revolts were connected and cumulative and has admitted a paucity of direct evidence and the existence of substantial methodological difficulties. Forty years later [i.e., the 1980s] the jury is still out and may never be able to reach a firm verdict. Yet by raising the question of a connection, Aptheker was led to develop a supporting thesis that has steadily been gaining empirical support: *his strong but little-noticed thesis that what he calls the revolutionary philosophy of the American and French revolutions exercised a decisive influence in the encouragement and shaping of slave revolts during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries*. As the evidence in support of this thesis mounts, it renders less important the interesting but narrower question of *direct links among the revolts*. In other words, the explanation for the dynamics to which Aptheker was, *along with C. L. R. James*, among the very first to draw attention might well have been rooted in the international revolutionary process as a whole, so that links between specific revolts need not be established in order to sustain the deeper argument.²⁴

The phrase “along with” is unintentionally misleading. Aptheker’s “supporting thesis” was central to James’s historiography. Aptheker’s senior by almost a generation, James, the Black man, raised the “deeper argument” first. James’s books put that “strong but little-noticed thesis” front-and-center. If it was “criminal,” rhetorically speaking, for the Academy to have ignored *American Negro Slave Revolts* and its author, it follows that it was no less so for Aptheker to have ignored *Black Jacobins* and its author.

In summarizing the historical profession's consensus on Aptheker, Genovese touched upon the SDR: "During the nineteenth century only the big rising in Louisiana in 1811, *about which we know almost nothing*, and Turner's in 1831 came to fruition and reached impressive proportions. Even so painstaking and thorough a scholar as Aptheker has been unable to discover firm evidence of a major revolt between 1831 and 1865.²⁵ As we have noted, Daniel Rasmussen has since worked up the alleged "almost nothing" into a book. According to Genovese, the largest of the revolts Aptheker studied "would rate little more than a page or two in a comprehensive study of slave revolts in Brazil and the Caribbean." After citing two major revolts in the Palmares and Bahia regions of Brazil, Genovese writes: "We need not review the story of Haiti" and other Caribbean-area revolts, citing James's masterpiece as deserving of "especial" attention.²⁶ In a note, however, Genovese let the proverbial cat out of the bag: ". . . *The Black Jacobins* . . . deserves to be ranked as a classic of Marxian historiography but has largely been ignored, perhaps because of the author's Trotskyist politics."²⁷ The passive construction obscures agency: although the *Academy* in those days ignored many a Marxist book, only *Stalinists* would have objected specifically to its Trotskyism. And Stalinists, needless to say, were never gatekeepers for the Academy.

John M. Bracey

In his foreword to the 40th anniversary edition of Aptheker's *American Negro Slave Revolts*, John Bracey provides another example of the unintegrated awareness some scholars have about Aptheker and James.²⁸ "C. L. R. James devotes the opening three chapters of *The Black Jacobins* . . . to an analysis of the slaves: "The Property," "The Owners" and "Parliament and Property." Aptheker's chapters three, four and five lay the groundwork in painstaking detail for the acts of resistance that are his chief concern."²⁹ Bracey is sensitive to the failure to give credit where credit is due:

. . . [T]wo lengthy reviews of Orlando Patterson's *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* . . . attempt to discuss the past thirty years of the historiography of slavery in the United States without mentioning Aptheker's name or his work. . . . David Brion Davis does all but mention Aptheker's name when he writes that ". . . the *Journal [of Negro History]* was also one of the few outlets for white scholars who like many of the blacks were interested not only in consequences of slavery and emancipation throughout the Americas but also in the interrelationship of slavery and other institutions." . . . The first half of the above sentence mentions William Brewer, the footnote praises

C. L. R. James's *The Black Jacobins* and Eric Williams's *Capitalism and Slavery*—both works of great importance, but neither with the influence of *A.N.S.R. [American Negro Slave Revolts]*³⁰

Bracey suggests that it was as remiss of Davis to fail to cite Aptheker as it was appropriate to cite James. It would seem to follow that it was equally remiss of Aptheker not to mention James, even if, in Bracey's opinion, the influence of *Black Jacobins* has been less than that of *American Negro Slave Revolts*. But Aptheker's negligence never merits a comment from Bracey.³¹

In his introduction to *Facing Reality*, which James co-authored, Bracey recalls that although *Black Jacobins* was available through mainstream outlets, he had to scour "left bookstores" for James's books and pamphlets in the early 1960s. Bracey emphasizes that he meant bookstores "not run by the Communist Party."³² Nevertheless, Bracey says that he and other "young African-American activists" in the mid-1960s ". . . admired the magnificent efforts of Communist scholars such as Herbert Aptheker to take on the liberal historiography that dominated American universities at the time."³³ To be clear, Bracey never regarded "the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe [to be] a glimpse of the future," but Aptheker's having done unto James what the Academy did unto Aptheker apparently did not mar the magnificence of Aptheker's efforts in Bracey's eyes. Nor does Bracey consider that a fate worse than invisibility might have befallen James had Aptheker's brand of politics prevailed where James lived. The neglect of *Black Jacobins* in Aptheker's writings mirrored the CP's embargo on all things Trotskyist, virtually the Soviet Union's policy in microcosm. James recalled to an interviewer that when he lived in England (1932-1938), he "made it a habit to wreck the Stalinist meetings," rhetorically speaking. He was warned against taking too cavalier an attitude about repeating such performances in America: "There was a black man who had joined the CP. He said to me that you could do that in Britain and keep breaking up their meetings but in America if you carry on like that they will kill you. As far as the police were concerned, if a Stalinist killed a Trotskyist they would have no part of that, so just take it easy. The difference between British democracy and democracy in the United States is that there you have to be aware, not of the government, but of the Stalinists."³⁴ Whatever virtue may have motivated the Black Stalinist to warn the Black Trotskyist, James's life may have been saved by his taking that warning to heart.

Robin D. G. Kelley

In his 1995 introduction to a new edition of James's 1938 *A History of Negro Revolt* (later renamed *A History of Pan-African Revolt*), Kelley compares it to others: "Five years before the publication of Herbert Aptheker's *American Negro Slave Revolts* and just three years after the appearance of W.E.B. Du Bois' *Black Reconstruction in America* . . . *A History of Negro Revolt* excoriated imperialism and placed Black laborers at the center of world events when the leading historians of his day believed Africans were savages, colonialism was a civilizing mission, and slavery was a somewhat benevolent institution."³⁵ When Kelley interviewed Aptheker in 1998, however, he not only did not ask him about *Black Jacobins*, but he also overlooked this obviously false statement of Aptheker's about Nat Turner's revolt: "I think at that time it was the only major slave revolt known."³⁶

But the SDR was known in 1803, when William Wordsworth penned "To *Toussaint L'Ouverture*"; in 1828 when "Theresa—A Haytien Tale," was serialized in *Freedom's Journal*, America's first Black newspaper; in 1857 when Frank J. Webb, an African-American novelist, referred to *Toussaint L'Ouverture* in *The Garies and Their Friends*; in 1863 when John Rely Beard's biography of L'Ouverture was published in Boston³⁷; and in 1931 when Percy Waxman's *The Black Napoleon* was published, only a few years before *Black Jacobins*.³⁸

Kelley acknowledged an overlap between his two 1995 essays. The first was the already cited introduction to James's *History*; the second, an essay for a James anthology. In the former, as we have seen, Kelley situated *History* between books by Du Bois and Aptheker. In the latter, however, Aptheker's book is "whited out" and replaced with *Capitalism and Slavery* by Eric E. Williams, James's fellow Trinidadian and former student. Ironically, after "blacking out" James from the *Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States*, Aptheker included an essay by Williams who, as Trinidad and Tobago's first Prime Minister, once put James under house arrest.³⁹ We will have more to say about Kelley and Aptheker in section 5.

Manning Marable, Eric Foner, and Jesse Lemisch

Only once have I found Aptheker's neglect of James mentioned, and then only circumspectly. During a roundtable discussion about Aptheker's legacy with Eric Foner and the late Manning Marable, Jesse Lemisch observed: "In his little piece about the British Communist Party Historians' Group, [E. J.] Hobsbawm talks about how they stayed away from C. L. R. James because he was a Trotskyist, and I think that

Herbert's work, though influential on mine in a positive way, had a similar downside. Coming from that historiographical background, I was cut off from other influences, in particular James and the people around him."⁴⁰ Here's what Hobsbawm wrote in that "little piece" (which is a 21-page, referenced study based on "memory, consultation with several old friends and on a substantial collection of materials"): "Since CP members then segregated themselves strictly from schismatics and heretics, the writings of living non-Party Marxists made little impact, though C. L. R. James's *Black Jacobins* was read, in spite of the author's known Trotskyism . . ." "⁴¹ If they had read *Black Jacobins*, however, even "heretically," then they didn't "stay away" from its author. Hobsbawm's facetious reference to "schismatics and heretics" also suggests what his comrades thought of Stalinism's censorious atmosphere. Was Aptheker simply more obedient than they, or merely more discreet about his disobedience?

Marable offered the following interpretation of James's distinction between "agency" and "self-activity": "Self-actualizing activity from below is where the role of the radical intellectual is not an organizer from above, but as a catalyst, as a person who provides information or resources. But the masses themselves, through their own self-activity, create new structures, new possibilities. And that is how James saw the process of revolution unfolding."⁴² Foner asked whether elements of self-activity "are in *American Negro Slave Revolts* [p]articularly regarding what we now call day-to-day resistance to slavery." Marable said they were, to which Foner responded: "outright rebellion grows out of daily struggles. There are daily struggles against slavery, which involve things that might not be considered resistance by some people—shirking work or breaking tools or making believe you're ill."⁴³ Lemisch thought this "too easy a way out of the James-Aptheker conflict," which Aptheker never acknowledged. "As I said," Lemisch continued, "there was indeed a form of agency in Aptheker's work, and it was important," even if it did not inform that work. "But it would have been fruitful for my work," Lemisch elaborated, "to have been exposed to the Trotskyist alternative; here was an alternative Left, a whole other group of people and a different intellectual tradition utilizing other notions."⁴⁴

One wonders what *except* ideology could have blocked Lemisch's exposure to James's point of view. An American scholar who read and admired a Stalinist writer during the Cold War must have *decided* not to read Trotskyists in general and James in particular. James's work—that is, *Black Jacobins*, whose title goes unmentioned in this roundtable discussion—recedes into the mist of a vague "alternative" tradition. Foner did Aptheker's scholarly reputation more harm than good, however, when he acknowledged that

*As an active member of the Communist Party one would not expect Apthekeer to be influenced by Trotskyist history.*⁴⁵ Although one thing I think we have to say about Apthekeer and my uncle Philip Foner, another Old Left historian, is that one of their great strengths lay in the gathering of material. They were indefatigable researchers. Apthekeer's *Documentary History*, my uncle's documentary collection of four volumes on Frederick Douglass, the documentary history of black labor which my uncle did—without funding from anybody, they dug up documents incessantly. Thanks to them, the material is there for people to use in whatever way they want. You can go through it from a different perspective. So, part of their contribution was unearthing this vast array of material, which was largely ignored by other historians.⁴⁶

Foner, who would object to the pigeon-holing of *American Negro Slave Revolts* as “Stalinist history,” evaded Lemisch's implicit ethical challenge. Foner preferred to emphasize his uncle's and Apthekeer's research labors, which ignored James as completely as “other historians” ignored Apthekeer. Neither other discussant, however, not even Marable, objected to Foner's disparaging description of *Black Jacobins* as “Trotskyist history.” With all due respect to Professor Foner: one *would* reasonably expect someone with Apthekeer's interests in 1938 to have critically integrated *Black Jacobins* into his studies of SDR-inspired slave revolts and even to have even tried to contact James. Apthekeer had reached out to many contemporary Black scholars, including Rayford W. Logan. It would be very unusual for Apthekeer not to have been aware of Logan's scholarly review of *Black Jacobins* or of Seabrook's in *The Journal of Negro History*.⁴⁷ There were also popular reviews in *Time* magazine and the *New York Times*?⁴⁸

W. E. B. Du Bois

On the cover of the W. E. B. Du Bois Memorial Issue of *Freedomways*, published toward the end of 1964, one finds a column of 32 names listed alphabetically beneath those of Kwame Nkrumah, then-President of the Republic of Ghana, and Nnamdi Azikiwe, then-President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. At the head of the list is the name of Herbert Apthekeer, Du Bois' literary executor. For this issue Apthekeer provided introductions to previously unpublished short essays by and letters from Du Bois. (His collected works, on which Apthekeer had labored since 1946, would not begin to be published until 1973.) Further down is the name of C. L. R. James. This is the only publication, to my knowledge, to which both men contributed.⁴⁹

In about a page and a half, James recounts Du Bois' chief organizational and scholarly accomplishments, praising in particular his *Black Reconstruction* as "one of the finest books of history ever written anywhere."⁵⁰ James does not link that volume with its near-contemporary, his own *Black Jacobins*. Neither, of course, does he say a word about Du Bois' Stalinism. James must have long since adjusted to the reality that the great man once eulogized Trotsky's executioner.⁵¹ He would not rebuke Du Bois on that score, not in that memorial issue or anywhere else.⁵²

In a 1970 essay on the African slave trade, James discussed Du Bois' "postlude" to a reprint of his Harvard doctoral dissertation, *The Suppression of the African Slave Trade to the United States of America, 1638-1870*: "Fifty years after Marx's statement [on the role of the slave trade in the rise of the modern West], an American historian, a young man twenty-four years of age, tackled the question. In 1954, looking again at his doctoral dissertation . . . Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, in an apologia of two and a half pages, three times expressed his regret that when he was doing the work he had not had the benefit of any acquaintance with the works or theories of Karl Marx. Yet with his own independent, if youthful, judgment Dr. Du Bois here showed himself as far in advance of American historiography as he was to show himself in other spheres of American life."⁵³ After commenting on the structure of Du Bois's dissertation, James wrote: "Then comes a most interesting chapter . . . 'Toussaint L'Ouverture and the Anti-Slavery Effort, 1787-1807.' The Haitian Revolt sharpens the debate for and against slavery in the U.S.A. It is 'the main cause of two laws' and soon was 'the direct instigation of a third.' But despite the combined efforts of fear and philanthropy, the profits of trade won in the end. Du Bois is pretty certain that it was the Haitian Revolution and its influence which was one of the main causes of the suppression of the slave trade by national law."⁵⁴

In his introduction to Du Bois' monograph, Aptheker does not mention this "main cause," but neither does Du Bois in his retrospective. He no doubt knew of *Black Jacobins*, which appeared three years after his own *Black Reconstruction*—both books are often mentioned together in the literature—yet never, at least never in any of his writings, does the Marxist-Pan Africanist Du Bois mention the Marxist-Pan Africanist James. It is worth noting that in the 1930s, Du Bois, who would not join the CPUSA until 1961, was no more under the latter's political discipline than was James. But perhaps he was already with it in spirit in all the ways that mattered. As his biographer noted:

. . . [B]y the end of 1925 he had progressed from curiosity to guarded approval of the Soviet experiment. When the International Committee for Political Prisoners [I.C.C.P.] published the book *Letters from Russian Prisons*, Du Bois was sufficiently troubled by the irate protests of Tass [the Soviet press agency] and the CPUSA that he asked Roger Baldwin and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn to remove his name from the organization's [i.e., the I.C.C.P.'s] list of supporters. He was not a Communist and he deplored violence, he explained to Flynn, but he was "especially sensitive" with regard to Russia. Having heard all kinds of stories that had proven to be lies about the USSR, he was reluctant to "believe anything under ordinary circumstances." Indeed, he now believed that Russia was "trying to do a great and wonderful thing for the economic organization of industry." Russia hadn't yet succeeded, of course, but he hoped for her success.⁵⁵

Du Bois was apparently not reluctant to believe that something great and wonderful was happening in Russia. Instead, he was skeptical about reports that strongly suggested that no ethical research protocols protected the "experiment's" human subjects. Du Bois, a prolific book reviewer, never took notice of Chamberlin's 1934 *Russia's Iron Age*, which told the world what was then known about the man-made famine in the Ukraine. In 1935 *The New Statesman*, a publication not unknown to Du Bois, published an exchange of letters about Chamberlin's book. In 1937 James summarized the latter's report in his *World Revolution*.⁵⁶ Just more lies? One wonders why the *Holodomor* never absorbed the attention of the student of the Middle Passage, nor the starvation of the Ukrainian peasant the exigent scholar of *The Philadelphia Negro*.

5. The Pravda about Hungary: ". . . still not ashamed of it. . ."

In 2000, after Robin D. G. Kelley's interview of Aptheker appeared in the *Journal of American History* [JAH], I wrote to the editor to express my disappointment in Kelley's failure to relate Aptheker's historiography to his ideology. Part of my letter reads: "Overturning racism, capitalism, and imperialism,' Kelly wrote, 'were always the first order of business [for Aptheker] . . . ' More accurately one might say his 'business' was to uncover some truth about slavery here and cover up a great deal of it elsewhere. In *The Truth about Hungary* the theoretician of 'partisanship and objectivity' vilified Hungarian freedom fighters as fascists . . . Again, about this side of his subject Kelly apparently doesn't know or doesn't care."⁵⁷ In 2009, writing to Kelley about another matter, I returned to this issue: "You may recall that our own divergent assessments of Aptheker were on display in the pages of the JAH [*Journal of American History*] back

in 2000-2001. ‘Partisanship [with the oppressed] and [scholarly] objectivity,’ a theme I first entertained at his feet in the early ‘[19]70s, compelled me to write what I did, and while I do not bear you any ill will for declining to respond . . . , I am still convinced that the issue raised in my letter (and *his* arguably intemperate and irrelevant response thereto) is still worthy of mutually respectful dialogue. . . . Speaking only for myself, I hope that the future will provide an opportunity for us to revisit it’ (Anthony Flood, personal communication, November 23, 2009) Kelley’s reply goes to the heart of the problem:

I don’t recall your letter [to the JAH], to be quite honest, and if I didn’t respond it may have been because around the time that interview came out I was hit by a car and as a result battled medical issues for about two years. . . . I have no particular investment in Aptheker hero-worship, and I have a stack of letters from him, handwritten on yellow lined legal paper, criticizing most everything I’ve written. I know some people were mad because I didn’t go after Herb about Hungary, etc., but my task was to talk to him about his contribution to African American history. I’m pleased that there are so many other scholars and activists who have had much to critique and expose, and it’s great that it’s out there. (Robin D. G. Kelley, personal communication, November 23, 2009.)

I appreciated Kelley’s ironic tone and would like now to amplify it before critically engaging him. Around the time he interviewed Aptheker in July 1998, an issue of the socialist magazine *Dissent* appeared on the newsstands. It featured the answers of several scholars on the political left, including Kelley, to Eugene Genovese’s question about who knew about Stalin’s crimes and what they did when they did know. Kelley said he renounced them as soon as he had learned of them. He wrote:

Genovese’s anti-Stalinist shout in the forest of multiculturalism should be taken seriously. The left(s) ought to speak frankly and critically against domination in the name of progressive causes. But more important, we should be at the forefront of rooting out the oppressions that persist in the groves of academe All of us can name academics, particularly among the self-identified “left,” who have attempted to use their influence to destroy careers or merely silence those critical of them. Of course, these institutional wars are neither new nor limited to radicals; the evidence of right-wing attacks on radical scholars is too overwhelming and familiar to recount here. But if we’re going to confront “The Question” honestly, let us begin at home, in our de-

partments, in our institutions, in our editorial boards and professional organizations. When I begin to count those who fell victim to the wrath of self-proclaimed radicals, the numbers are mind boggling.⁵⁸

Hear, hear. It is therefore not true, as I had inaccurately insinuated in my letter to the JAH, Kelley “doesn’t know or doesn’t care” about this side of Aptheker. With all due respect, however, Kelley’s retrospective description of his interview’s scope is much narrower than his practice indicates. For Aptheker’s *The Truth about Hungary*, an apologetic for the violent suppression of a popular revolt against extreme repression, does not square with Kelley’s inclusion of its author in the “tradition of scholars who work with the goal of liberation in mind.”⁵⁹

When he interviewed him, Kelley did *not* skirt the issue of the political dimension of the Academy’s politically motivated “marginalization” (Kelley’s word) of Aptheker. What he did was assume that Aptheker’s positions on “Hungary, etc.” were not germane to the evaluation of his “contribution to African American history.” And when Kelley asked him: “How did your political work inform your scholarship at the time [i.e., 1939, when he joined the CPUSA]?” Aptheker’s answer showed that discussing “Hungary, etc.” would not involve “going after” him, but rather pursuing the logic of his response: “It was complementary; it’s not contradictory at all. I was a leader in the antiwar movement [in the 1930s]. We made speeches, organized, stopped traffic, and drew thousands to the movement. I even appeared in Movietone News. It was related to my history work, and I continued that throughout my life.⁶⁰ Kelley did not ask him whether his stance against, and then for, U. S. involvement in the Second World War was a function of Stalin’s perception of the Soviet Union’s interest; or whether Aptheker privileged this interest over that of the Polish people; or whether his stance on any other international issue also reflected the Kremlin’s interpretation of Soviet interest, which strongly suggested that Aptheker’s “partisanship with the oppressed” varied with the political identity of the oppressors.

Kelley didn’t reply to my letter in the JAH, but Aptheker did, and in doing so confirmed that his partisanship with the oppressors of Hungary, 1956 had not changed in over forty years. In my letter I suggested that Aptheker’s view of uprisings against Communist oppression should inform our evaluation of his efforts to document slave uprisings.⁶¹ In reply, Aptheker attributed “ignorance” and “malice” to me and then reaffirmed, with apparent pride, the value of *Truth*, which bears the same relationship to truth as does *Pravda* to the events of the day. “I have reread it recently,” Aptheker said about his book, “and am still not ashamed of it—all the circumstances considered.”⁶²

In another interview, after relating a dramatic anecdote from his visit to the South with his father in the early 1930s, Aptheker added: “My mind has been damaged from the stroke,” yet he remembered that story.⁶³ One must factor in this medical condition when evaluating any of his post-stroke remarks. As Bettina Aptheker commented: “My father had a stroke . . . [on] April 1, 1992. He lost much of his capacity for short-term memory, and his right leg was permanently impaired. He was in the hospital, and then a rehabilitation center, for weeks. His historical memory remained intact, however. Gradually he improved, but he never recovered his mental acuity, and his health deteriorated.”⁶⁴ Was his failure to repudiate *Truth* in 2001 symptomatic of a loss of mental acuity? Or evidence of intact historical memory? There is certainly no evidence that he recalls the conversations he and I had had in the early 1970s about *Truth* and the circumstances of its production.

Aptheker’s mental acuity was not always impaired. In 1950, for example, he observed that there were “uprisings” in South Korea, but none in North Korea. Here’s what our authority on slave uprisings deduced: “As soon as the reactionary and imperialist nature of the American occupation in South Korea and of its creature, the [Syngman] Rhee clique, became clear, demonstrations, strikes, uprisings and guerilla warfare appeared once again. These appeared . . . in South Korea only—not in North Korea. Uprisings come from oppression. In North Korea the people ruled—therefore no revolts; in South Korea a new foreign master and new Korean traitors held power—therefore constant rebellion.”⁶⁵ Aptheker, who had risen to the rank of major in the United States Army during the Second World War, wrote those words as North Korean and American soldiers were killing each other. Six months later, the Army stripped him of his commission, not for those words, but because he had failed to answer its year-old letter of inquiry about his earlier Communist activities.⁶⁶ Commenting on his reasoning, I wrote: “Common sense suggests that while uprisings may come from oppression, extreme oppression may make them impossible. Aptheker, however, interpreted their absence under Communism as evidence that ‘the people rule.’ Should historians ignore this when they appraise his work on slave uprisings?”⁶⁷ It seems that many of them have. Also published during the same year as *Truth* was a collection of first-hand reportage on those events.⁶⁸ Contemporary Marxists also denounced Aptheker’s book,⁶⁹ arguing that he unHHungrawas a partisan, not of Hungary’s oppressed, but of its oppressors and *their* “existing order.”

As did virtually every other leading American Communist, Aptheker described what Khrushchev reported about Stalin’s crimes as a “revelation.” The irony of Aptheker’s doing this in an apologia for one of Khrushchev’s crimes was apparently lost on him.

For example, anticipating reader skepticism about Communist trials in general and that of József Cardinal Mindszenty in particular, Aptheker wrote: “The terrible revelations of coerced confessions in the lands of Socialism, which have come with such shattering impact, naturally cast extreme doubt on all court proceedings there, and it is possible that one or another element in the trial of the Cardinal was not fully true. But it is certain that his essential guilt—to which he pleaded guilty, in part—was and remains true.”⁷⁰ Not a word about the years of torture preceding the “guilty” plea, rendering the latter inadmissible. Citing only those journalists who happened to have agreed with him, the historian of Nat Turner’s trial was “certain” of the Cardinal’s “essential guilt.” In short, his view of “the lands of Socialism” was nothing less than Phillipsian.

Normally, the word “revelation” refers to the disclosure of a fact generally unknown until disclosed by the few who do know it. Except for true-believing Stalinists, however, Khrushchev’s partial exposé of Stalin’s crimes was not so much a “revelation” as a confirmation of what the historical record had established long before 1956.⁷¹ As late as 2000, Aptheker could write: “I left the party in 1992, when the subservience of the [Communist] party to Moscow became glaring. The activity of the party became useless. The party was destroyed, as was the Soviet Union.”⁷² Unless suffering from diminished mental acuity, an American historian who suggests that this subservience became glaring only in 1992 jeopardizes his scholarly reputation. Aptheker left the party when it was a shell of its former self and there was no longer any Soviet Union to defend.

* * *

James once wrote that “the only place where Negroes did not revolt is in the pages of capitalist historians.”⁷³ Ironically, one of the places where *James does not appear is in the pages of Herbert Aptheker. His Stalinism is sufficient explanation of the failure. Compounding it are his admirers, some of whom are also James’s, who studiously avoided Aptheker’s silence. Appreciations of both men are in need of critical integration.*

NOTES

- 1 C. L. R. James on the “Negro Question,” ed. Scott McLemee, University Press of Mississippi, 1996, xii-xiii.

- 2 Dennis L. Dworkin, "C. L. R. James in Nevada," *History Workshop Journal* [Oxford University Press], Issue 63, Spring 2007, pp. 90-112.
- 3 Pete Daniel, *The Shadow of Slavery: Peonage in the South, 1901-1969*. University of Illinois Press, 1990, 176-177.
- 4 Christopher Taylor, "Sharing Time: C. L. R. James and Southern Agrarian Movements," *Social Text* 111 [Duke University Press], 30:2, Summer 2012, 75.
- 5 C. L. R. James, *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*. New York: Dial Press, 1938; published the same year in London by Secker & Warburg.
- 6 Aileen Kraditor, "*Jimmy Higgins*": *The Mental World of the American Rank-And-File Communist, 1930-1958*. New York: Praeger, 1988. Kraditor argues that Aptheker exemplified "Jimmy Higgins," a psychological composite of members of the Communist Party, to which she had belonged (1947-1958).
- 7 C. L. R. James, *World Revolution, 1917-1936: The Rise and Fall of the Communist International*, Paultrou (Somerset) and London, Furnell & Sons, 1937.
- 8 Published as Herbert Aptheker. *Nat Turner's Slave Rebellion*. New York: Humanities Press, 1966.
- 9 Herbert Aptheker, "Militant Abolitionism," *Journal of Negro History*, Vol. 26, No. 4, October 1941, 441. Reprinted in Herbert Aptheker, *To Be Free*, New York: International Publishers, 1948, 43.
- 10 Herbert Aptheker, *Anti-Racism in U.S. History: The First Two Hundred Years*, Westport, CT and London: Praeger, 1993, 98.
- 11 Herbert Aptheker, *American Negro Slave Revolts*, International Publishers, 1943, p. 397. Aptheker cites C. L. R. James, "History of Negro Revolt," *Fact*, London, 1938, No. 18.
- 12 Daniel Rasmussen, *Uprising: The Untold Story of America's Largest Slave Revolt*. New York: HarperCollins, 2011.
- 13 Herbert Aptheker, "American Negro Slave Revolts," *Science & Society*, Vol. 1, No. 4, Summer 1937, 523-524; Aptheker, *American Negro Slave Revolts*, 249-251.
- 14 I recall his telling his audience in the early 1970s (I paraphrase): "They say people left the Party over the Pact. Leave? That's when I joined!"
- 15 Gary Murrell, "Herbert Aptheker's Unity of Theory and Practice in the Communist Party USA: On the Last Night, and During the First Two Decades," *Science & Society*, Vol. 70, No. 1, January 2006, 103. If Jerome was "astonished," then perhaps Aptheker was already no longer psychologically free to engage James as a fellow laborer in the same vineyards.
- 16 Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *A Life in the Twentieth Century: Innocent Beginnings*, New York, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 519. The Schlesinger-Aptheker debate was held at Harvard by the John Reed Club on December 2, 1949.
- 17 . Aldon Lynn Nielsen, *C. L. R. James: A Critical Introduction*, Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 1997, 58.
- 18 C. L. R. James ["J. Meyer"], "Stalinism and Negro History," *Fourth International*, Vol. 10, No. 10, November 1949. http://www.marxists.org/history/etol/newspape/fi/index2.htm#fi49_11 Reprinted in *C. L. R. James and Revolutionary Marxism: Selected Writings of C. L. R. James 1939-1949*, eds. Scott McLemee and Paul Le Blanc, Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humani-

- ties Press, 1994. This volume gives 1948 as the article's date, but the index for Fourth International on Marxists.org leaves no doubt that 1949 is correct.
- 19 Ernest Kaiser, "Racial Dialectics: The Aptheker-Myrdal School Controversy," *Phylon*, Vol. 9, No. 4, 4th Quarter 1948, 295-302.
 - 20 C. L. R. James ["J. Meyer"], "Herbert Aptheker's Distortions," *Fourth International*, Vol. 10, No. 11, December 1949. http://www.marxists.org/history/etol/newspape/fi/index2.htm#fi49_12
 - 21 Eugene Genovese, "Herbert Aptheker's Achievement and Our Responsibility," *In Resistance: Studies in African, Caribbean, and Afro-American History*, ed. Gary Y. Okihiro, Amherst, University of Massachusetts Press, 1986, 22.
 - 22 Ibid., 26.
 - 23 C. L. R. James, *Mariners, Renegades and Castaways: The Story of Herman Melville and the World We Live In*. New York: privately printed (1953). Reprinted, London: Allison & Busby (1984).
 - 24 . Genovese, "Aptheker's Achievement," 22-23. My emphasis.—A. F.
 - 25 . Eugene D. Genovese, "Slavery and the Roots of Black Nationalism," in *In Black and Red: Marxian Explorations in Southern and Afro-American History*, Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1984, 131.
 - 26 . Ibid., 131.
 - 27 . Ibid., 154-55, n. 4.
 - 28 . John Bracey, "Foreword, 40th Anniversary Edition," Herbert Aptheker, *American Negro Slave Revolts*, International Publishers, 1993, 6.
 - 29 . Ibid., 8.
 - 30 . Ibid., 10-11.
 - 31 . Ibid., 9-10.
 - 32 . John Bracey, "The Questions We Should Be Asking," C. L. R. James and Grace C. Lee with the collaboration of Cornelius Castoriadis, *Facing Reality: The New Society—Where It Is and How to Bring It Closer*, Chicago: Charles H. Kerr, [1958] 2006, 3. Emphasis in the original.—A.F. Bracey's essay is the introduction to the 2006 edition.
 - 33 . Ibid., 3-4.
 - 34 . Interview of C. L. R. James by Al Richardson, Clarence Chrysostom, and Anna Grimshaw, June 8 and November 16, 1986. <http://www.marxists.org/archive/james-clr/works/1986/11/revhis-interview.htm>
 - 35 . Robin D. G. Kelley, "Introduction," *A History of Pan-African Revolt*, Chicago: Charles H. Kerr Publishing Company, 1995, 2.
 - 36 . Interview of Herbert Aptheker by Robin D. G. Kelley, *Journal of American History*, Vol. 87, No. 1, June 2000, 152.
 - 37 . The University North Carolina at Chapel Hill's "Documenting the American South" project has made text and facsimiles available online. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/beard63/beard63.html>

-
- 38 . Percy Waxman, *The Black Napoleon*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1931.
- 39 . *Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States, Vol. IV: From the Beginning of the New Deal to the End of the Second World War, 1933-1945*, ed. Herbert Aptheker, pp. 549-551.
- 40 . *African American History and Radical Historiography: Essays in Honor of Herbert Aptheker*, ed. Herbert Shapiro, Minneapolis: MEP Press, 1998, 74-75. The transcript of this conversation also appears in Herbert Aptheker on *Race and Democracy: A Reader*, eds. Eric Foner and Manning Marable, Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2010.
- 41 . E. J. Hobsbawm, "The Historians' Group of the Communist Party [of Great Britain]," in *Rebels and Their Causes: Essays in Honour of A. L. Morton*, edited by Maurice Cornforth, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1978, 21, 23.
- 42 . *African American History*, 75; and *Aptheker on Race and Democracy*, 251.
- 43 . *African American History*, 75; and *Aptheker on Race and Democracy*, 251.
- 44 . *African American History*, 75; and *Aptheker on Race and Democracy*, 251.
- 45 . This sentence implies, incorrectly, that "one" (Foner?) is the active member of the Communist Party in view. What Foner meant, of course, is: "One would not expect Aptheker, as an active member of the Communist Party, to be influenced by Trotskyist history," and the editor should have caught and clarified that unintended ambiguity.
- 46 . *African American History*, 76; and *Aptheker on Race and Democracy*, 252. My emphasis.
- 47 . Rayford W. Logan, *Revista de Historia de América* [Pan American Institute of Geography and History], No. 6, August 1939, 140; W. G. Seabrook, *Journal of Negro History*, Vol. 24, No. 1, January 1939, 125-127.
- 48 . *Time*, December 5, 1938; *New York Times*, December 11, 1938.
- 49 . Herbert Aptheker, "Some Unpublished Writings of W. E. B Du Bois," *Freedomways: A Quarterly Review of the Negro Freedom Movement*, Vol. 5, No. 1, Winter 1965, 103-128.
- 50 . C. L. R. James [untitled tribute to Du Bois], *Freedomways: A Quarterly Review of the Negro Freedom Movement*, Vol. 5, No. 1, Winter 1965, 24-25.
- 51 . W. E. B. Du Bois, "On Stalin," *National Guardian*, March 16, 1953. In *Newspaper Columns by Du Bois*, Vol. 2: 1945-1961. Compiled and edited by Herbert Aptheker. White Plains, New York: Kraus-Thomson Organization, 1986, 1015.
- 52 . A dozen years later, James told David Levering Lewis that Du Bois was "the most progressive and distinguished intellectual of the 20th century." Interview of C. L. R. James by David Levering Lewis, April 1976, Voices from the Renaissance Collection, Schomburg Research Collection in Black Culture.
- 53 . C. L. R. James, "The Atlantic Slave Trade and Slavery: Some Interpretations of Their Significance in the Development of the United States and the Western World." In *Amistad 1: Writings on Black History and Culture*, edited by John A. Williams and Charles F. Harris. New York: Vintage Books, 1970, 124. Aptheker comments on Du Bois' 1954 "Apologia" in his Introduction to "The Suppression of the African Slave Trade," in *Aptheker on Race and Democracy*, 198-209.
- 54 . *Ibid.*, 123-125.

-
- 55 . David Levering Lewis, *Du Bois: 1919-1963: The Fight for Equality and the American Century*, New York: Henry Holt, Vol. 2, 197.
- 56 . James's cites, in his second reference note to *World Revolution*, 303-304, the following items from the *New Statesman*: Beatrice Webb's review of W. H. Chamberlin [there misspelled "Chamberlain"], *Russia's Iron Age*, March 9, 1935; Chamberlin's reply to that review, May 18, 1935; and a letter by E. J. Evans, April 20, 1935.
- 57 . Anthony Flood, letter, *Journal of American History*, Vol. 87, No. 4, March 2001, 1598-1599.
- 58 . Robin D. G. Kelley [untitled answer to Genovese's question], *Dissent*, Summer 1994, 380-381.
- 59 . Robin D. G. Kelley, "Afterword [to his interview of Aptheker]," *Journal of American History*, Vol. 87, No. 1, June 2000, 170. Herbert Aptheker, *The Truth about Hungary*, New York: Mainstream Publishers, 1957.
- 60 . Kelley interview of Aptheker, 155.
- 61 . Anthony Flood, letter.
- 62 . Herbert Aptheker, letter, *Journal of American History*, Vol. 87, No. 4, March 2001, 1599.
- 63 . Transcript of interview conducted November 10, 2000. *White Men Challenging Racism*, eds. Cooper Thompson, Emmett Schaefer, and Harry Brod. Duke University Press, 2003, 21.
- 64 . Bettina Aptheker, *Intimate Politics: How I Grew Up Red, Fought for Free Speech, and Became a Feminist Rebel*, Berkeley, CA: Seal Press, 2006, 494.
- 65 . Herbert Aptheker, "The Truth about the Korean War," *Masses and Mainstream*, August 1950, pp. 3-24. Reprinted in Herbert Aptheker, *American Foreign Policy and the Cold War*, New York: International Publishers, 1962, pp. 123-43. The quotation is from page 131.
- 66 . Herbert Aptheker, "Autobiographical Note," *Journal of American History*, Vol. 87, No. 1, June 2000, 147-150.
- 67 . Anthony Flood, letter.
- 68 . *The Hungarian Revolution: The Story of the October Uprising as Recorded in Documents, Dispatches, Eye-Witness Accounts, and World-wide Reactions*, Melvin Lasky, ed., New York: Praeger and London: Secker & Warburg, 1957.
- 69 . Shane Mage, *The Hungarian Revolution*. April 1959.
- 70 . Aptheker, Truth, 117.
- 71 . See, for example, *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression*, by Stéphane Courtois, Nicolas Werth, Jean-Louis Panné, et al. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999. See also the material cited in note 56.
- 72 . *White Men Challenging Racism*, 21.
- 73 . C. L. R. James and *Revolutionary Marxism*, 77.